

Hackathons as Extracurricular Activities: Unraveling the Motivational Orientation Behind Student Participation

 Manuel B. Garcia ^{a,b}

^a College of Education, University of the Philippines Diliman, Philippines

^b College of Computer Studies and Multimedia Arts, FEU Institute of Technology, Philippines

Abstract:

The education sector is constantly progressing its competency paradigm by establishing nexus between practical, theoretical, and technical dimensions of teaching and learning. In the modern age of education, hackathons are becoming increasingly prominent in providing an optimal academic environment that connects classroom learnings to real-life scenarios. This study explored the motivational orientation behind student participation in hackathons through the framework provided by self-determination theory. Specifically, it investigated the role of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations in encouraging initial and continuous hackathon participation. The partial least squares-structural equation modeling method was used to analyze data collected from 437 students in 12 countries. According to the findings, although intrinsic motivation influences participation intention, extrinsic motivation drives continuance participation. When intrinsic and extrinsic motivational constructs were analyzed individually, it was found that continuance participation demands both motivational orientations. Comparisons of demographic characteristics indicate that older students with more extensive educational experience may have higher intentions to participate and continue participating in these events. This study offers insights into how the education sector can increase hackathon participation by tapping on the motivational orientation of students. From a methodological point of view, it is apparent to recommend the promotion of hackathons as a core extracurricular activity at a school level, and more indispensably, as pedagogy at a classroom level. In a world where students are encouraged to fail early, fast, and often, participating in hackathons is a tactical preparation for eventual success.

Keywords:

Hackathon, Extracurricular Activity, Self-Determination Theory, Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Motivation

Reference to this paper should be made as follows:

Garcia, M. B. (2022). Hackathons as Extracurricular Activities: Unraveling the Motivational Orientation Behind Student Participation. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*. DOI: 10.1002/cae.22564.

Corresponding Author:

Manuel B. Garcia, FEU Institute of Technology, Philippines. Email: mbgarcia@feutech.edu.ph

Disclaimer: This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of an article copied from <https://manuelgarcia.info/publication/hackathon-extracurricular-activity> and published in the *Computer Applications in Engineering Education* journal. The final authenticated version is available online at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/cae.22564>

Received: **29 Mar 2022** / Revised: **25 Jun 2022** / Accepted: **15 Aug 2022** / Published: **03 Sep 2022**

1. INTRODUCTION

An extracurricular activity (henceforth abbreviated as ECA) is a critical segment of the education landscape. Depicted as an adjunct to the primary curricula, the appreciation of its vital role stems from the positive relationships between activity participation (i.e., school-based ECAs engaged in by students) and cognitive, psychological, and social outcomes (Crosnoe et al., 2015; Fredricks & Eccles, 2010; Stuart et al., 2011). In particular, several studies suggest that ECA participation is associated with a stronger sense of school belonging (Ivaniushina & Aleksandrov, 2015), better character development (Solfema et al., 2019), more social and human capital (Feldman & Matjasko, 2005), superior academic performance (Chan, 2016), a higher likelihood of attending college (Morris, 2016), and increased employability chances (Thompson et al., 2013). ECA examples include running for student government, competing in athletics, joining academic organizations, and participating in hackathons. Among the forenamed instances, hackathon participation is the most recent addition to the growing inventory of ECAs.

Hackathon (a portmanteau of “*hack*” and “*marathon*”) is an intensive, time-bound event where participants in multidisciplinary teams collaborate and develop innovative solutions to real-world problems. In their book, Kohne and Wehmeier (2020) narrated the origin of hackathons as pure software development meetings for developers to create software on their respective platforms. Since then, it has evolved into several forms, and various organizations host hackathons for different reasons: technology companies to promote their products, governments to build technologies for social good, institutions to accelerate scientific discoveries, and schools to empower their students (Ghouila et al., 2018; Kvamsås et al., 2021; Leemet et al., 2021; Warner & Guo, 2017). As it originated outside academia, research is still scarce on hosting hackathons within the education field. In addition, most studies concentrated on engineering, computer science, and allied disciplines where innovation is a core mechanism of development. For instance, Porrás et al. (2018) concluded from a decade of events in software engineering education that hackathons fulfill the needs of students (e.g., acquire hard and soft skills), capstone projects (e.g., foster collaborative work), and society (e.g., solve real problems). These needs are collectively exhibited in a recent study by Pakpour et al. (2022), which examined hackathon events to highlight the important role of computer scientists and engineers in controlling disease outbreaks. In emulating a real-life workplace and challenges, students perceived the hackathon environment to be more authentic than university classes (Warner & Guo, 2017).

Despite the potential of hackathons for educational transformation, why students intend to or continuously participate remains unexplored. Understanding this phenomenon will help devise appropriate institutional schemes necessary to encourage more hackathon participation. Building on this research gap, the purpose of this study was to examine the motivational orientation behind student participation in hackathons. Although not in the context of hackathons but ECAs, researchers such as Dang and Nguyen Viet (2021) and Liu (2020) launched similar investigations grounded in various theories. However, there is still a lack of understanding on whether student participation is likewise driven by motivational factors. Saeed and Zyngier (2012) framed

motivation as a prerequisite of student engagement not only in learning but also in the processes (e.g., any activity to achieve sound academic outcomes) by which it is acquired. More importantly, motivation is among the most powerful determinants of students' success or failure in school (Hidi & Harackiewicz, 2000). Thus, this study employed the framework provided by self-determination theory (SDT) to explore the role of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations in encouraging hackathon participation. The succeeding parts of the study discuss the theoretical underpinning, research model and hypotheses development, methodology, discussion of the findings, and the implications, recommendations, and conclusion.

2. BACKGROUND

Life Outside the Classroom

The world is constantly evolving, and it has been increasingly recognized that formal education alone is insufficient (UNESCO, 2020). For students to thrive in the digital age, the school climate must be supportive of activities that promote exposure to realities and are conducive to experimenting with disruptive ideas. Following the notion of “*whole-person education*” (i.e., a school experience is not limited to academic undertaking), students should be exhorted to explore life beyond the classroom walls and acquire skills not directly taught in the traditional curriculum (Kim et al., 2021; Margaret Podger et al., 2010). Lipscomb (2007) asserted that many of the character-building skills needed in the workplace are attainable through ECAs. This assertion is further corroborated by employers who underscore ECAs as instrumental in exemplifying skills and competencies transferable to the workplace (Stuart et al., 2011). Thus, schools are constantly looking for new ECAs not only to upgrade their education models but also to help their students succeed academically and developmentally.

Hackathons as Extracurricular Activities

With hackathons primitively intended for and attended by software developers, it is unsurprising that most prior studies have focused on events organized by governments, nonprofits, and corporations rather than those by and for education institutions (Warner & Guo, 2017). Much like design thinking methodologies (Revano & Garcia, 2020), hackathons have made their way into education to encourage curiosity and innovation beyond the classroom and into the world (Steglich et al., 2021; Yarmohammadian et al., 2021). In addition to design thinking, hackathons pose similarities with cooperative learning, project-based learning, and inquiry-based learning when viewed as a pedagogy. Kohne and Wehmeier (2020) provided a detailed account of hackathons as a campus event of a university. In their book, they posited the importance of paying close attention to students and their backgrounds, such as age, education, seniority, and motivation. Contrary to its origin, a hackathon yields promising results when groups are made up of students with different disciplines and backgrounds. In principle, any motivated, creative, and idealistic students (rather than solely coding connoisseurs or engineers) are welcome to participate, although it still largely depends on the event objectives and its expected results (e.g., prototype or working products). Thus, the context of a hackathon in this study is not limited to

coding-based events. Regardless of their characteristics, it is still unknown what motivates students to participate in hackathons. Although there is a study that identified what motivates ECA participation (Dang & Nguyen Viet, 2021), motivating factors were not given a priority.

