This item was submitted to [Loughborough's Research Repository](#) by the author.
Items in Figshare are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved, unless otherwise indicated.

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

PLEASE CITE THE PUBLISHED VERSION

<https://doi.org/10.1080/10413200.2017.1410255>

PUBLISHER

© Association for Applied Sport Psychology. Published by Taylor & Francis

VERSION

AM (Accepted Manuscript)

PUBLISHER STATEMENT

This work is made available according to the conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND 4.0) licence. Full details of this licence are available at:
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

LICENCE

CC BY-NC-ND 4.0

REPOSITORY RECORD

Slater, Matthew J., and Jamie Barker. 2019. "Doing Social Identity Leadership: Exploring the Efficacy of an Identity Leadership Intervention on Perceived Leadership and Mobilization in Elite Disability Soccer". figshare. <https://hdl.handle.net/2134/28211>.

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

Abstract

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Social Identity Approach to Leadership (SIL)

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

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

The Application of SIL

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Present Study

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

Hypotheses

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

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

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

Method

Intervention Design

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

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

Program Context and Delivery

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

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

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

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

Participants

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

The 3R Leadership Program in Sport

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Measures

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

Target variables.

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

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

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

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

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

Non-target variable.

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

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

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

Results

Analytical Strategy

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

Target Variables

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

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

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

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

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

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

Non-target Variable

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

Social Validation

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

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

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

Staff Perceptions in Year 2

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

Discussion

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Implications for “Doing SIL”

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

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

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

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

Limitations and Considerations for Future Researchers

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Conclusion

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

References

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

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

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

 $N = 9$ * $p < .05$