

2

3

4 **Doing social identity leadership: Exploring the efficacy of an identity leadership**
5 **intervention on perceived leadership and mobilization in elite disability soccer**

6

7

8

9

10

11

Author's accepted version

12

Abstract

13 Based on social identity principles we explore the efficacy of a leadership intervention in elite
14 disability sport. A two-year longitudinal design involved an elite male disability soccer team
15 that prepared for a World Championship in Year 1 and then reformed for Paralympic
16 competition in Year 2. Athlete data indicated marginal to significant increases from baseline
17 to intervention phases in social identification, identity leadership displayed by staff, and
18 hours practice completed away from training camps, but no significant change in
19 mobilization of effort (in Year 1 and 2). We discuss the applied implications, study
20 limitations, and opportunities for future researchers.

21 Keywords: coaching, disability, group dynamics, leadership, motivation, performance
22 environment.

23 **Doing social identity leadership: Exploring the efficacy of an identity leadership**
24 **intervention on perceived leadership and mobilization in elite disability soccer**

25 Leadership represents one of the most significant organizational factors that impacts
26 individuals' and teams' psychological readiness and performance. Despite this notion and
27 extensive evidence that has established the positive consequences of effective leadership
28 (Day, Fleenor, Atwater, Strum, & McKee, 2014), sport psychology researchers have seldom
29 (a) developed evidence-based leadership programs and (b) examined program efficacy in
30 real-world sporting contexts. Therefore, our current study is the first to (a) develop a
31 leadership program in sport based on a contemporary approach to leadership that has received
32 growing attention from researchers — social identity leadership (SIL; Haslam, Reicher, &
33 Platow, 2011; Hogg, 2001), and (b) examine the efficacy of a SIL program on perceived
34 leadership and athletes' mobilization in the novel environment of international disability
35 sport.

36 To date, there exists increasing attention paid to the organizational context in which
37 elite athletes perform (see Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009; Wagstaff, 2016; Wagstaff & Larner,
38 2015). Of particular relevance, Wagstaff and Larner (2015) referred to the “myth of
39 individualism” as an accepted fallacy that individual ability and/or effort solely determines
40 athletic success and, that simultaneously, interpersonal, group, and organizational factors are
41 often overlooked. Early investigations of organizational psychology in elite sport in the US
42 found group dynamics (e.g., poor interactions with teammates) and leadership (e.g.,
43 trustworthiness of the coach) to be distinguishing factors between successful and
44 unsuccessful Olympic performances (e.g., Greenleaf, Gould, & Dieffenbach, 2001). Further,
45 both able-bodied (e.g., Hanton, Fletcher, & Coughlan, 2005) and disabled (Arnold, Wagstaff,
46 Steadman, & Pratt, 2016) international athletes in the UK have reported group (e.g., team
47 atmosphere and support) and leadership (e.g., coach interactions and behavior) issues as key

48 sources of organizational stress. Amongst other things, Arnold and colleagues (2016)
49 suggested that researchers should seek to address the comparative lack of organizational
50 psychology research in elite disability sport settings.

51 Recently, Slater, Barker, and Mellalieu (2016) highlighted the synergy between the
52 “myth of individualism” (Wagstaff & Larner, 2015) and the social identity approach (that
53 encompasses both social identity; Tajfel & Turner, 1979, and self-categorization theories;
54 Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell 1989). Social identities refer to the part of
55 individuals’ self-concept associated with internalized group memberships (e.g., as an athlete
56 part of a soccer team). In other words, social identities in sport are concerned with the extent
57 to which athletes feel an emotional attachment and a sense of belonging to their team (Slater,
58 Evans, & Barker, 2013). This contrasts the notion of *personal identity*, which reflects
59 individuals’ perception of themselves as a unique individual. Positioning the social aspect of
60 the self within an organizational lens, social identities reflect the belonging to groups
61 perceived by individuals across multi-layered sport organizations (e.g., an athlete with their
62 defensive unit, through the captain with the starting team, to the performance director with
63 the overarching organization).

64 According to self-categorization theory (Turner et al., 1989) when (and to the extent
65 that) an individual categorizes themselves as psychologically part of a group their cognitions
66 and behaviors operate within the boundaries of that identity, or, what it means to be “us”.
67 Following proposals that, in organizational contexts, there is much to be gained from
68 understanding how behaviors are structured within a shared social identity, systematic
69 examinations of social identity principles have flourished (for reviews see Haslam, 2004;
70 2014). This literature has placed group and contextual factors at the heart of understanding
71 individuals’ psychology and behavior (Haslam, 2004). More specifically, the principles of the
72 social identity approach assert that to gain a holistic understanding of perception and

73 interaction in organizational settings (e.g., elite sport) researchers need to directly examine
74 how individuals' psychology and behavior are inextricably linked to their social identities
75 (e.g., as part of a sports team). To this end, sport teams provide unique settings within which
76 to explore a plethora of social identity-related postulations.

77 Substantial evidence within the social identity paradigm demonstrates that, amongst
78 many other outcomes, an individuals' level of social identification is a main determinant of:
79 (a) commitment (Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1997); (b) well-being and stress (Steffens et al.,
80 2016); (c) depression (Cruwys, Haslam, Dingle, Haslam, & Jetten, 2014); and (d) leadership
81 (Haslam et al., 2011). Until recently the social identity approach had been largely ignored
82 within sport and exercise contexts, yet over the past few years a range of scholars have
83 proposed its relevance, potential, and *application* (Fransen, Boen, Stouten, Cotterill, & Vande
84 Broek, 2016; Rees, Haslam, Coffee, & Lavalley, 2015; Slater, Coffee, Barker, & Evans,
85 2014; Slater et al., 2016). In particular, the social identity approach has been proposed to
86 enhance our understanding of the psychosocial influences that underpin group dynamics and
87 leadership (Slater et al., 2014; 2016). Indeed, within the field of SIL the effect of identity
88 leadership on followers' psychology and behavior has been subject to decades of empirical
89 investigations from organizational scholars across the world.

90 **The Social Identity Approach to Leadership (SIL)**

91 SIL is concerned with how leadership is inextricably connected to group processes,
92 and that successful and enduring leadership develops, manages, and advances a shared group
93 identity (Haslam et al., 2011; Hogg, 2001). Empirical evidence supporting SIL is significant
94 and established across varied methodologies and contexts (for reviews see Haslam et al.,
95 2011; Steffens et al., 2014). For instance, individuals who lead in-line with social identity
96 principles, such as representing the in-group, are more trusted (Geissner & van Knippenberg,
97 2008), influential (Subašic, Reynolds, Turner, Veenstra, & Haslam, 2011), and effective (van

98 Knippenberg & van Knippenberg, 2005). Informed by this evidence and early
99 conceptualizations (e.g., the Social Identity Model of Leadership; Hogg, 2001), Haslam and
100 colleagues synthesized four principles of SIL in their 2011 text as: (a) leaders as in-group
101 prototypes; (b) leaders as in-group champions; (c) leaders as entrepreneurs of identity; and
102 (d) leaders as embedders of identity. For a detailed application of the four principles to sport,
103 readers are directed to Slater et al. (2014).

104 **The Application of SIL**

105 Despite substantial evidence pertaining to the positive effect of SIL on leadership
106 outcomes per se (e.g., trust; Geissner & van Knippenberg, 2008), the *application* of SIL has
107 received comparatively limited attention. Haslam and colleagues (2011) initially made this
108 assertion in their proposal of the 3R's model (Reflecting, Representing, Realizing) to enhance
109 identity leadership. The 3R model involves three stages. First, *Reflecting* involves listening
110 and observing to understand the identities that matter to the individuals within an
111 organization. Second, *Representing* involves ensuring that actions champion the collective
112 identity. Third, *Realizing* involves embedding in reality the collective identity and associated
113 goals. In 2014 Haslam reiterated this sentiment, asserting that to date, there is a dearth of
114 applied research in SIL (and within the social identity approach generally).