The Self-Determination Theory

The SDT is one of the core psychological theories on motivation (Deci & Ryan, 1985). It describes the innate psychological needs of people to thrive, such as *autonomy* or the need to feel in control of one's behavior; *competence* or the need to gain mastery; and *relatedness* or the need to experience a sense of belonging. The nature of hackathons reflects these needs by allowing students to work together (relatedness), have creative freedom in solving problems without faculty supervision (autonomy), and build their skills in the process (competence). In educational research, motivation is a prerequisite and necessary element for student engagement in learning and activities (e.g., ECAs) that can lead to improved academic outcomes (Saeed & Zyngier, 2012; Vu et al., 2022). Initially, motivation was regarded as a single concept, but SDT differentiates individual motivation into two types: *intrinsic* and *extrinsic*. In essence, the main difference between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is that the former involves engaging in an activity for the sake of doing it (e.g., satisfaction) while the latter involves external rewards (e.g., tangible incentives). The implications of both these motivation types in education have been profound (Ryan & Deci, 2020; Zaccone & Pedrini, 2019), which is why it is important to determine whether hackathon participation is driven by these factors.

3. RESEARCH MODEL AND HYPOTHESES DEVELOPMENT

Within the field of educational research, there is a scarcity of studies on hackathons as a form of ECA despite their growing popularity. The only available systematic reviews on the hackathon domain have primarily focused on the connection between the event outcomes and design aspects (Medina Angarita & Nolte, 2020), and how to organize it online (Happonen et al., 2021). Thus, to supplement the lack of hackathon studies, the research model of the present investigation borrowed theories, frameworks, and concepts from the ECA domain.

Previous research on ECA participation used various theoretical lenses to form and embody their analyses. Cortellazzo et al. (2021) adopted experiential learning theory (Kolb, 2015) to empirically disentangle the connection between ECAs (cultural activities, sport, volunteering, experience abroad) and emotional and social competencies. Griffiths et al. (2021) conducted a similar study but grounded the investigation on self-efficacy theory (Bandura, 1997) and self-concepts of student self-efficacy. Both studies have successfully established the positive relationship between ECA participation and student educational success. Shaffer (2019) posited that participation in an ECA is also a predictor of student motivation. However, while ECAs influence student motivation, what motivates students to participate in ECAs remains unclear. Conversely, Dang and Nguyen Viet (2021) looked at the antecedents by combining the theories of planned behavior (Ajzen, 1991) and signaling (Spence, 2002). This study used demographic,

information quality, capability, and motivation (i.e., attitude and subjective norm) factors to determine what influences students to participate in ECAs. While these prior works indicate transferable similarities between ECAs and hackathons, there is still a lack of understanding on whether student participation is likewise driven by intrinsic or extrinsic motivations. Thus, instead of replicating the studies in the hackathon context using the same theories, the present study selected the SDT approach to focus on the motivational factors.

SDT research commenced with an emphasis on intrinsic motivation – a prototypical manifestation of active human tendencies. Deci and Ryan (1985) posited that intrinsically motivated people freely engage in an activity for the inherent satisfaction and pleasure derived from the process. By doing so, they experience enjoyment and interest and feel self-determining and competent (Ryan & Deci, 2020). For instance, when intrinsically motivated students participate in hackathons, they do so not because of the potential rewards (e.g., prize money) but because they are interested in the events. This established association of intrinsic motivation with the mood of pleasure institutes a personal long-lasting commitment thereby permitting an adequate performance (Cerasoli & Ford, 2014). As intrinsic needs, self-determination and competence inevitably lead people in endless cycles of pursuing and conquering challenges (e.g., hackathons). Accordingly, the following hypotheses are proposed:

- H1.* Intrinsic motivations are positively associated with participation intention in hackathons.
- H2.* Intrinsic motivations are positively associated with continuance participation in hackathons.

Often contrasted with intrinsic motivation is the behavior of undertaking activities for reasons separate from the activity itself (i.e., extrinsic motivation). According to Deci and Ryan (1985), a person who is extrinsically motivated is generally focused on the expected results. Thus, when extrinsically motivated students participate in hackathons, they do so because they are aiming for external awards, such as improving their reputation to find a better job in the future. The study of Lepper et al. (2005) in traditional education contexts has shown that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation can and do coexist. This prospect indicates that students may seek out activities that they find inherently pleasurable while simultaneously paying attention to their extrinsic consequences. Thus, the following hypotheses are likewise proposed:

- H3.* Extrinsic motivations are positively associated with participation intention in hackathons.
- H4.* Extrinsic motivations are positively associated with continuance participation in hackathons.

In this study, the dependent variables (i.e., participation intention and continuance participation) aim to distinguish the factors affecting hackathon participation between students with and without experience. The research model is presented in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Research Model

4. METHODOLOGY

Measurement Development

Drawing from the existing literature, the constructs were formulated based on the concepts and findings presented in studies related to ECAs, hackathons, motivation, and educational research in general. As shown in Table 1, the constructs selected to measure intrinsic motivations were *practical experience* (Miller & Brickman, 2004), *social connection* (Al-Ansari et al., 2016), *vocational skills* (Lipscomb, 2007), and *challenge demand* (Lepper et al., 2005). Meanwhile, the constructs selected to measure extrinsic motivations were *competition prize* (Sternberg & Baalsrud-Hauge, 2015), *additional credit* (Groves, 2000), *career opportunities* (Thompson et al., 2013), and *personal reputation* (Urip & Kurniawati, 2020). The items per each construct were either extracted from or formulated based on the forenamed literature. All items were measured on a five-point Likert scale with anchors from “*strongly disagree*” (1) to “*strongly agree*” (5). After formulating the initial questionnaire, its characteristics (e.g., format, completeness, and readability) were scrutinized using the expert judgment approach. The questionnaire was then revised accordingly. Before data collection, the revised questionnaire was subjected to a pilot test with 50 students at a large university to ensure its reliability and validity. The Cronbach’s alpha was computed for each construct, and the results show all values were above the cutoff point ($\alpha > 0.7$), which indicates an internally consistent questionnaire.

Table 1. Construct Definitions

Constructs	Definition
Intrinsic Motivations	
Practical Experience (PEXP)	The degree to which students perceive that the incentive value of engaging in hackathons is instrumental to the attainment of their future goals.
Social Connection (SOCO)	The degree to which students desire the human emotional need to affiliate with and be accepted by others or as a member of a social group.
Vocational Skills (VOSK)	The degree to which students believe that hackathon participation results in the acquisition or enhancement of existing skills transferrable into a workplace.
Challenge Demand (CDEM)	The degree to which students tend to engage in and enjoy challenges as a unique opportunity for personal growth and development.
Extrinsic Motivations	
Competition Prize (PRZE)	The degree to which students participate in hackathons because of the tangible rewards (e.g., money, trophy, medal, certificate) given to winning participants.
Additional Credit (ADDC)	The degree to which students participate in hackathons because of the promised extra academic rewards offered simply by joining the events.
Career Opportunities (CAOP)	The degree to which students believe that hackathon events are an exceptional avenue where they can obtain an internship or job offer.
Personal Reputation (PERS)	The degree to which students believe that hackathon participation improves their reputation and profile within a social system.

