Competitive Learning Comes of Age

Erich J Baker
Editor, Journal of Competitive Learning
Belmont University
Nashville, TN, USA
erich.baker@belmont.edu

EDITORIAL

Competition is among the most widely used and least understood motivational structures in education, embraced enthusiastically in some disciplines and regarded with suspicion in others. Components of competitive learning stress rewards tied to rigorous reasoning, disciplined collaboration, and resilience under pressure, but competition may also simultaneously provide performance-enhancement and performance-avoidance among individuals in the same cohort, [1], and surface complex dynamics of inter- and intra-team competition which may provide barriers to student motivation.

The International Collegiate Programming Contest (ICPC) exemplifies a community that has spent decades navigating these advantages and disadvantages. Tracing its origins to 1970 and now reaching tens of thousands of students and thousands of coaches across more than a hundred countries each year, the ICPC has, for over half a century, run a vast natural experiment in cooperative-competitive learning. Hackathons, olympiads, debate circuits, and gamified courses extend the same logic across disciplines. These are not idiosyncrasies of computing. They are instances of a general pedagogy whose principles cross subject boundaries.

The urgency of understanding that pedagogy has only grown. In 2025, artificial-intelligence systems competing in a parallel track under the contest's own conditions solved problems at the ICPC World Finals that defeated every human team, one reproducing a flawless score, another resolving a task no university team could [2]. It is tempting to read such results as the obsolescence of the human contestant. The opposite inference is more defensible. When a machine can generate the winning solution, the educational purpose of the contest can no longer reside in the solution alone; it migrates to the formation of the people who pursue it. Team competition cultivates shared reasoning under pressure, the division and coordination of knowledge across a group, communication, trust, and the resilience to fail publicly and recover. This is precisely the set of human capacities that automation does not supply, and precisely what an AI-enamored account of learning is most prone to forget. A field that takes competitive learning seriously is, in this light, a form of corrective action, insisting that education is about solvers, not only solutions.

Yet the scholarly record has lagged the practice. Generations of contestants, coaches, and researchers have accumulated problem sets, instructional techniques, hard-fought failures, and hard-won successes that circulate largely as folklore rather than as citable knowledge. However, to systematize the dissemination of decades of knowledge, the maturing discipline of competitive learning requires durable artifacts. The field must make every effort to curate and collate peer-reviewed studies, validated problem sets, and replicable methods that outlast any single cohort.

Creating those artifacts is not merely an editorial convenience; it is the mechanism by which competitive learning can claim standing as an independent contribution to the academy rather than a borrowed footnote to educational psychology or computing education. The academy confers legitimacy through peer review. To submit competitive learning to that process is to assert that its questions are real questions, answerable by evidence and accountable to a community of experts.

There is a fittingness to this demand that the field should not overlook. Competitive learning is itself founded on impartial evaluation against shared standards: a contest judge accepts or rejects a solution on objective criteria, indifferent to the reputation of the submitter. Peer review is the academy's homologue of that judging system. A field built on the discipline of evaluation must not exempt itself from being evaluated. It must hold its own scholarship to the standard it asks of its students.

That standard must, if anything, be higher here than elsewhere. Because competition has so often been dismissed as extracurricular play rather than pedagogy, the field cannot establish itself on celebratory anecdote or selective reporting. Independent standing is earned through clear construct definitions, replication, hypothesis testing where warranted, and a willingness to publish null and negative results. Each contribution that survives genuine scrutiny is a brick in the case for disciplinary autonomy — evidence that competitive learning generates knowledge its neighboring fields do not already contain.

The Journal of Competitive Learning sets out to convert decades of accumulated practice into a cumulative, self-critical science, and in doing earn competitive learning a permanent place in the scholarly record. The contests have long proven their worth to students. Through peer review, it is now the field's turn to prove its generational worth.

REFERENCES

[1] Kou Murayama and Andrew J. Elliot. The competition–performance relation: A meta-analytic review and test of the opposing processes model of competition and performance. *Psychological Bulletin*, 138(6):1035–1070, 2012.

[2] Google DeepMind. Gemini achieves gold-medal level at the International Collegiate Programming Contest World Finals. https://deepmind.google/, 2025. Accessed 28 June 2026.