115 An exception to the lack of development and evaluation of social identity
116 interventions is the Actualizing Social and Personal Identity Resources (ASPIRe) model
117 (Haslam, Eggins, & Reynolds, 2003). The purpose of the ASPIRe model is to understand a
118 range of organizational and leadership issues, raise awareness, and incorporate diversity, to
119 ultimately develop individuals' personal and social identities to improve employee
120 satisfaction and organizational performance. Evidence of the utility of the ASPIRe model
121 comes from studies including hospital staff (O'Brien et al., 2004) and teachers (Reynolds,
122 Subasic, Lee, & Tindall, 2014). Yet these programs have primarily focused on developing

123 shared identity, and not leadership explicitly, thus the effect or efficacy (see Seligman, 1995)
124 of the intervention on leadership competencies remains unknown.

125 Addressing the lack of research that has focused on the application of social identity
126 informed programs to develop leadership competencies, Haslam and colleagues (2017)
127 conducted a preliminary investigation of the 5R's leadership program with managers of
128 various Allied Health teams in Australia. The 5R's program included workshops on the core
129 3Rs (*Reflecting*, *Representing*, and *Realizing* as explained above), bookended by one-hour
130 *Readying* (i.e., to raise managers' awareness of the importance of social identity processes for
131 leadership) and *Reporting* (i.e., to monitor progress towards group goals and to troubleshoot)
132 sessions. The workshops took place over a two-month period involving various social
133 identity-based activities (e.g., identity mapping during the *Reflecting* phase; Cruwys et al.,
134 2016). Amongst other outcomes, measures indicated an increase in managers' self-
135 assessment of their ability to engage in identity leadership and a marginal increase in their
136 social identification from pre- to post-program. As Haslam et al. (2017) conclude, this
137 encouraging evidence provides a platform from which future researchers should build. In
138 particular, Haslam et al. (2017) gleaned evidence from leaders about *their* leadership, and as
139 the authors acknowledge, there is a need to obtain evidence from their followers. Further, no
140 research to date has (a) focused on the longitudinal effects of SIL interventions or, as
141 highlighted by sport psychology scholars (Slater et al., 2016), (b) examined the viability of a
142 SIL intervention in sport settings. In this present study we address this gap in the literature.

143 Overall, based on social identity principles leadership development is not simply
144 about training leaders to be better individuals, but to be better group members that have the
145 ability to harness and utilize an understanding of their group and organization within which
146 they lead. Additionally, within SIL, leadership is conceptualized as a behavior that can be
147 enacted by any group member, thus representing an organizational (and group-level) focus,

148 rather than only on formal individual leaders. Thus, the facets of SIL capture the nuanced
149 picture of multiple groups (e.g., (a) playing units such as defence, attack; (b) players such as
150 starting players, substitutes; and (c) staff such as coaches, support staff) and organizational
151 layers (e.g., the national governing body; the playing squad) evident in elite sport. To embed
152 the SIL program in the present study we followed suggestions from a case-study with a
153 World Champion sport team (Hodge, Henry, & Smith, 2014) and evidence in elite sport that
154 has found that teams with high quality athlete leadership teams (i.e., shared leadership) have
155 greater team effectiveness (e.g., commitment to the team's goals) and performance outcomes
156 (Fransen et al., 2017). Accordingly, in what follows we create a Senior Leadership Team
157 (SLT) that includes three members of staff and four athletes (termed hereafter SLT athletes)
158 to implement the 3Rs program and assess its influence on all athletes within an elite disability
159 soccer team.

160 **The Present Study**

161 To date, researchers have overlooked the application of social identity principles,
162 particularly in the field of leadership development (Haslam, 2014). Further, researchers have
163 failed to present rigorous empirical data to evaluate the psychological outcomes of
164 organizational psychology-based interventions in sport, particularly in the area of
165 performance management (Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009), a dearth that is heightened further in
166 disability sport (Arnold et al., 2016). Our current study is the first in sport to provide a
167 longitudinal insight into the development and efficacy of an organizational (leadership-based)
168 intervention over a two-year period underpinned by social identity principles. To this end, we
169 explore the efficacy of a 3R leadership program delivered twice (i.e., in Year 1 and 2) across
170 two years in elite disability soccer.

171 **Hypotheses**

172 Based on social identity theorizing, two exploratory hypotheses were established:

173 H1: That the 3R program would increase all athletes' perceptions of (a) social
174 identification and (b) the identity leadership displayed by staff.

175 H2: That the 3R program would increase all athletes' (a) mobilization of effort and (b)
176 hours of practice completed away from training camps.

177 **Method**

178 **Intervention Design**

179 In-line with previous applied sport psychology research (e.g., Barker, Evans, Coffee,
180 Slater, & McCarthy, 2014), we had a consulting focus in a naturalistic setting but aimed to
181 maintain high scientific rigor as closely as possible. We used a one-group, pre- to post-test,
182 longitudinal design. The group were a male elite soccer team involving athletes with a
183 classified disability (confirmed by their national governing body).

184 Overall, the study duration was 22 months (September 2014 — June 2016) and
185 involved two distinct phases, which we term Year 1 (September 2014 — June 2015) and
186 Year 2 (September 2015 — June 2016). In Year 1, the team operated as an international team
187 consisting of a single nation in preparation for a disability World Championship in June
188 2015. In Year 2, the team merged with three other nations to create an international
189 Paralympic team in preparation for the Paralympic Games in Rio de Janeiro in September
190 2016. Threats to internal validity are inherent within such designs and therefore we aimed to
191 somewhat mitigate this threat by completing the 3R program twice — once within each phase
192 — both preceded by two baseline timepoints with two different teams (i.e., Year 1 and Year
193 2). In each phase, data were collected on nine occasions (two baseline and seven during
194 intervention timepoints in both Year 1 and 2). Institutional ethical approval was granted and
195 all participants completed informed consent before the study commenced.

196 **Program Context and Delivery**

197 The soccer team competed on a voluntary basis and were formally involved in three-
198 day training camps, typically once a month, at a National Performance Center. Away from
199 training camps, athletes were responsible for their own soccer development and were
200 typically in full or part-time employment and/or education. At the start of the study
201 (September 2014), the international team had recently appointed a new head coach and the
202 Sport Psychologist (SP; second author). The first author led the project and acted as a
203 consultant focusing on the 3R program only.

204 In September 2014, the SP conducted a needs analysis through (a) observations at a
205 training camp and (b) an hour-long reflective discussion with the performance director and
206 head coach. As a result, two organizational factors were identified for development: (a) to
207 improve the connections between staff and athletes; and (b) to increase the level of practice
208 hours completed by athletes away from camps. To this end, we established a SLT and
209 devised and implemented a 3R program with the seven members of the SLT. The SLT
210 comprised three members of staff (head coach, goalkeeping coach, and team manager) and
211 four athletes (one was the captain). A collective decision between the head coach,
212 performance director, team manager, and SP was made to select the four SLT athletes. The
213 decision was based on staff members' experiences to date of working with the team (e.g., the
214 performance director had been in post for over ten years at this time). In particular, the staff
215 members carefully considered each athlete's (a) influence within the team, (b) international
216 experience (a range of experience was deemed optimal), and (c) the likelihood that athletes
217 would be selected for training camps. Following the baseline phase in both Year 1 and 2, a
218 two-hour SLT meeting was scheduled on the first evening of each training camp (see Table
219 1). Our approach involved developing the identity leadership of the seven members of the
220 SLT for the staff and athletes to integrate ideas into their everyday practice, and specifically,

221 for the four SLT athletes to gain input from the remaining athletes in the team throughout the
222 3R program.

223 In Year 2, the international team reformed to become a multi-national Paralympic
224 team. This transition involved a change in playing and staff personnel and thereby provided
225 an opportunity to retest the 3R program. The SLT maintained the same number of individuals
226 but saw change to personnel with (a) the team manager (this post was no longer part of the
227 organizational structure) replaced by an assistant coach (a new post), and (b) three new
228 athletes becoming part of the SLT, with the captain maintaining his place (and the captaincy).

229 **Participants**

230 The number of athletes that attended each camp varied for a range of reasons (e.g.,
231 injuries, other commitments such as employment, or selection decisions). Therefore, we base
232 data analyses on the athletes that attended all camps in each phase (i.e., nine camps): Year 1
233 ($n = 8$, M age = 23.38 ± 5.55 , M soccer experience = 14.88 ± 5.38); and Year 2 ($n = 9$, M age
234 = 22.67 ± 5.34 , M soccer experience = 10.33 ± 4.85). In Year 2, data were additionally
235 collected from three members of staff (head, assistant, and goalkeeping coaches).