Procedure and Sample

The final validated questionnaire was disseminated online via academic (e.g., learning management system) and social media channels (e.g., Facebook, Reddit, and LinkedIn) in January 2022. All students are eligible to participate in the survey to embody the vast implications of ECAs and break the common misconception that hackathons are exclusive to coding-based events. Steered by an assumption that most students have not yet attended a hackathon event, a separate invitation was dispatched to universities known for their active involvement in this kind of event. This tactic was to gather enough responses to measure the continuance participation variable. The assistance of teachers was crucial in this process because they pinpointed students with hackathon experience. As the present study concentrates on students with and without hackathon experience, an upfront question was set to identify which questionnaire and dependent variable (i.e., participation intention or continuance participation) will be displayed. Thus, there are two questionnaire versions with different item wordings. Appendix A shows the version for the continuance participation, and the items for the participation intention were included to showcase all statements on one page. The survey items were also randomized to decrease common method bias (Podsakoff et al., 2003). Overall, 437 students from 12 countries participated in the survey, of whom most were from the Philippines ($n = 174$, 39.8%), Egypt ($n = 82$, 18.8%), and India ($n = 59$, 13.5%). The majority of students were male ($n = 254$, 58.1%) with a

mean age of 19.54 ± 1.4 years, and sophomore ($n = 143, 32.7\%$) in a public university ($n = 234, 53.5\%$). Of the sample, 259 students (59.3%) indicated that they had not yet tried to participate in a hackathon although 296 (67.7%) students disclosed that they are familiar with this kind of event. Lastly, there was almost an equal proportion of students from computing ($n = 209, 47.8\%$) and non-computing ($n = 228, 52.2\%$) disciplines. Of the non-computing disciplines, there were 157 engineering students, 45 health students, and 26 business students.

Model and Hypotheses Testing

To test the research model and hypotheses, the component-based partial least squares structural equation modeling (PLS-SEM; Chin & Newsted, 1999) approach was adopted using *SmartPLS* 3.3.5 software. As described by Hair et al. (2014), PLS-SEM is a technique following an iterative approach that maximizes the explained variance of endogenous constructs. It was selected because it can process non-continuous variables (Haenlein & Kaplan, 2004) and does not make assumptions about data distribution (Fornell & Bookstein, 1982). In this study, the data is not normally distributed according to Kolmogorov–Smirnov's test. The model was first assessed in terms of reliability and validity, and the results are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Validity and Reliability Testing

	α	CR	AVE	PEXP	SOCO	VOSK	CDEM	PRZE	ADDC	CAOP	PERS	PINT	CONP
PEXP	0.898	0.904	0.702	<i>0.838</i>									
SOCO	0.857	0.891	0.654	0.562	<i>0.809</i>								
VOSK	0.772	0.813	0.676	0.425	0.596	<i>0.822</i>							
CDEM	0.781	0.828	0.638	0.562	0.532	0.676	<i>0.799</i>						
PRZE	0.945	0.952	0.775	0.345	0.425	0.452	0.354	<i>0.880</i>					
ADDC	0.859	0.875	0.662	0.290	0.678	0.369	0.125	0.653	<i>0.814</i>				
CAOP	0.876	0.891	0.544	0.301	0.556	0.268	0.532	0.686	0.653	<i>0.758</i>			
PERS	0.823	0.867	0.542	0.178	0.804	0.732	0.353	0.446	0.356	0.656	<i>0.736</i>		
PINT	0.944	0.950	0.760	0.381	0.246	0.553	0.256	0.576	0.743	0.734	0.465	<i>0.842</i>	
CONP	0.934	0.943	0.794	0.397	0.357	0.357	0.347	0.359	0.414	0.356	0.645	0.692	<i>0.831</i>

Notes: CR, Composite Reliability; AVE, Average Variance Extracted; PEXP, Personal Experience; SOCO, Social Connection; VOSK, Vocational Skills; CDEM, Challenge Demand; PRZE, Competition Prize; ADDC, Additional Credit; CAOP, Career Opportunities; PERS, Personal Reputation; PINT, Participation Intention; CONP, Continuance Participation. The italic value stands for the square root of AVE.

In PLS-SEM, reliability is tested through composite reliability (CR). According to the results, the CR values ranged from 0.813 to 0.952, all exceeding the acceptable level of 0.70, thus showing good internal consistency. Meanwhile, the convergent validity was measured by examining the average variance extracted (AVE). The AVE values ranged from 0.542 to 0.794, which was well above the threshold of 0.50. On the other hand, the discriminant validity was calculated by using the Fornell and Larcker (1981) criterion. The correlations among constructs were all below the square root of AVE (i.e., the diagonal values in italic), indicating compliance

with the criterion. The collinearity measurements of tolerance and variance inflation factor (VIF) were also well within recognized parameters (VIF < 5, Tolerance < 0.1; Hair et al., 2011). Thus, multicollinearity is not an issue in this study. To expose a possible non-response bias, the wave analysis was conducted. For this approach, the collected data were divided into two groups (i.e., the early and late respondent datasets) and evaluated using a *t*-test to determine the difference between the means. There was no significant difference between groups, confirming that non-response bias was not a problem for this study. Finally, the construct correlation matrix was also assessed to determine a common method bias issue. Upon assessment, none of the constructs were correlated above 0.90 indicating that there is no common method variance. Overall, the results of the measurement model (Table 2) warrants further testing of the structural model.

5. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of Demographic Profiles as Control Variables

Prior works have shown that the demographic profile influences students' intention to participate in ECAs (Dang & Nguyen Viet, 2021; Pan et al., 2022). These factors may also affect the interrelationships between the core variables in the hackathon context. Thus, variables including age, gender, education level, type of institution, and hackathon familiarity have been controlled for in the analysis. The findings show that age and education level influence participation intention ($\beta = 0.116, p < 0.046$; $\beta = 0.143, p < 0.038$) and continuance participation ($\beta = 0.114, p < 0.043$; $\beta = 0.125, p < 0.021$). These significant effects indicate that older students with more extensive educational experience may have higher intentions to participate and continue participating in these events. Conversely, gender, institution type, and familiarity do not influence either participation intention or continuance participation in hackathons.

The significant association of age and education level with participation intention and continuance participation in hackathons may have something to do with self-esteem and self-efficacy that students may have developed through the years. Ogihara and Kusumi (2020) investigated the developmental trajectory of self-esteem over the life course and found that the average level of self-esteem suggests an upward trend as people age. A high level of self-esteem implies students are free of social anxiety (e.g., fear of social situations and lack of self-confidence) that may restrict them from participating in hackathons (Lowe & Harris, 2019). Meanwhile, the correlation between educational experience and self-efficacy can be found in Bandura's (1997) theory, which postulates mastery experience as the most influential source of efficacy information. In the educational setting, students with high self-efficacy are more likely to accept challenging tasks (e.g., hackathon competitions) than students with low self-efficacy. This is supported by Griffiths et al. (2021), who uncovered the relationship between self-efficacy and ECA participation, and that self-efficacy increases over time. Finally, these findings offer practical insights for the education sector to formulate strategies that may reinforce self-esteem and self-efficacy, especially among younger students. More importantly, the effects should be recognized not only within the classroom walls but even beyond the school gate.

One unconventional finding of this analysis was the insignificant effect of gender. In the ECA context, Dang and Nguyen Viet (2021) found the opposite: gender has a significant impact on the participation and attitude of students. For instance, girls have a more favorable attitude and stronger intention to partake in extracurricular dance than boys (Anderson et al., 2017). Undoubtedly, the type of ECAs has a moderating role in this example since students naturally prefer the activity compatible with their gender identity (i.e., gender norms) or parallel to the acceptable behavior in society (i.e., social norms). However, hackathons are also vulnerable when peeked through these vantage points because they are often orchestrated as coding-based events. The academic field of computing is a prime example of disparity along gender lines where women have been historically underrepresented. In addition to the gender gap issue, Warner and Guo (2017) pointed out that hackathons embody a geeky environment that implicitly excludes women. Consequently, a possible explanation why gender was insignificant is that the study was not restricted to coding-based events and computing students.

Table 3. Hypotheses Testing Results (Overall Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations)

Hypothesis	Path	β	CI	<i>p</i> -value	Decision
<i>H1</i>	INMO → PINT	0.142*	0.016–0.271	0.038	Supported
<i>H2</i>	INMO → CONP	0.234	-0.034–0.212	0.154	Rejected
<i>H3</i>	EXMO → PINT	0.156	-0.046–0.257	0.310	Rejected
<i>H4</i>	EXMO → CONP	0.566***	0.492–0.664	0.000	Supported

Notes: INMO: Intrinsic Motivations; EXMO: Extrinsic Motivations, PINT: Participation Intention; CONP: Continuance Participation. **p* < 0.05; ***p* < 0.01; ****p* < 0.001

Analysis of Overall Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations

The results of the hypothesis testing for the analysis of overall intrinsic and extrinsic motivations are summarized in Table 3. A crisscross pattern was evident on the results: intrinsic motivations were statistically significantly associated with participation intention ($p = 0.038$, *H1* supported) but not with continuance participation ($p = 0.154$, *H2* rejected) while extrinsic motivations ($p = 0.310$, *H3* rejected) were not statistically significantly associated with influence participation intention but with continuance participation ($p = 0.000$, *H4* supported). These associations indicate that albeit intrinsic motivation influences initial participation, extrinsic motivation drives subsequent participation. A potential example is that students initially participate in a competition to acquire *practical experience* but continue to do so to boost their *personal reputation*. This finding extended the work of Lepper et al. (2005) on the coexistence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivations by ascertaining that students may be more intrinsically motivated at first before becoming more extrinsically motivated on succeeding participation. Conversely, this finding is in contrast to the study of Liu (2020), which identified extrinsic motivation as the most significant determinant of competition participation intention. However, continuance participation was unaccounted for in that study, indicating that prior experience may

affect the motivational orientation behind student participation. Nevertheless, this study cannot prove the transition of motivation from intrinsic to extrinsic after initial participation because the data were gathered from two groups of students (with and without hackathon experience) and analyzed separately. It is therefore recommended for future research to conduct a longitudinal study to validate the switching of motivational orientations.




Figure 2. Analysis of Specific Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations

Analysis of Specific Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations

A more detailed analysis of specific intrinsic and extrinsic motivations is presented in Figure 2. The path analyses revealed mixed findings, in the sense that they are only in part in line with the foregoing result (e.g., intrinsic motivation → participation intention). Explicitly, there are specific intrinsic and extrinsic motivation constructs that are positively associated with continuance participation, which parades the coexistence of both motivation types (Lepper et al., 2005). For instance, continuance participation is significantly positively associated with both intrinsic motivations such as *social connection* ($\beta = 0.293, p < 0.038$) and *vocational skills* ($\beta = 0.152, p < 0.043$), and extrinsic motivations such as *career opportunities* ($\beta = 0.183, p < 0.046$) and *personal reputation* ($\beta = 0.114, p < 0.037$). Drawing on the number of significant constructs associated with the dependent variables, it can be inferred that it may take more than intrinsic motivations for students to continue participating in hackathons after their initial experience.

A common denominator among the significant constructs is the predilection towards the employability benefits of hackathon participation. This emerging pattern is supported by prior studies (Roulin & Bangerter, 2013; Stuart et al., 2011; Thompson et al., 2013) that unravel student motives behind ECA participation. The evidence suggests students exploit ECAs to develop their employability narrative and obtain a positional advantage over their competitors. In hackathons, students accumulate *practical experience* valued in the workplace by formulating different approaches that solve intricate real-life problems. Together with academic credentials, students consider this acquired experience (i.e., hard currencies) as charismatic qualities to present themselves distinctively to employers (Roulin & Bangerter, 2013). The nature of hackathons likewise affords students developmentally appropriate opportunities to earn soft currencies (Feraco et al., 2021; Tanaka & Ito, 2020), including teamwork, problem-solving, time management, and interpersonal skills. Both hard and soft currencies (*vocational skills*), combined with self (e.g., personality and *personal reputation*), are packaged as a narrative of employability according to the social construction of personal capital (Brown et al., 2004).

The positive bearing of *career opportunities* not only reinforces this employability pattern but also insinuates a stronger association of hackathons with business enterprises than education providers. While the former host hackathons to attract new talents, the latter merely send students to represent their institution at these events. This innuendo may indicate that the education sector has not yet fully embraced hackathons as a form of ECAs and that this sprint-like event is still somehow exclusive to the industry where it emanated. From an academic standpoint, this is a missed opportunity to suffuse a mindset of innovation and prepare students for the workforce. More importantly, the familiar presence of corporate sponsorships in company-hosted hackathons is turning the events into full-fledged competitions instead of authentic learning environments (Warner & Guo, 2017). It is therefore paramount that schools also organize in-house hackathons rather than send representatives to competitions hosted by outside organizations. If the involvement of external enterprises is a necessity, a university-industry collaborative approach (e.g., de Macedo Guimarães et al., 2021; Yuen & Wong, 2021) is worth

consideration. By arranging regular hackathons either at a school (as an ECA) or classroom (as a pedagogy) level, students can master job-related competencies and characteristics that can put a veneer on their lack of significant work experience (Clark et al., 2015). Although the allure of acclaimed companies offering to fund school-hosted hackathons can be a powerful persuader, as an ECA, it is compulsory to preserve the core values (e.g., informal learning, collaboration, community building) that benefit students and not simply sponsors.

Among the specific motivations, only *social connection* was positively associated with both participation intention ($\beta = 0.145, p < 0.024$) and continuance participation ($\beta = 0.293, p < 0.038$). The relevance of social connection as a motivator in hackathon participation may not be surprising as the event is highly social in nature, where participants typically assemble groups of about 2-5 individuals. Students perceive hackathons as a weekend social event where they can hang out with their friends and other like-minded people. This finding reinforces the work of Al-Ansari et al. (2016), where socialization was the most frequently cited motive for ECA participation. By participating in activities together, students have a sense of belonging and a support mechanism to cope with stressful times (Thompson et al., 2013). Regardless, there is a paradox between why students choose and choose not to participate in hackathons. Warner and Guo (2017) uncovered that *novice fear* is the primary reason students choose not to participate – something that social connection can alleviate. Garcia (2021) authenticated the value of social elements by operating cooperative learning in computer programming with novice students who usually experience a *fear of coding* when alone. In practice, this dichotomy accentuates the implication of building social ties at a classroom level and regularly integrating social interaction elements in the pedagogical techniques of teachers. The formation of these social relationships is not only vital academically, but also in improving one's quality of life, self-esteem, life satisfaction, and human and societal development (Fung et al., 2022; Garcia et al., 2022).