236 **The 3R Leadership Program in Sport**

237 The intervention was informed by insights from Haslam and colleagues (2011) 3Rs of
238 identity leadership, the three core workshops of the 5Rs program (Haslam et al., 2017), and
239 included a number of new activities. The operationalization of the intervention involved
240 workshops on the 3Rs — (a) *Reflecting*, (b) *Representing*, and (c) *Realizing* — facilitated
241 jointly by the authors to the SLT. Each workshop adopted the same format, which involved
242 taking the SLT through activities, and subsequently, for the SLT athletes ($n = 4$) to complete
243 key activities with the remaining athletes following the session. This approach aligns with
244 Haslam and colleagues (2017), who instructed the managers involved in their program to
245 complete the tasks with their own teams following each workshop. The primary rationale for

246 this approach was that (a) completing the activities in the SLT encouraged understanding and
247 connections between staff and athletes, (b) empowering SLT athletes to complete activities
248 with fellow athletes encouraged practical experience of leadership during camps, which could
249 then be reflected upon in subsequent sessions, and (c) ensured that all athletes in the team
250 were involved in the process. Overall, the SLT athletes gained specific input and worked with
251 the remaining athletes in all phases across both years (see Table 1 for more detail).

252 As detailed in Table 1, in Year 1 we facilitated two workshops per R ($n = 6$), followed
253 by a single reinforcement/monitoring session. In Year 2, we facilitated one workshop on
254 *Reflecting* and *Realizing*, and two workshops on *Representing* ($n = 4$), followed by three
255 reinforcement/monitoring sessions. In what follows, we provide an overview of workshop
256 and follow-up content.

257 **Reflecting.** In Year 1, the purpose of the first *Reflecting* workshop was to (a) provide
258 a program overview, and (b) increase SLT members' understanding and application of
259 reflection from a SIL perspective. Coaches and athletes often engage in self-reflection, but
260 the focus here was to encourage the SLT to reflect with different lenses (e.g., on group and
261 organizational level factors). In the first workshop, the concept of '#whatstrending?' was
262 proposed by the captain to allow time in the SLT meetings for athletes to, non-judgementally,
263 raise awareness and discuss current team dynamics. The '#whatstrending?' concept was
264 proposed by the captain following a discussion with all the athletes prior to the SLT session.
265 Accordingly, time within each SLT session was planned to discuss '#whatstrending?', which
266 adopted the approach of the SLT athletes consulting with all athletes prior to the SLT
267 sessions and sharing input as necessary.

268 In the second workshop, the SLT completed two identity mapping activities (see
269 Cruwys et al., 2016; Haslam et al., 2017). The first invited SLT members to "draw a map of
270 your significant and meaningful identities", to identify the groups that are meaningful to them

271 in their life (e.g., social groups, working groups). Members shared their identity maps with
272 the SLT before completing a second mapping activity. Here, the SLT were invited to “draw a
273 map of your [team name] identity (player or staff). Consider your values and goals associated
274 with your identity, and what it means to you to be part of this team”. Once again members
275 shared their maps. In addition to this disclosure to enhance understanding, identity mapping
276 afforded an insight into the SLT members’ identities and specifically their thoughts on the
277 values, goals, and aspirations of the organization.

278 Following the second workshop, SLT athletes facilitated the two identity mapping
279 activities with the remaining athletes. The SLT athletes were allocated three athletes each and
280 completed this on a one-to-one basis during the camp, before they fed back to the SP. All
281 documents were taken away by the SP and were analyzed by the first author to inform the
282 *Representing* workshops. In Year 2, due to time, only the second, identity mapping-based,
283 workshop outlined above was completed following an overview of the program (see Table 1).
284 We were only able to complete one *Reflecting* workshop and chose to complete the second
285 rather than the first because it focuses on the specific team’s identity in question and was
286 therefore fundamental for the remainder of the 3R program (e.g., to generate shared values
287 for *our* team). As in Year 2, SLT athletes then completed the two identity mapping activities
288 with the remaining athletes.

289 **Representing.** Prior to the first *Representing* workshop, the first author anonymously
290 collated the values that members had identified as being important to their team’s identity.
291 The first activity in the workshop involved the SLT reviewing and discussing these values to
292 propose shared team values. Following discussions, five values were agreed. Next, the SLT
293 identified barriers that would interfere with the team ‘living out’ the values, together with
294 developing an action plan to overcome these barriers. Following the first *Representing*
295 workshop, SLT athletes facilitated a group session with the remaining athletes to share and

296 obtain feedback on the five values. It was agreed that in all athlete-led sessions that the SP
297 would attend, but not lead, the session. No other staff were present. The second *Representing*
298 workshop revisited the action plan, elicited further discussions, before agreeing on the action
299 plan. The next activity involved generating a series of behaviors aligned with each value.
300 Four observable behaviors per value were agreed.

301 Following the second *Representing* workshop, SLT athletes facilitated a group session
302 with the remaining athletes to share and obtain feedback on the agreed behaviors. No
303 amendments were made to the behaviors. In addition, a session with the remaining support
304 staff ($n = 6$) was facilitated by both authors, with the team manager present, but not involved.
305 The purpose of this session was to share the 3R program (staff were aware of the SLT but not
306 of session content), and seek input/facilitate discussions on how the organization could best
307 optimize program results. Staff members also provided a vision statement for the team that
308 were taken into the *Realizing* stage.

309 In Year 2, the first *Representing* workshop ran as in Year 1. In Year 2, there were four
310 shared values agreed. One difference of note between Year 1 and 2 was in the athlete sharing
311 session. In Year 1, the values were generated by the SLT and then shared by the SLT athletes
312 with the remaining athlete group in a highly discursive session. The process was the same for
313 the behaviors. However, in Year 2, in the value sharing session, athletes quickly agreed on
314 the values and because one of the SLT athletes had completed the process in Year 1, the
315 athletes started the process of generating behaviors in-line with each value. As a result, in the
316 second *Representing* workshop in Year 2, the SLT discussed and agreed on the behaviors
317 suggested by the athletes (opposed to generating them as in Year 1). At this stage in Year 2,
318 each SLT member created a vision for the team, which they shared with the SLT and then
319 were collected by the authors to review ahead of the next session.

320 **Realizing.** In the first *Realizing* workshop, the SLT were asked to review the
321 operationalization of the values and behaviors agreed in the *Representing* stage. The main
322 focus of the session was then to create the team's vision. Each SLT member created a vision
323 statement and then presented this to the SLT. Next, the vision statements noted by the support
324 staff were shared and discussion continued. During the session it became apparent that
325 agreement on a vision statement was unlikely given that members were drawn towards
326 different parts of different statements. The head coach suggested that the authors generated
327 two vision statements, based on those created and the SLT discussions, for the next session.

328 This camp (May 2015) was the first where observable changes occurred in staff and
329 athletes' behavior and the environment. Through dialogue with the SP, the head coach began
330 to use the language of the shared values in pre-match team talks. Further, we created
331 environmental materials involving posters of the values/behaviors in the changing rooms, and
332 we presented each athlete with a laminated cue card of the values/behaviors. In addition, one
333 of the action points from the staff session was for the SP to work with the performance
334 analyst to observe and code/edit training and match videos in reference to the
335 values/behaviors. To this end, video montages set to music, based on the values/behaviors,
336 were developed and shown to the team for motivational purposes pre and post match.

337 The first activity of the second *Realizing* workshop involved the SLT discussing and
338 agreeing on the vision statement generated by the authors. Once agreed, the second activity
339 sought to reflect on the program and consider how best to continue to use the values,
340 behaviors, and vision created. For example, through dialogue with the SP, the head coach
341 began to use the language of the shared values as a framework for an aspect of their post-
342 training and match debriefs. Following the second *Realizing* workshop, the SLT athletes
343 facilitated a group session with the remaining athletes that reflected upon the program with
344 specific reference to the values, behaviors, and vision ahead of the World Championships.

345 In Year 2, given that the SLT members had previously noted their vision statements, a
346 single *Realizing* workshop focused on discussing and agreeing on the collective vision.
347 Follow-up activities were instigated in the same manner with the addition of an infographic
348 of ‘our values’, which was shared with the team and displayed in the performance
349 environment.