Implications, Limitations, and Future Directions

From a theoretical standpoint, this study contributes to the scant literature on hackathons in education and advances our cognizance of ECAs. By wearing the lens of SDT, it realizes a holistic model of student participation (both participation intention and continuance participation) in hackathons rooted in motivation factors and ECA research. Consequently, it extended the study of Dang and Nguyen Viet (2021) by integrating intrinsic and extrinsic motivations as additional antecedents of ECA participation via hackathons as the central point of investigation. While intrinsic motivation influences initial participation, students will continue to partake because of extrinsic motivation. The materialization of this finding is attributed to the inclusion of continuance intention – a construct absent in prior works (e.g., Dang & Nguyen Viet, 2021; Liu, 2020). Nevertheless, whether there is a changeover of motivational orientation (e.g., from intrinsic to extrinsic) in the subsequent involvement is for future studies to find out.

Although a deeper investigation is warranted, the number of associated factors with the dependent variables implies that it may take more than intrinsic motivation for students to continue participating in hackathons after their initial experience. Unlike most ECAs, the

attractiveness of hackathon events is ascribed to its primordial form (business-sponsored) and the affixed promising rewards, such as prize money, venture capital, internship, and employment (Kamariotou & Kitsios, 2022; Kohne & Wehmeier, 2020). Paradoxically, the inability of its academic variant to afford all these rewards may impact the continuous engagement of students. The reliance on extrinsic motivation is also deleterious because it neither supports learning nor long-lasting lifetime performance and can lead to obsessive behavior problems, procrastination, and negativism (Clanton Harpine, 2015). This certitude suggests that schools may need to rebrand hackathons as primarily ECAs where internal factors are in the foreground to preclude the ascendancy of extrinsic over intrinsic motivation. According to a 40-year meta-analysis (Cerasoli et al., 2014), extrinsic motivation matters less when intrinsic motivation matters more to performance. Therefore, another managerial implication of this study concerns the exigency of school-wide strategies for fostering intrinsic motivation in students. For courses with laboratory or hands-on components, intrinsic motivation is important because it shows the highest relationship with academic achievement (Avci, 2022; Mustafa et al., 2022).

This study likewise deepened its discovery by heeding specific constructs derived from the vast literature of ECAs. Specifying individual motives unlocks a unique line of interpretation that is much deeper than merely scratching the surface of the motivation theory. For instance, the appeal of *practical experience* as a participation driver regurgitates the unabating challenge of balancing the teaching of foundational theoretical concepts with the pragmatic skills instrumental to one's future goals. Students discern hackathons as an avenue of worthwhile experience that may not always be accessible in curricular activities. From a methodological point of view, it is apparent to recommend the promotion of hackathons as a core ECA at a school level, and more indispensably, as pedagogy at a classroom level. For instance, teachers may administer mini hackathons inside the classroom where students conceive small open-ended projects aligned with the subject matter. One empirical example is the *Engineering Design Days* deployed by Christopher et al. (2018) in different undergraduate programs (Mechanical, Electrical, Computer, and Mechatronics Engineering). These in-house engineering hackathon events replaced several traditional class sessions allowing students to collaborate in designing and building solutions to real-life problems. According to Mehta et al. (2022), this implementation of pedagogical hackathons is supported by engineering educators. Not only does it introduce hackathons as more of a learning ecology rather than a business-sponsored competition, but it also diversifies the praxis into other academic programs. With hackathons temporarily disguised as a project-based learning approach, time is afforded to scholastic leaders and researchers to cultivate an inclusive version where students can take part, regardless of age, gender, educational experience, or major.

These implications raise enthralling points on the migration of hackathons in education thus unlocking important research avenues to pursue in the coming years. From the outset, sparking these discussions commences the proliferation of hackathon literature that presently lacks sufficient exploration. First, there should be a consensus on how corporate (e.g., Valença et al., 2019) academic (e.g., Kumalakov et al., 2018), and university-industry (e.g., Yuen & Wong, 2021) hackathons differ in terms of proper implementation and their effectiveness when utilized

in an educational context. This differentiation will draw a line between these formats, allowing teachers to choose whether, what, and how to host hackathons. Then, it is crucial to substantiate which positive and negative effects of ECAs are inheritable by hackathons when implemented as such. Isolating these effects is imperative because prior works seldom considered the specific type of ECA in their investigations. With the growing implementation of hackathons in academia, future research should also investigate how they are conducted in different disciplines. For instance, differentiating a healthcare hackathon (Wang et al., 2018) from an engineering hackathon (Christopher et al., 2018) will pinpoint tailored experiences and recommendations. As a pedagogy, it is also beneficial to explore how hackathons influence traditional classroom teaching. Would students experience tension between hackathons and academic work like in other ECAs? How effective would hackathons be if teachers deploy them as a regular learning activity rather than an occasional ECA? With teachers being included in the conversation, examining the factors affecting their intention to host hackathon events is recommended to guarantee coordination between stakeholders. Finally, it is also worth exploring the possibilities of using hackathons in non-computing and non-engineering degrees, especially in programs where innovation should be highlighted as part of the core curriculum. As argued by Falk et al. (2021), carefully designed activities and mechanisms are necessary to encourage broader and more diverse participation. Future works therefore should draft a guideline on transforming hackathons into an ECA that is more inclusive, diverse, and welcoming to everyone.

In addition to these future work suggestions, researchers may likewise address the limitations of the study. First, the cross-sectional nature of this research restricts its ability to demonstrate the changeover from intrinsic to extrinsic motivation after initial participation in hackathon events. Employing a longitudinal research design is recommended to determine whether there is a transition in motivational orientation. Second, the data collection was carried out in the middle of the COVID-19 pandemic when students suffered periods of isolation due to lockdown regulations. These social effects experienced by students at the time of the study could have affected their self-reported responses (Garcia & Revano, 2022). Finally, although it is a strength of the study to involve students from different programs because of its anchor to ECA, these students may have different perceptions toward hackathons. For instance, engineering and computing students may have perceived hackathons as an avenue to acquire new or enhance existing skills that are transferrable to the workplace while others are driven by different motivators. Replicating the study at a per program level is therefore recommended.

6. CONCLUSION

The education sector is constantly progressing its competency paradigm by establishing nexus between practical, theoretical, and technical dimensions of teaching and learning. This undertaking has initiated continuous curriculum adjustments, introducing new courses and activities relevant to sustainable development. In the modern age of education, hackathons are becoming increasingly prominent in providing an optimal academic environment that allows students to connect what they learned in the classroom to real-life scenarios. Despite the

potential for academic transformation, there is still a shortage of research that empirically examines the occupation of hackathons in education. Following the notion that motivation is a prerequisite of student engagement, this study explored the motivational orientation behind student participation in hackathons. According to the findings, although intrinsic motivation influences participation intention, extrinsic motivation drives continuance participation. When specific constructs are analyzed individually, continuance participation demands both motivational orientations. Following the pattern among significant constructs, students exploit hackathons to develop their employability narrative and obtain a positional advantage over their competitors. Comparisons of demographic characteristics indicate that older students with more extensive educational experience may have higher intentions to participate and continue participating in these events. Taking everything into consideration, the findings and implications of the study offer insights into how the education sector can increase hackathon participation by tapping on the motivational orientation of students. In a world where students are encouraged to fail early, fast, and often, participating in hackathons is preparation for eventual success.

REFERENCES

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The Theory of Planned Behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179-211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Al-Ansari, A., Al-Harbi, F., AbdelAziz, W., AbdelSalam, M., El Tantawi, M. M., & ElRefae, I. (2016). Factors Affecting Student Participation in Extra-Curricular Activities: A Comparison Between Two Middle Eastern Dental Schools. *The Saudi Dental Journal*, 28(1), 36-43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sdentj.2015.05.004>
- Anderson, S. D., Leyland, S. D., & Ling, J. (2017). Gender Differences in Motivation for Participation in Extra-Curricular Dance: Application of the Theory of Planned Behaviour. *Research in Dance Education*, 18(2), 150-160. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14647893.2017.1330325>
- Avcı, Ü. (2022). A Predictive Analysis of Learning Motivation and Reflective Thinking Skills on Computer Programming Achievement. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/cae.22505>
- Bandura, A. (1997). *Self-Efficacy: The Exercise of Control*. Worth Publishers.
- Brown, P., Hesketh, A., & Williams, S. (2004). *The Mismanagement of Talent: Employability and Jobs in the Knowledge Economy*. Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199269532.001.0001>
- Cerasoli, C. P., & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic Motivation, Performance, and the Mediating Role of Mastery Goal Orientation: A Test of Self-Determination Theory. *The Journal of Psychology*, 148(3), 267-286. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00223980.2013.783778>
- Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M., & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic Motivation and Extrinsic Incentives Jointly Predict Performance: A 40-Year Meta-Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(4), 980-1008. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0035661>
- Chan, Y.-K. (2016). Investigating the Relationship Among Extracurricular Activities, Learning Approach and Academic Outcomes: A Case Study. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 17(3), 223-233. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787416654795>
- Chin, W. W., & Newsted, P. R. (1999). Structural Equation Modeling Analysis with Small Samples Using Partial Least Squares. In R. H. Hoyle (Ed.), *Statistical Strategies for Small Sample Research* (pp. 307-341). SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Christopher, R., Carol Hulls, P. E., Derek Wright, P. E., Andrew, J. B. M., Eugene, L., & Sanjeev Bedi, P. E. (2018). Engineering Design Days: Engaging Students with Authentic Problem-Solving in an Academic Hackathon. *2018 ASEE Annual Conference & Exposition*. <https://doi.org/10.18260/1-2-30407>

- Clanton Harpine, E. (2015). Is Intrinsic Motivation Better Than Extrinsic Motivation? In E. Clanton Harpine (Ed.), *Group-Centered Prevention in Mental Health: Theory, Training, and Practice* (pp. 87-107). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-19102-7_6
- Clark, G., Marsden, R., Whyatt, J. D., Thompson, L., & Walker, M. (2015). 'It's everything else you do...': Alumni Views on Extracurricular Activities and Employability. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 16(2), 133-147. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787415574050>
- Cortellazzo, L., Bonesso, S., Gerli, F., & Pizzi, C. (2021). Experiences That Matter: Unraveling the Link Between Extracurricular Activities and Emotional and Social Competencies. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12(2775), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.659526>
- Crosnoe, R., Smith, C., & Leventhal, T. (2015). Family Background, School-Age Trajectories of Activity Participation, and Academic Achievement at the Start of High School. *Applied Developmental Science*, 19(3), 139-152. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10888691.2014.983031>
- Dang, H. P., & Nguyen Viet, B. (2021). Inside the Intention to Join Extracurricular Activities: Integrating the Theory of Planned Behavior and Signaling Theory. *Cogent Education*, 8(1), 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2021.1888672>
- de Macedo Guimarães, L. B., Bitencourt, R. S., Chrusciak, C. B., Derenevich, M. G., Poncini, C. R., Okumura, M. L. M., & Junior, O. C. (2021). Sustainability Hackathon: Integrating Academia and Companies for Finding Solutions for Socio-environmental Problems. In W. Leal Filho, U. Tortato, & F. Frankenberger (Eds.), *Integrating Social Responsibility and Sustainable Development: Addressing Challenges and Creating Opportunities* (pp. 591-607). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-59975-1_40
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior*. Springer US. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2271-7>
- Falk, J., Kannabiran, G., & Hansen, N. B. (2021). What Do Hackathons Do? Understanding Participation in Hackathons Through Program Theory Analysis. *2021 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Article 147. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3411764.3445198>
- Feldman, A. F., & Matjasko, J. L. (2005). The Role of School-Based Extracurricular Activities in Adolescent Development: A Comprehensive Review and Future Directions. *Review of Educational Research*, 75(2), 159-210. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543075002159>
- Feraco, T., Resnati, D., Fregonese, D., Spoto, A., & Meneghetti, C. (2021). Soft Skills and Extracurricular Activities Sustain Motivation and Self-Regulated Learning at School. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 8(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00220973.2021.1873090>
- Fornell, C., & Bookstein, F. L. (1982). Two Structural Equation Models: LISREL and PLS Applied to Consumer Exit-Voice Theory. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 19(4), 440-452. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378201900406>
- Fornell, C., & Larcker, D. F. (1981). Structural Equation Models with Unobservable Variables and Measurement Error: Algebra and Statistics. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 18(3), 382-388. <https://doi.org/10.1177/002224378101800313>
- Fredricks, J. A., & Eccles, J. S. (2010). Breadth of Extracurricular Participation and Adolescent Adjustment Among African-American and European-American Youth. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 20(2), 307-333. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2009.00627.x>
- Fung, C. Y., Su, S. I., Perry, E., & Garcia, M. B. (2022). Development of a Socioeconomic Inclusive Assessment Framework for Online Learning in Higher Education. In M. B. Garcia (Ed.), *Socioeconomic Inclusion During an Era of Online Education*. IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-6684-4364-4.ch002>
- Garcia, M. B. (2021). Cooperative Learning in Computer Programming: A Quasi-Experimental Evaluation of Jigsaw Teaching Strategy with Novice Programmers. *Education and Information Technologies*, 26(4), 4839-4856. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10639-021-10502-6>
- Garcia, M. B., & Revano, T. F. (2022). Pandemic, Higher Education, and a Developing Country: How Teachers and Students Adapt to Emergency Remote Education. *2022 4th Asia Pacific Information Technology Conference*, 111-115. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3512353.3512369>
- Garcia, M. B., Rull, V. M. A., Gunawardana, S. S. J. D., Bias, D. J. M., Chua, R. C. C., Cruz, J. E. C., Fernando-Raguro, M. C., & Perez, M. R. L. (2022). Promoting Social Relationships Using a Couch Cooperative Video Game: An Empirical Experiment With Unacquainted Players. *International Journal of Gaming and Computer-Mediated Simulations (IJGCMS)*, 14(1), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.4018/IJGCMS.303106>