350 **Reinforcement/monitoring.** Following the completion of the 3R workshops in both
351 Year 1 and 2, the SLT continued to meet to: (a) review the ‘living out’ of the team
352 values/behaviors; (b) establish and reflect on targets set for training and matches centered on
353 the values/behaviors; and (c) continue the ‘#whatstrending?’ theme. The follow-up activities
354 undertaken by SLT athletes, coach and support staff, and the authors were crucial to embed
355 the program. Specifically, follow-up work involved: (a) creating and displaying posters in the
356 environment that detailed the values/behaviors/vision; (b) presenting cue cards, and in Year 2
357 an infographic, that displayed the values; (c) all staff using the language of the
358 values/behaviors in training, pre and post match talks, and in media-related work; (d) SLT
359 athlete-led reflections of the team’s performance in reference to the values; and (e) SP
360 observations and working with the performance analyst to create video montages.

361 **Measures**

362 Participants completed a series of questionnaires previously used in social identity
363 research, which assessed targeted and non-targeted variables. To allow time for the program
364 to be implemented, athletes completed the questionnaire on the final day of each training
365 camp. All measures were preceded by the stem, “To what extent do you agree that...” with
366 responses indicated on a scale from 1 (*do not agree at all*) to 7 (*completely agree*) unless
367 otherwise stated.

368 **Target variables.**

369 *Social identification.* The Single-Item Social Identity Scale (SISI; Postmes, Haslam,
370 & Jans, 2012) assessed athletes' level of *social identification*: "you strongly identify with
371 [team name]". Previous evidence has found the SISI to show good convergent and divergent
372 validity, good test-retest reliability (Postmes et al., 2012), and the SISI been used in sport
373 psychology research with elite athletes (Barker et al., 2014). Further, Postmes and colleagues
374 recommend that for researchers working in applied settings the SISI is a valid substitute to
375 longer measures of identification. Given the naturalistic setting and repeated measurement,
376 the SISI was deemed most suitable for the current study. In Year 2, data were additionally
377 collected from three members of staff to assess their level of social identification. Staff
378 completed this measure at the end of each camp except the final camp in June where data
379 collection with the staff was not possible (resulting in six intervention data points).

380 *Identity leadership.* The Identity Leadership Inventory — Short-Form (ILI — SF;
381 Steffens et al., 2014) assessed *identity leadership* with four-items. Athletes were invited to
382 consider the leadership of the staff group: (a) "the staff are model members of the [team
383 name] team"; (b) "the staff act as champions of the [team name] team"; (c) "the staff create a
384 sense of cohesion within the [team name] team"; and (d) "the staff create structures that are
385 useful for the [team name] team". The four-items generated a composite mean score. The ILI
386 — SF has been validated across cultures and has shown to have good reliability and validity
387 (Steffens et al., 2014). In the current study, the scale showed good to excellent reliability
388 (from .73 to .91 in Year 1 and .76 to .94 in Year 2).

389 *Mobilization.* A five-item *mobilization* scale was developed for the context of the
390 current study and needs analysis. The items were: (a) "you are strongly motivated to engage
391 in your soccer development when away from [team name] camp"; (b) "you will exert very
392 high levels of effort in your soccer development when away from [team name] camp"; (c)
393 "you will do everything you possibly can away from [team name] camp to fulfil your soccer

394 potential”; (d) “you are passionate and enthusiastic about your soccer development when
395 away from [team name] camp”; and (e) “you want to make a distinct contribution in terms of
396 your soccer development when away from [team name] camp to impress the staff”. The scale
397 showed good to excellent reliability (from .73 to .89 in Year 1 and .74 to .90 in Year 2).

398 *Hours practice.* A single item commonly used in social identity research (e.g.,
399 Seyranian, 2014) assessed athletes’ *hours of practice* completed away from camps, “Away
400 from [team name] camps how many hours per week do you dedicate to training for your
401 soccer development?” Athletes were asked to state the number of hours completed. In Year 2,
402 we additionally collected data from three members of staff to report the number of hours that
403 they believed athletes completed.

404 **Non-target variable.**

405 *Collective efficacy.* To aid confidence in which any changes in target variables could
406 be attributed to the 3R program, athletes’ collective efficacy was measured as a non-targeted
407 variable. Whilst we anticipated to observe small changes across the intervention in collective
408 efficacy as a consequence of the team performing in competitions, we were satisfied that as
409 the program targeted social identity-related variables, this measure acted as a non-target
410 variable. For brevity, a four-item collective efficacy scale that has found to be reliable in
411 previous social identity (Reicher & Haslam, 2006) and used in previous sport psychology
412 research (Barker et al., 2014) assessed athletes’ *collective efficacy*. The items were: (a)
413 “throughout a match your team can minimize errors when under pressure”; (b) “your team
414 can find a solution when confronted with a problem”; (c) “throughout a match as a team you
415 make correct decisions”; and (d) “your team is capable of achieving goals/targets that are
416 set”. The four-items generated a composite mean score. In the current study, the scale showed
417 good to excellent reliability (from .77 to .91 in Year 1). Athletes completed this non-targeted
418 measure in Year 1 only.

419 **Social validation.** Members of the SLT ($n = 6$, not completed by one staff member)
 420 completed a social validation questionnaire following the World Championships in
 421 September 2015 (end of Year 1). Based on recommendations for the evaluation of
 422 psychological interventions, the questionnaire included quantitative and qualitative elements
 423 to assess the experience of the SLT members (Page & Thelwell, 2013).

424 Quantitatively, SLT members responded to seven questions: (1) “creating a shared
 425 team identity is important for you”; (2) “bringing individuals in the team closer is important”;
 426 (3) “the SLT programme has positively influenced the team”; (4) “you were strongly
 427 motivated to engage in the SLT programme”; (5) “the SLT programme was very effective”;
 428 (6) “you exerted very high levels of effort during the SLT programme”; and (7) “you were
 429 passionate and enthusiastic about the SLT programme”. Responses were collated on three
 430 scales: (a) *importance* of the target variable (Q 1 – 2); (b) *influence* of the program (Q 3); and
 431 (c) how *mobilized* members were to engage in the program (Q 4 – 7). Qualitatively, a series
 432 of open-ended questions followed to glean detail on the SLT’s experience of the program.

433 **Results**

434 **Analytical Strategy**

435 For each dependent variable we compared baseline to intervention change within each
 436 year (i.e., Year 1 baseline vs. Year 1 intervention and Year 2 baseline vs. Year 2 intervention)
 437 via (a) within-subjects *t*-tests on each of the five dependent variables (four targeted and one
 438 non-targeted), and (b) calculations of effect size (Cohens *d*). The following results are
 439 presented by dependent variable encompassing both Year 1 and Year 2 comparisons. An
 440 overview of Year 1 and 2 means, standard deviations, and comparisons are presented in Table
 441 2 and 3 respectively, whilst correlations between all study variables in Year 1 and 2 are
 442 presented in Table 4 and 5 respectively.

443 **Target Variables**

444 **Social identification.** Examining H1, a within-subjects *t*-test indicated a marginal
445 statistical increase in athletes' level of *social identification* from baseline to intervention in
446 Year 1 $t(7) = 1.96, p = .091$, and a significant increase in Year 2 $t(8) = 2.71, p = .027$. Effect
447 size calculations indicated a large increase in Year 1 ($d = .76$) and Year 2 ($d = .82$).

448 **Identity leadership.** A within-subjects *t*-test indicated a marginal statistical increase
449 in *identity leadership* from baseline to intervention in Year 1 $t(7) = 2.12, p = .071$, and a
450 significant increase in Year 2 $t(8) = 2.52, p = .036$. Effect size calculations indicated a large
451 increase in Year 1 ($d = .76$) and Year 2 ($d = .98$).

452 Providing partial support for H1, *social identification* and *identity leadership* data
453 indicated marginal statistical increases in Year 1, significant increases in Year 2, and large
454 practical increases in Year 1 and 2 (as indicated by Cohens *d*).

455 **Mobilization.** Examining H2, a within-subjects *t*-test indicated no statistical change
456 in *mobilization* from baseline to intervention in Year 1 $t(7) = 1.54, p = .167$, and Year 2 $t(8) =$
457 $1.45, p = .184$. Effect size calculations indicated a moderate to large increase in Year 1 ($d =$
458 $.70$) and a moderate increase in Year 2 ($d = .54$).

459 **Hours practice.** A within-subjects *t*-test indicated a marginal statistical increase in
460 the number of *hours practice* athletes completed away from training camps from baseline to
461 intervention in Year 1 $t(7) = 2.35, p = .051$, and Year 2 $t(8) = 2.29, p = .051$. Effect size
462 calculations indicated a large increase in Year 1 ($d = 1.65$) and a moderate increase in Year 2
463 ($d = .59$).

464 Providing partial support for H2, *mobilization* data highlighted no statistical change
465 and moderate (Year 2) to large (Year 1) practical increases, as indicated by Cohens *d*, whilst
466 *hours practice* data indicated moderate (Year 2) to large (Year 1) practical increases, which
467 both approached statistical significance.

468 **Non-target Variable**

469 **Collective efficacy.** As expected, a within-subjects *t*-test indicated no statistical
470 change in the *collective efficacy* from baseline to intervention in Year 1 $t(7) = .61, p = .564$,
471 and effect size calculations indicated a small increase ($d = .23$).

472 **Social Validation**

473 **Quantitative responses.** Data indicated that the SLT members perceived that (a) the
474 target variable of the program was *important* ($M = 6.83 \pm .41$), (b) the program had a positive
475 *influence* ($M = 6.50$), and they were *mobilized* to engage in the program ($M = 6.75 \pm .52$).

476 **Qualitative responses.** Data indicated that two athletes noted an initial concern
477 regarding how other athletes not involved in the SLT would perceive them: “I was a bit
478 concerned that the rest of the team might have seen us as an elite group”. All athletes and
479 staff stated involvement in the program had improved their leadership. One athlete
480 commented: “It has improved my quality of leadership with learning how to cope with
481 different types of players.” Three athletes and both staff stated that they believed the program
482 had helped to group’s togetherness: “I think it has helped on the journey we are on and help
483 us become more ‘as one’”. In terms of influence, responses included benefits including
484 leadership, greater feeling of belonging, the creation of shared values, and the importance of
485 the vision: “Having a vision that we can share and strive to achieve”. Regarding the vision, an
486 athlete and member of staff suggested the greatest challenge was agreeing on the vision,
487 whilst three athletes noted that gaining the cooperation of the other athletes (particularly at
488 the start) was the greatest challenge. The benefits of the program covered a range of aspects
489 from: “It was great to share ideas with the group”, to: “Developing personal relationships
490 with staff and players and having a shared vision and values for the squad”. Regarding
491 improvements athletes and staff noted more time/meetings together, and athletes wished for
492 more support in the initial phase when working with non-SLT athletes. Finally, a staff
493 member stated: “Thought it [the program] was very worthwhile, [the program] created a

494 greater sense of unity, created shared visions and awarded greater interaction between staff
495 and players”.

496 **Staff Perceptions in Year 2**

497 Data indicated a small decrease in *social identification* reported by staff (baseline: M
498 = $6.50 \pm .86$; intervention: $M = 6.33 \pm .60$; $d = -.20$), and no change in the number of *hours*
499 *practice* staff believed athletes completed (baseline: $M = 11.50 \pm 3.04$; intervention: $M =$
500 11.83 ± 4.54 ; $d = .11$).

501 **Discussion**

502 In this present study we explored the efficacy of a 3R leadership program on
503 perceived leadership and athlete mobilization across two years in elite disability soccer.
504 Given the unique context of the study, we delivered the 3R leadership program to essentially
505 two different elite disability soccer teams (Year 1: in preparation for the World
506 Championships and Year 2: in preparation for the Paralympic Games). Broadly, in
507 comparison to corresponding baseline data, athlete data in the intervention phase indicated
508 that the 3R program had a positive effect on social identification, perceived staff identity
509 leadership, and hours practice completed. Specifically, in-line with H1, compared to
510 respective baseline data, findings indicated a marginal increase in social identification and
511 perceived staff identity leadership in Year 1 and a significant increase in both of these
512 variables in Year 2. In partial support of H2, compared to respective baseline data, the 3R
513 program did not increase athletes’ mobilization of effort, but did marginally increase the
514 number of hours practice completed away from camps by athletes in both Year 1 and 2.
515 Finally, no changes in a non-targeted variable—collective efficacy—were observed (Year 1
516 only). In sum, the findings are encouraging and provide initial support pertaining to the
517 efficacy of the 3R leadership program in sport.

518 Although the positive effects of SIL on pertinent leadership outcomes is well
519 established in previous literature (e.g., trust; Giessner & van Knippenberg, 2008), and the 5Rs
520 have been applied in organizational settings (Haslam et al., 2017), our present study is the
521 first to apply social identity principles to explore the efficacy of an evidence-based leadership
522 program in sport. Moreover, our research begins to address the dearth of organizational
523 psychology interventions (Fletcher & Wagstaff, 2009), and the application of social identity
524 principles (Haslam, 2014) by reporting a 3Rs program that is both efficacious (evidenced by
525 increases in social identity and identity leadership variables) and has practical applicability
526 (evidenced by the implementation of the 3R program through a SLT and positive social
527 validation data) in sport.

528 The increases seen in athletes' social identification and perceptions of staff identity
529 leadership may be explained by social identity principles. First, in contrast to traditional
530 leadership development programs that typically focus, individualistically, on the leader (Day
531 et al., 2014), the collective focus of the 3R activities (Haslam et al., 2011; Haslam et al.,
532 2017) brought the SLT and entire team (athletes and staff) together to facilitate *psychological*
533 connections. For example, the completion of identity mapping (*Reflecting*) both within the
534 SLT and then by athletes outside the SLT may have initiated the exchange of social support,
535 which has been found to be more powerful when coming from a group member with whom
536 we feel strong ties (Cruwys et al., 2016). Second, key stakeholders across organizational
537 levels were involved in the SLT (e.g., head coach, captain, and athletes), and all athletes were
538 involved in all stages of the 3R program. As a result, it's likely that all members of the
539 organization felt empowered that their input was valued and central to the development of the
540 values, behaviors, and vision in the 3R program. Such involvement is central to SIL (Haslam
541 et al., 2011; Hogg, 2001), and accords more closely with the notion that group functioning
542 and leadership are best operationalized in a power *through* (rather than *over*) manner (Turner,

543 2005). Third, the 3R program involved systematic staff and athlete disclosure and sharing.
544 Previous evidence has reported that such disclosure (via Personal-Disclosure Mutual-Sharing;
545 Barker et al., 2014) increases athletes' social identification. Taken together, increases in
546 athletes' social identification and staff identity leadership are likely to be due to the collective
547 (organizational) program focus that empowered stakeholders through disclosure and sharing.

548 The finding that compared to baseline the number of practice hours that athletes
549 reported that they completed away from camps increased (albeit marginally) in the
550 intervention phase (in Year 1 and 2), but their mobilization of effort did not is unexpected. In
551 Year 2 baseline mobilization data, there appears to be a ceiling effect, with mobilization of
552 effort high prior to the program. High mobilization may be due to contextual factors such as
553 the reality that the team was entering into a Paralympic year at this point of data collection.
554 Despite a non-significant change in Year 1, the descriptive mobilization data and effect size
555 change are in-line with other targeted variables, are similar to self-reported changes by Allied
556 Health leaders following participation in a 5R program (Haslam et al., 2017), and broadly
557 indicate a moderate positive effect. Despite no statistical change, such moderate effect size
558 increases may have practical meaning (see Baer, 1977; Seligman, 1995) in international and
559 Paralympic soccer where fine margins exist between success and failure.

560 Returning to the increases seen in the number of hours reported by the athletes this
561 may be explained by the underlying mechanism of social identification. To elaborate, the
562 extent to which individuals' categorize themselves as part of a group (e.g., the soccer team)
563 determines the importance of that particular group to one's self-concept (see Haslam, 2004;
564 Turner et al., 1989). In other words, greater social identification equates to greater importance
565 of that group for the self. Therefore, team success and failure is perceived as collective *and*
566 personal success and failure. This, taken with findings that social identification is a main
567 determinant of commitment (Ellemers et al., 1997), is likely to explain the indirect increase in

568 athletes' mobilization of effort and hours practice completed seen in the intervention
569 compared to baseline. Put simply, as athletes' social identification increased and staff
570 displayed greater identity leadership, athletes' may have indirectly been more willing to
571 dedicate extra hours of practice away from camps for the group and themselves.