- Ghouila, A., Siwo, G. H., Entfellner, J.-B. D., Panji, S., Button-Simons, K. A., Davis, S. Z., Fadlilmola, F. M., Participants, D. o. M. H., Ferdig, M. T., & Mulder, N. (2018). Hackathons as a Means of Accelerating Scientific Discoveries And Knowledge Transfer. *Genome research*, 28(5), 759-765. <https://doi.org/10.1101/gr.228460.117>
- Griffiths, T.-L., Dickinson, J., & Day, C. J. (2021). Exploring the Relationship Between Extracurricular Activities and Student Self-efficacy Within University. *Journal of Further and Higher Education*, 45(9), 1294-1309. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0309877X.2021.1951687>
- Groves, J. L. (2000). Students' Perceptions of Extra Credit. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Education*, 12(1), 27-62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10963758.2000.10685265>
- Haenlein, M., & Kaplan, A. M. (2004). A Beginner's Guide to Partial Least Squares Analysis. *Understanding Statistics*, 3(4), 283-297. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15328031us0304_4
- Hair, J. F., Ringle, C. M., & Sarstedt, M. (2011). PLS-SEM: Indeed a Silver Bullet. *Journal of Marketing Theory and Practice*, 19(2), 139-152. <https://doi.org/10.2753/MTP1069-6679190202>
- Hair, J. F., Sarstedt, M., Hopkins, L., & Kuppelwieser, V. G. (2014). Partial Least Squares Structural Equation Modeling (PLS-SEM). *European Business Review*, 26(2), 106-121. <https://doi.org/10.1108/EBR-10-2013-0128>
- Haponen, A., Tikka, M., & Usmani, U. A. (2021). A Systematic Review for Organizing Hackathons and Code Camps in COVID-19 Like Times: Literature in Demand to Understand Online Hackathons and Event Result Continuation. *2021 International Conference on Data and Software Engineering (ICoDSE)*, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICoDSE53690.2021.9648459>
- Hidi, S., & Harackiewicz, J. M. (2000). Motivating the Academically Unmotivated: A Critical Issue for the 21st Century. *Review of Educational Research*, 70(2), 151-179. <https://doi.org/10.3102/00346543070002151>
- Ivaniushina, V. A., & Aleksandrov, D. A. (2015). Socialization Through Informal Education: The Extracurricular Activities of Russian Schoolchildren. *Russian Social Science Review*, 56(5), 18-39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10611428.2015.1115290>
- Kamariotou, M., & Kitsios, F. (2022). Hackathons for Driving Service Innovation Strategies: The Evolution of a Digital Platform-Based Ecosystem. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 8(3), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc8030111>
- Kim, D., Wortham, S., Borowiec, K., Yatsu, D. K., Ha, S., Carroll, S., Wang, L., & Kim, J. (2021). Formative Education Online: Teaching the Whole Person During the Global COVID-19 Pandemic. *AERA Open*, 7, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1177/23328584211015229>
- Kohne, A., & Wehmeier, V. (2020). *Hackathons: From Idea to Successful Implementation*. Springer International Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-58839-7>
- Kolb, D. A. (2015). *Experiential Learning: Experience as the Source of Learning and Development* (2nd ed.). Pearson FT Press.
- Kumalakov, B., Kim, A., Mukhtarova, S., Shukurova, A., & Khon, N. (2018). Hackathon as a Project Based Teaching Tool: Employing Programming Challenge in the Class. *2018 IEEE 12th International Conference on Application of Information and Communication Technologies (AICT)*, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICAICT.2018.8747149>
- Kvamsås, H., Neby, S., Haarstad, H., Stiller-Reeve, M., & Schrage, J. (2021). Using Collaborative Hackathons to Coproduce Knowledge on Local Climate Adaptation Governance. *Current Research in Environmental Sustainability*, 3. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crsust.2020.100023>
- Leemet, A., Milani, F., & Nolte, A. (2021). Utilizing Hackathons to Foster Sustainable Product Innovation - The Case of a Corporate Hackathon Series. *2021 IEEE/ACM 13th International Workshop on Cooperative and Human Aspects of Software Engineering (CHASE)*, 51-60. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CHASE52884.2021.00014>
- Lepper, M. R., Corpus, J. H., & Iyengar, S. S. (2005). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivational Orientations in the Classroom: Age Differences and Academic Correlates. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 97(2), 184-196. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.97.2.184>
- Lipscomb, S. (2007). Secondary school extracurricular involvement and academic achievement: a fixed effects approach. *Economics of Education Review*, 26(4), 463-472. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econedurev.2006.02.006>
- Liu, I. F. (2020). The Impact of Extrinsic Motivation, Intrinsic Motivation, and Social Self-efficacy on English Competition Participation Intentions of Pre-college Learners: Differences Between High School and Vocational Students in Taiwan. *Learning and Motivation*, 72, 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.lmot.2020.101675>

- Lowe, J., & Harris, L. M. (2019). A Comparison of Death Anxiety, Intolerance of Uncertainty and Self-Esteem as Predictors of Social Anxiety Symptoms. *Behaviour Change*, 36(3), 165-179. <https://doi.org/10.1017/bec.2019.11>
- Margaret Podger, D., Mustakova-Possardt, E., & Reid, A. (2010). A Whole-Person Approach to Educating for Sustainability. *International Journal of Sustainability in Higher Education*, 11(4), 339-352. <https://doi.org/10.1108/14676371011077568>
- Medina Angarita, M. A., & Nolte, A. (2020). What Do We Know About Hackathon Outcomes and How to Support Them? – A Systematic Literature Review. *Collaboration Technologies and Social Computing*, 50-64. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-58157-2_4
- Mehta, N., Bist, S. S., & Shah, P. (2022). Hackathons: What do Engineering Educators Think About it? *Higher Education, Skills and Work-Based Learning*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/HESWBL-03-2021-0064>
- Miller, R. B., & Brickman, S. J. (2004). A Model of Future-Oriented Motivation and Self-Regulation. *Educational Psychology Review*, 16(1), 9-33. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:EDPR.0000012343.96370.39>
- Morris, D. S. (2016). Extracurricular Activity Participation in High School: Mechanisms Linking Participation to Math Achievement and 4-Year College Attendance. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(5), 1376-1410. <https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831216667579>
- Mustafa, A. S., Alkaws, G. A., Ofosu-Ampong, K., Vanduhe, V. Z., Garcia, M. B., & Baashar, Y. (2022). Gamification of E-Learning in African Universities: Identifying Adoption Factors Through Task-Technology Fit and Technology Acceptance Model. In F. Portela & R. Queirós (Eds.), *Next-Generation Applications and Implementations of Gamification Systems* (pp. 73-96). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-8089-9.ch005>
- Ogihara, Y., & Kusumi, T. (2020). The Developmental Trajectory of Self-Esteem Across the Life Span in Japan: Age Differences in Scores on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale From Adolescence to Old Age. *Frontiers in Public Health*, 8(132), 1-18. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2020.00132>
- Pakpour, N., Nouredini, S., & Tandon, J. (2022). Engaging Engineering Students in Public Health Responses to Disease Outbreaks Through Hackathons. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TE.2022.3159150>
- Pan, Y., Zhou, D., & Shek, D. T. L. (2022). Participation in After-School Extracurricular Activities and Cognitive Ability Among Early Adolescents in China: Moderating Effects of Gender and Family Economic Status [Original Research]. *Frontiers in Pediatrics*, 10, 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fped.2022.839473>
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common Method Biases in Behavioral Research: A Critical Review of the Literature and Recommended Remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(5), 879-903. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879>
- Porras, J., Khakurel, J., Ikonen, J., Happonen, A., Knutas, A., Herala, A., & Drögehorn, O. (2018). Hackathons in Software Engineering Education: Lessons Learned From a Decade of Events. *2nd International Workshop on Software Engineering Education for Millennials*, 40–47. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3194779.3194783>
- Revano, T. F., & Garcia, M. B. (2020). Manufacturing Design Thinkers in Higher Education Institutions: The Use of Design Thinking Curriculum in the Education Landscape. *2020 IEEE 12th International Conference on Humanoid, Nanotechnology, Information Technology, Communication and Control, Environment, and Management (HNICEM)*, 1-5. <https://doi.org/10.1109/HNICEM51456.2020.9400034>
- Roulin, N., & Bangertter, A. (2013). Students' Use of Extra-Curricular Activities for Positional Advantage in Competitive Job Markets. *Journal of Education and Work*, 26(1), 21-47. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13639080.2011.623122>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2020). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation from a Self-Determination Theory Perspective: Definitions, Theory, Practices, and Future Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 61, 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cedpsych.2020.101860>
- Saeed, S., & Zyngier, D. (2012). How Motivation Influences Student Engagement: A Qualitative Case Study. *Journal of Education and Learning*, 1(2), 252-267. <https://doi.org/10.5539/jel.v1n2p252>
- Shaffer, M. L. (2019). Impacting Student Motivation: Reasons for Not Eliminating Extracurricular Activities. *Journal of Physical Education, Recreation & Dance*, 90(7), 8-14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07303084.2019.1637308>
- Solfema, Syafruddin, W., & Alim Harun, P. (2019). The Development of Character through Extra-Curricular Programs. *1st International Conference on Education Social Sciences and Humanities*, 918-926. <https://doi.org/10.2991/icesshum-19.2019.143>