572 Overall, due to the systematic application of the 3R program, the assurance of
573 consistency via the sessions being jointly led by the authors, the retest of the intervention in
574 Year 2 with a new Paralympic team yielding broadly similar results, the operationalization of
575 the target variables, and the measurement of a non-target variable, this study provides
576 encouraging results for the efficacy of the 3R program with an elite disability soccer team,
577 but not the effectiveness (for discussion see Seligman, 1995). A further contribution of the
578 current research is the longitudinal design and disability context within which the study took
579 place. In their seminal paper, Fletcher and Wagstaff (2009) proposed the need for
580 longitudinal investigations of organizational psychology in sport. To the authors' knowledge,
581 this is the first study to have investigated group dynamics and leadership over a two-year
582 period from a social identity perspective. Such longitudinal designs are scantily reported in
583 elite sport. More generally too, by investigating an elite soccer team with a classified
584 disability, the current study adds to the comparative lack of organizational psychology
585 research conducted in disability sport (Arnold et al. 2016). Yet, despite encouraging athlete
586 data, the effects of the 3R program on staff social identification remains equivocal. In Year 2,
587 staff reported a small decrease in social identification, which appears to reflect the fact that
588 identification was already high at the start of the program, showing a ceiling effect, whilst the
589 small sample size must be considered ($n = 3$). It was also interesting to note the divergence in
590 the number of hours practice staff believed athletes to be completing per week ($M = 11.50 \pm$
591 3.04) vs. the number of hours reported by athletes ($M = 9.67 \pm 2.30$).

592 **Implications for "Doing SIL"**

593 The purpose of this investigation was also to document the experiences of developing
594 and implementing a 3R program in elite disability sport. Overall, applying the 3R program
595 through a SLT presented unique challenges compared to applying a psychological skills
596 training program with athletes individually. Here, we explore four areas for consideration.
597 First, we highlight the importance of communicating the program expectations to key
598 stakeholders across organizational levels including the performance director and head coach.
599 To illustrate, the head coach stayed behind after the second *Reflecting* workshop in Year 1 to
600 question when observable changes in athletes' behavior would be apparent. This was a key
601 point of reflection for us, where we emphasized the need and importance of the *Reflecting*
602 stage to provide (a) an understanding of the group's dynamics and (b) the *psychological*
603 foundation for the *Representing* and *Realizing* stages. Thus, a potential challenge for future
604 applications of the 3R program and organizational psychology interventions more broadly is
605 the need to clearly and transparently explain expectations for key stakeholders across the
606 organizational structure. This includes, at the start of and during the project, the importance
607 of the SP clearly outlining the amount of time and effort required to instigate athlete behavior
608 change (as with any psychological skills training), but also the collective approach needed
609 that includes all athletes and staff in a social identity-informed intervention of this type. To
610 this end, a fully implemented 3Rs intervention marks a significant cultural shift in a sporting
611 organization and the power through (Turner, 2005) and interactive (rather than exclusively
612 top-down) approach may be a novel challenge for an organization to embrace.

613 Similarly, in-light of the organizational focus of our current study, and as
614 recommended by Fletcher and Wagstaff (2009) to create harmony and effectiveness across
615 the multiple layers of playing and support roles, we included individuals across
616 organizational layers (individual, intra-group, inter-group, and organizational levels). To this
617 end, in Year 1 we organized a support staff session to share the project with the wider staff

618 team not involved in the SLT. The session was useful but on reflection would have been
619 better positioned towards the start of the program. Alternatively, although not possible in the
620 current study, a challenge for future practitioners is to involve staff members throughout the
621 process. For example, whilst SLT athletes completed activities with the remaining athletes it
622 would be worthwhile for the SLT staff to conduct the activities with the remaining staff. This
623 would be more feasible with a full-time elite sport team with regularity of contact and a SP
624 immersed in the high performance environment with an organizational-level remit.

625 Third, key to the efficacy of the 3R program were the follow-up activities that focused
626 on displays in the performance environment and multi-disciplinary work (e.g., with coaches
627 and support staff). In applying identity leadership interventions in sport, developing
628 innovative environmental materials (e.g., posters, infographics) are crucial and should be
629 approached with creativity. Also, the collaborative work by the SP with staff (e.g., the head
630 coach, performance analyst) to embed the approach we feel was paramount in the positive
631 impact of the 3R program. Finally, as reflected in the social validation data, SLT members
632 requested more frequent sessions, which we were unable to achieve. We ran a two-hour SLT
633 session per camp across two years, yet the time between camps afford an opportunity for
634 messages to be reinforced, which practitioners could make use of (e.g., through SLT Skype
635 sessions).

636 **Limitations and Considerations for Future Researchers**

637 The current study had important limitations. First, for the purposes of statistical
638 analyses, the study had a small sample size in Year 1 and 2, which reflects the longitudinal
639 design and international performance setting within which we delivered the project.
640 Uncontrollable factors such as team selection and injury largely explain the small sample
641 size. Nevertheless, our study is the first to explore the efficacy of a 3R program on social

642 identity-related and mobilization outcomes in sport, on which future applied endeavors can
643 build with larger samples.

644 Second, we were unable to collect data at the Paralympic Games (end of Year 2).
645 Although originally planned, this was not feasible despite the SP continuing to work with the
646 organization. Thus, the study cannot make conclusions regarding the efficacy of the 3R
647 program directly in the lead up to and during a Paralympic Games. Similarly, due to the
648 irregularity of competition throughout Year 1 and 2 we were unable to accurately measure
649 performance. Therefore, it is difficult to infer the efficacy of the 3R program on individual
650 and team performance. However, previous literature has demonstrated improved performance
651 on sporting tasks (e.g., a soccer dribbling task; Fransen et al., 2016) through increases in
652 social identification. Accordingly, the application of the 3Rs in sport teams who compete
653 regularly would be worthwhile in understanding effects on individual and team performance.

654 Third, a potential limitation of the present study reflected how the SLT was created.
655 In Year 1 and 2, the four SLT athletes were selected following a collective discussion
656 between four staff members. An alternative approach could be to use a network approach to
657 select athletes for the SLT (see Fransen et al., 2017). To illustrate, each athlete could be asked
658 to individually rate the influence of all other athletes in the team. Based on these data, a
659 network diagram would identify the most influential athletes to directly join the SLT, or to
660 inform the collective staff decision. Indeed, the network approach would provide interesting
661 data on which athletes the members of staff perceive to be influential vs. which athletes the
662 athletes do. This approach would additionally involve all athletes at this early stage, and thus
663 would be a worthwhile inclusion in future applied SIL endeavors.

664 Finally, due to potential threats to internal validity, the findings in the current study
665 could be due to a range of factors, such as repeated measurement or rival hypotheses.

666 However, in-line with recommendations (Shadish, Cook, & Campbell, 2002) we mitigated

667 threats to internal validity by: (a) retesting the 3R program in Year 2 with a new team; (b)
668 measuring a nonequivalent variable of collective efficacy, in which effect size calculations
669 reflected a small increase (and large increases were seen in targeted variables); and (c) by
670 including two baseline measures in Year 1 and 2.

671 **Conclusion**

672 Our current study contributes to the organizational psychology literature in sport and
673 social identity literature by reporting the longitudinal efficacy of a 3R program on athletes'
674 social identification, perceived staff identity leadership, and mobilization in elite disability
675 soccer. Moreover, our study is the first to capture the potential of SIL programs to develop
676 leadership in sport. Nevertheless, there remains extensive scope to take leadership theory to
677 practice (Haslam, 2014), and the group and organizational-level foci of SIL may be vital to
678 ensure that we do not fall into a myth of individualism for leadership. As Wagstaff and
679 Larner (2015) referred to the "myth of individualism" in terms of athletic success, we wish to
680 avoid a re-coining of this observation to the "myth of individualism in leadership" as an
681 accepted fallacy that individual ability and/or effort solely determines *leadership* success and,
682 that simultaneously, interpersonal, group, and organizational factors are overlooked. We are
683 sure that applying social identity principles can furnish researchers and practitioners with the
684 necessary tools to avoid this fallacy and develop leadership excellence in sport and beyond.

685

686

687

688

689

690

691

References

- 692
693 Arnold, R., Wagstaff, C. R. D., Steadman, L., & Pratt, Y. (2016). The organisational stressors
694 encountered by athletes with a disability. *Journal of Sports Sciences*. doi:
695 10.1080/02640414.2016.1214285.
- 696 Baer, D.M. (1977). Perhaps it would be better not to know everything. *Journal of Applied*
697 *Behavior Analysis, 10*, 167–172.
- 698 Cruwys, T., Haslam, S. A., Dingle, G. A., Haslam, C., & Jetten, J. (2014). Depression and
699 social identity: An integrative review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review,*
700 *18*(3), 215-238. doi:10.1177/1088868314523839.
- 701 Cruwys, T., Steffens, N. K., Haslam, S. A., Haslam, C., Jetten, J., & Dingle, G. (2016). Social
702 Identity Mapping: A procedure for visual representation and assessment of subjective
703 multiple group memberships. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 55*(4), 613-642.
704 doi: 10.1111/bjso.12155.
- 705 Day, D. V., Fleenor, J. W., Atwater, L. E., Sturm, R. E., & McKee, R. A. (2014). Advances
706 in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory.
707 *Leadership Quarterly, 25*, 63-82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.004>.
- 708 Ellemers, N., Spear, R., & Doosje, B. (1997). Sticking together or falling apart: In-group
709 identification as a psychological determinant of group commitment versus individual
710 mobility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(3), 617-626.
- 711 Fletcher, D., & Wagstaff, C. R. D. (2009). Organizational psychology in elite sport: Its
712 emergence, application and future. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 10*, 427-434.
- 713 Fransen, K., Boen, F., Stouten, J., Cotterill, S., & Vande Broek, G. (2016). Optimal
714 environments for team functioning in sport organizations in C. R. D. Wagstaff (Ed.),
715 *The organizational psychology of sport: Key issues and practical applications* (pp. 235-
716 255). London: Routledge.
- 717 Fransen, K., Steffens, N. K., Haslam, S. A., Vanbeselaere, N., De Cuyper, B., & Boen, F.
718 (2016). We will be champions: Leaders' confidence in 'us' inspires team members'
719 team confidence and performance. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in*
720 *Sports, 26*(12), 1455-1469. doi: 10.1111/sms.12603.
- 721 Fransen, K., Haslam, S. A., Mallett, C. J., Steffens, N. K., Peters, K., & Boen, F. (2017). Is
722 perceived athlete leadership quality related to team effectiveness? A comparison of
723 three professional sports teams. *Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport, 20*, 800-806.
724 doi:10.1016/j.jsams.2016.11.024

- 725 Geissner, S. R., & van Knippenberg, D. (2008). "License to fail": Goal definition, leader
726 group prototypicality, and perceptions of leadership effectiveness after leader failure.
727 *Organizational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 105, 14-35.
- 728 Greenleaf, C., Gould, D., & Dieffenbach, K. (2001). Factors influencing Olympic
729 performance: Interviews with Atlanta and Nagano US Olympians. *Journal of Applied*
730 *Sport Psychology*, 13, 154–184.
- 731 Hanton, S., Fletcher, D., & Coughlan, G. (2005). Stress in elite sport performers: a
732 comparative study of competitive and organizational stressors. *Journal of Sports*
733 *Sciences*, 23, 1129–1141.
- 734 Haslam, S. A. (2004). *Psychology in organizations: The social identity approach*. (2nd ed.).
735 Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- 736 Haslam, S. A. (2014). Making good theory practical: Five lessons for an Applied Social
737 Identity Approach to challenges of organizational, health, and clinical psychology.
738 *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 53(1), 1-20.
- 739 Haslam, S. A., Eggins, R. A., & Reynolds, K. J. (2003). The ASPIRe model: Actualizing
740 social and personal identity resources to enhance organizational outcomes. *Journal of*
741 *Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 76, 83-113.
- 742 Haslam, S. A., Reicher, S. D., & Platow, M. J. (2011). *The new psychology of leadership:*
743 *Identity, influence and power*. Hove: Psychology Press.
- 744 Hodge, K., Henry, G., & Smith, W. (2014). A case study of excellence in elite sport:
745 Motivational climate in a World champion team. *The Sport Psychologist*, 28(1), 60-74.
746 <https://doi.org/10.1123/tsp.2013-0037>
- 747 Hogg, M. A. (2001). A social identity theory of leadership. *Personality and Social*
748 *Psychology Review*, 5, 184-200.
- 749 O'Brien, A. T., S. Haslam, S. A., Jetten, J., Humphrey, L., O'Sullivan, L., Postmes, T.,
750 Eggins, R., & Reynolds, K. J. (2004). Cynicism and disengagement among devalued
751 employee groups: the need to ASPIRe. *Career Development International*, 9(1), 28-44,
752 doi: 10.1108/13620430410518129.
- 753 Page, J., & Thelwell, R. (2013). The value of social validation in single-case methods in sport
754 and exercise psychology. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 25(1), 61-71.
755 doi: 10.1080/10413200.2012.663859
- 756 Rees, T., Haslam, S. A., Coffee, P., & Lavalley, D. (2015). A social identity approach to sport
757 psychology: Principles, practice, and prospects. *Sports Medicine*, 45, 1083-96. doi:
758 10.1007/s40279-015-0345-4.

- 759 Reicher, S. D. & Haslam, S. A. (2006). Rethinking the psychology of tyranny: The BBC
760 Prison Study. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *45*, 1–40.
761 doi:10.1348/014466605X48998
- 762 Reynolds, K. J., Subasic, E., Lee, E., & Tindall, K. (2014). Does education really transform
763 us? The impact of school-based social processes on the person. In K. J. Reynolds & N.
764 R. Branscombe (Eds.), *The psychology of change: Life contexts, experiences, and*
765 *identities*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.
- 766 Seligman, M. E. P. (1995). The effectiveness of psychotherapy: The consumer reports study.
767 *American Psychologist*, *50*, 965-974.
- 768 Seyranian, V. (2014). Social identity framing communication strategies for mobilizing social
769 change. *Leadership Quarterly*, *25*, 468-486.
770 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.10.013>.
- 771 Slater, M. J., Barker, J. B., & Mellalieu, S. D. (2016). “We are in this together”: A social
772 identity perspective on change and conflict management in C. R. D. Wagstaff (Ed.),
773 *The organizational psychology of sport: Key issues and practical applications* (pp. 256-
774 273). London: Routledge.
- 775 Slater, M. J., Coffee, P., Barker, J. B., & Evans, A. L. (2014). Promoting shared meanings in
776 group memberships: A social identity approach to leadership in sport. *Reflective*
777 *Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, *15*(5), 672-685.
- 778 Slater, M. J., Evans, A. L., & Barker, J. B. (2013). Using social identities to motivate athletes
779 towards peak performance at the London 2012 Olympic Games: Reflecting for Rio
780 2016. *Reflective Practice: International and Multidisciplinary Perspectives*, *14* (5),
781 672-679.
- 782 Steffens, N. K., Haslam, S. A., Reicher, S. D., Platow, M. J., Fransen, K., Yang, J., Jetten, J.,
783 Ryan, M. K., Peters, K. O., & Boen, F. (2014). Leadership as social identity
784 management: Introducing the Identity Leadership Inventory (ILI) to assess and validate
785 a four-dimensional model. *Leadership Quarterly*, *25*, 1004–1025.
- 786 Steffens, N. K., Haslam, S. A., Schuh, S., Jetten, J., & van Dick, R. (2016). A meta-analytic
787 review of social identification and health in organizational contexts. *Personality and*
788 *Social Psychology Review*. doi:10.1177/1088868316656701
- 789 Subašić, E., Reynolds, K. J., Turner, J. C., Veenstra, K. E., & Haslam, S. A. (2011).
790 Leadership, power and the use of surveillance: Implications of shared social identity for
791 leaders’ capacity to influence. *Leadership Quarterly*, *22*, 170-181.