- Spence, M. (2002). Signaling in Retrospect and the Informational Structure of Markets. *American Economic Review*, 92(3), 434-459. <https://doi.org/10.1257/00028280260136200>
- Steglich, C., Marczak, S., Guerra, L., Trindade, C., Dutra, A., & Bacelo, A. (2021). An Online Educational Hackathon to Foster Professional Skills and Intense Collaboration on Software Engineering Students. In *Brazilian Symposium on Software Engineering* (pp. 388–397). Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3474624.3476973>
- Sternberg, H., & Baalsrud-Hauge, J. (2015). Does Competition with Monetary Prize Improve Student Learning? An Exploratory Study on Extrinsic Motivation. *Lunds Universitets Utvecklingskonferens*.
- Stuart, M., Lido, C., Morgan, J., Solomon, L., & May, S. (2011). The Impact of Engagement with Extracurricular Activities on the Student Experience and Graduate Outcomes for Widening Participation Populations. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 12(3), 203-215. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787411415081>
- Tanaka, M. S., & Ito, T. (2020). Extracurricular Activities Through Regional Collaboration That Fosters Learning Ability. *2020 IEEE International Conference on Teaching, Assessment, and Learning for Engineering (TALE)*, 646-651. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TALE48869.2020.9368426>
- Thompson, L. J., Clark, G., Walker, M., & Whyatt, J. D. (2013). 'It's just like an extra string to your bow': Exploring Higher Education Students' Perceptions and Experiences of Extracurricular Activity and Employability. *Active Learning in Higher Education*, 14(2), 135-147. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1469787413481129>
- UNESCO. (2020). *Education for Sustainable Development: A Roadmap*. United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization. <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000374802>
- Urip, S. R., & Kurniawati, N. (2020). The Concept of Maintaining Personal Reputation in Educational Institutions. *International Conference on Humanities, Education, and Social Sciences*, 522–530. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v4i14.7911>
- Valença, G., Lacerda, N., Rebelo, M. E., Alves, C., & de Souza, C. R. B. (2019). On the Benefits of Corporate Hackathons for Software Ecosystems – A Systematic Mapping Study. *Product-Focused Software Process Improvement*, 367-382. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-35333-9_27
- Vu, T., Magis-Weinberg, L., Jansen, B. R. J., van Atteveldt, N., Janssen, T. W. P., Lee, N. C., van der Maas, H. L. J., Raijmakers, M. E. J., Sachisthal, M. S. M., & Meeter, M. (2022). Motivation-Achievement Cycles in Learning: a Literature Review and Research Agenda. *Educational Psychology Review*, 34(1), 39-71. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-021-09616-7>
- Wang, J. K., Roy, S. K., Barry, M., Chang, R. T., & Bhatt, A. S. (2018). Institutionalizing Healthcare Hackathons to Promote Diversity in Collaboration in Medicine. *BMC Medical Education*, 18(1), 269. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-018-1385-x>
- Warner, J., & Guo, P. J. (2017). Hack.edu: Examining How College Hackathons Are Perceived By Student Attendees and Non-Attendees. *ACM Conference on International Computing Education Research*, 254–262. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3105726.3106174>
- Yarmohammadian, M. H., Monsef, S., Javanmard, S. H., Yazdi, Y., & Amini-Rarani, M. (2021). The Role of Hackathon in Education: Can Hackathon Improve Health and Medical Education? *Journal of education and health promotion*, 10, 334-334. https://doi.org/10.4103/jehp.jehp_1183_20
- Yuen, K. K. F., & Wong, A. O. M. (2021). Designing an Effective Hackathon via University-Industry Collaboration for Data Science Education. *2021 IEEE International Conference on Engineering, Technology & Education (TALE)*, 1-6. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TALE52509.2021.9678826>
- Zaccone, M. C., & Pedrini, M. (2019). The Effects of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation on Students Learning Effectiveness. Exploring the Moderating Role of Gender. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 33(6), 1381-1394. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJEM-03-2019-0099>

Appendix A. Research Questionnaire Items

Personal Experience

- PEXP1 Participating in a hackathon adds value to my learning
- PEXP2 Participating in a hackathon prepares me for my career
- PEXP3 Participating in a hackathon lets me apply theories in the real world
- PEXP4 Participating in a hackathon gives an experience that is useful in the future

Social Connection

- SOCO1 I feel connected when I participate in a hackathon
- SOCO2 I feel accepted by my hackathon teammates
- SOCO3 I feel like I am an important member of my hackathon team
- SOCO4 I receive support from my hackathon teammates

Vocational Skills

- VOSK1 When I participate in a hackathon, I improve my soft skills
- VOSK2 When I participate in a hackathon, I improve my hard skills
- VOSK3 When I participate in a hackathon, I improve my skills related to my degree
- VOSK4 When I participate in a hackathon, I improve my skills for my future job

Challenge Demand

- CDEM1 Participating in a hackathon put my skills to the test
- CDEM2 Participating in a hackathon brings out my competitive nature
- CDEM3 Participating in a hackathon means I get to solve complex problems
- CDEM4 Participating in a hackathon is a challenging yet rewarding experience

Competition Prize

- PRZE1 I participate in a hackathon to win the prize money
- PRZE2 I participate in a hackathon to acquire certificates
- PRZE3 I participate in a hackathon to receive promotional products
- PRZE4 I participate in a hackathon to acquire funding for my projects
- PRZE5 I participate in a hackathon to collect trophies and medals

Career Opportunities

- CAOP1 I feel like participating in a hackathon will get me a job offer
- CAOP2 I feel like participating in a hackathon will get me an internship offer
- CAOP3 I am perceived better by employers because of my hackathon experience
- CAOP4 My hackathon experience can have a positive impact on my future career
- CAOP5 Because of my hackathon experience, I have a bright career ahead of me

Additional Credit

- ADDC1 I participate in a hackathon to receive additional course grades
- ADDC2 I participate in a hackathon to excuse my absences
- ADDC3 I participate in a hackathon to receive extra examination points

Personal Reputation

- PERS1 I participate in a hackathon to improve my image at school
- PERS2 I participate in a hackathon to enhance my social status
- PERS3 I participate in a hackathon to gain respect
- PERS4 I participate in a hackathon to enhance my popularity
- PERS5 I participate in a hackathon to make myself noticed by others

Continuance Participation

- CONP1 I intend to continue participating in a hackathon in the future
- CONP2 I predict that I would continue participating in a hackathon in the future
- CONP3 I expect to continue participating in a hackathon in the future

Participation Intention

- PINT1 I intend to participate in hackathons in the future
- PINT2 I predict that I would participate in hackathons in the future
- PINT3 I expect to participate in hackathons in the future

Note: As mentioned in the *Procedure and Sample* subsection, the wording in this questionnaire shows the version for the continuance participation (students with hackathon experience), and the items for the participation intention were included to showcase all statements on one page.