- 792 Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In S. Worchel
793 & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *The psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey,
794 CA: Brooks-Cole.
- 795 Turner, J. C. (2005). Explaining the nature of power: A three-process theory. *European*
796 *Journal of Social Psychology*, 35, 1-22.
- 797 Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987).
798 *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorisation theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- 799 van Knippenberg, B., & van Knippenberg, D. (2005). Leader self-sacrifice and leadership
800 effectiveness: The moderating role of leader prototypicality. *Journal of Applied*
801 *Psychology*, 90, 25-37.
- 802 Wagstaff, C. R. D. (2016). Organizational psychology in sport: An introduction in C. R. D.
803 Wagstaff (Ed.), *The organizational psychology of sport: Key issues and practical*
804 *applications* (pp. 1-9). London: Routledge.
- 805 Wagstaff, C. R. D., & Larner, R. J. (2015). Organizational psychology in sport: Recent
806 developments and a research agenda in S. D. Mellalieu and S. Hanton (Eds.),
807 *Contemporary advances in sport psychology: A review* (pp. 91-119). London:
808 Routledge.

Table 1

An overview of the two-year leadership development program based on the 3Rs of identity leadership.

<i>Year 1</i>	Oct	Nov	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	June 2
Measures (phase)	Yes (baseline)	Yes (baseline)	Yes (intervention)	Yes (intervention)	Yes (intervention)	Yes (intervention)	Yes (intervention)	Yes (intervention)	Yes (intervention)
SLT Session (theme)	No	No	Yes – (Walking a mile in your team’s shoes: The foundations of Reflection)	Yes – (Reflection II)	Yes – (Championing the group: The importance of Representing the team).	Yes – (Representing II)	Yes – (Let’s do it: Realizing our ambitions).	Yes – (Realize II)	Yes (reinforcement and monitoring)
Content Themes			1. SLT established. 2. Overview of program. 3. Understanding and applying reflection.	1. Identity mapping with SLT. 2. #whatstrending?	1. Review and agree on shared values with SLT. Five values were agreed. 2. The barriers to these values and an action plan to live these out discussed. 3. #whatstrending?	1. Action plan agreed. 2. SLT discussed and agreed on four behaviors for each value. 3. #whatstrending?	1. Check in with values and behaviors. 2. SLT asked to write and share their vision for the team. 3. #whatstrending?	1. Review and agree on vision. 2. #whatstrending?	1. Review of values/behaviors. 2. Targets set based on values/behaviors. 3. #whatstrending?
Follow-up Themes				As a follow-up SLT players completed mapping with remaining athletes. SLT players fed back to SP.	As a follow-up SLT players led a player-player session to communicate/discuss values with remaining athletes.	1. As a follow-up players led a player-players session to share behaviors. 2. Staff session to share the program	1. Posters of values in environment 2. Cue cards of values 3. Work with analyst 4. Coach used values in team-talks.	1. Player to player session to share vision, values, and behaviors. 2. Staff-led reflections on behaviors associated with values. 3. Work with analyst.	1. Posters and cue cards of values/behaviors displayed in changing room. 2. SLT player led reflections on matches using behaviors/values. 3. Work with analyst.

Year 2	Oct	Nov	Dec	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June
Measures (phase)	Yes (baseline)	Yes (baseline)	Yes (intervention)	Yes (intervention)	Yes (intervention)	Yes (intervention)	Yes (intervention)	Yes (intervention)	Yes (intervention)
SLT Session (theme)	No	No	Yes (Reflect)	Yes (Represent)	Yes (Represent II)	Yes (Realize)	Yes (reinforcement and monitoring)	Yes (reinforcement and monitoring)	Yes (reinforcement and monitoring)
Content Themes			1. SLT established. 2. Overview of program. 3. Identity mapping with SLT. 4. #whatstrending?	1. Review and agree on shared values with SLT. Four values were agreed. 2. #whatstrending?	1. SLT discussed and agreed on four behaviors for each value (based on a pool of 10 p/behavior generated by player-player session, as below). 2. SLT asked to write their vision for the team. 3. #whatstrending?	1. Review, discuss, and agree on vision. 2. #whatstrending?	1. Review of values/behaviors. 2. Targets set based on values/behaviors. 3. #whatstrending?	1. Review of values/behaviors. 2. Targets set based on values/behaviors. 3. #whatstrending?	1. Review of values/behaviors. 2. Targets set based on values/behaviors. 3. #whatstrending?
Follow-up Themes			As a follow-up, SLT players completed identity mapping with remaining athletes. SLT players fed back to SP.	As a follow-up, SLT players led a session to communicate/discuss values with remaining athletes. SLT players fed back to SP.	Before the SLT meeting, players led a player-player session developing behaviors to be associated with each value.	1. Vision, values, and behaviors launched to all team (including all staff/players). 2. Following the camp, an infographic was developed and shared with the team. 3. Work with analyst.	1. Posters and cue cards of values/behaviors displayed in changing room. 2. SLT player led reflections on matches using behaviors/values. 3. Work with analyst.	1. Posters and cue cards of values/behaviors displayed in changing room. 2. SLT player led reflections on matches using behaviors/values. 3. Work with analyst.	1. Posters and cue cards of values/behaviors displayed in changing room. 2. SLT player led reflections on matches using behaviors/values. 3. Work with analyst.

Table 2

Means, standard deviations, and statistical comparisons of dependent variables from baseline to intervention phases in Year 1.

Variable	Baseline Mean (SD)	Intervention Mean (SD)	<i>t</i> (7)	<i>d</i>
Social identification	5.81 (.84)	6.45 (.37)	1.96 [#]	.76
Identity leadership	5.93 (.64)	6.42 (.25)	2.12 [#]	.76
Mobilization	6.03 (.75)	6.56 (.37)	1.54	.70
Hours practice	7.97 (1.86)	11.04 (2.39)	2.35 [#]	1.65
Collective efficacy	5.63 (.75)	5.80 (.21)	.61	.23

Notes.

[#]*p* < .10.

Collective efficacy was a non-target variable in Year 1 of the study where small change was expected.

Table 3

Means, standard deviations, and statistical comparisons of dependent variables from baseline to intervention phases in Year 2.

Variable	Baseline Mean (SD)	Intervention Mean (SD)	<i>t</i> (8)	<i>d</i>
Social identification	6.17 (.50)	6.58 (.18)	2.71*	.82
	<i>6.50 (.86)</i>	<i>6.33 (.60)</i>		<i>-.20</i>
Identity leadership	6.21 (.44)	6.64 (.15)	2.52*	.98
Mobilization	6.74 (.24)	6.87 (.07)	1.45	.54
Hours practice	9.67 (2.30)	11.03 (2.39)	2.29 [#]	.59
	<i>11.50 (3.04)</i>	<i>11.83 (4.54)</i>		<i>.11</i>

Notes.

* $p \leq .05$, [#] $p < .10$.

Staff data is presented in *italics* and was not subject to statistical testing because $n = 3$.

Table 4

Correlations between dependent variables across baseline and intervention phases in Year 1

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Variables at baseline									
1. Social identification	-								
2. Identity leadership	.28	-							
3. Mobilization	.54	.50	-						
4. Hours practice	.28	.55	.51	-					
5. Collective efficacy	.12	.15	-.12	-.17	-				
Variables at intervention									
6. Social identification	.42	.27	.04	.12	.27	-			
7. Identity leadership	.15	.36	.39	.27	.06	.10	-		
8. Mobilization	.28	.27	.52	.61	.09	.22	.65	-	
9. Hours practice	.33	.16	.75*	.49	.09	.14	.23	.28	-
10. Collective efficacy	.10	.30	.15	-.11	.41	.12	.09	.05	.13

Notes.

 $N = 8$ * $p < .05$

Table 5
Correlations between dependent variables across baseline and intervention phases in Year 2

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Variables at baseline							
1. Social identification	-						
2. Identity leadership	.18	-					
3. Mobilization	.14	.53	-				
4. Hours practice	.28	.27	.30	-			
Variables at intervention							
5. Social identification	.36	.13	.25	.30	-		
6. Identity leadership	.17	.39	.09	.15	.26	-	
7. Mobilization	.20	.04	.18	.25	.26	.31	-
8. Hours practice	.33	.16	.25	.71*	.09	.72*	.42

Notes.

$N = 9$

* $p < .05$