1	Full title: Leading together towards a stronger 'us': An experimental test of the effectiveness of the
2	5R Shared Leadership Program (5R ^s) in basketball teams.
3	Word Count: 2990
4	Abstract Word Count: 249
5	Number of Tables: 2
6	Number of Figures: 1
7	
8 9	Abstract Objectives. Leadership has been suggested to be a key factor in gaining a competitive
10	advantage as a team, with shared leadership being a better predictor of team functioning than vertical
11	leadership. Although the benefits of shared leadership are well-documented, evidence about how to
12	implement a shared leadership structure remains sparse. This leaves coaches with three key
13	challenges: (1) identifying the best leaders; (2) defining what roles those leaders should fulfill; and (3)
14	developing their leadership skills. Solutions to these challenges have been proposed in the 5R Shared
15	Leadership Program $(5R^{S})$ — a leadership development program that seeks to implement an effective
16	structure of shared leadership within sports teams.
17	Design. To test the effectiveness of $5R^{S}$ program, we conducted an experimental-comparison
18	group intervention in which eight national-level basketball teams ($N = 96$) completed a questionnaire
19	at two points in time (i.e., pre- and posttest). The teams in the intervention condition completed the
20	5R ^s program, in which we identified the leadership structure in their teams (through Shared Leadership
21	Mapping), appointed the best leaders in their leadership role, and then developed their identity
22	leadership skills.
23	Results. The results revealed that the 5R ^s program was successful in strengthening athlete
24	leaders' identity leadership skills, and as a result also team members' identification with their team.
25	Furthermore, in contrast to athletes in the comparison condition, athletes in the 5R ^s condition were
26	able to maintain their levels of intrinsic motivation and commitment to team goals, while also
27	reporting improved well-being.

This is an accepted manuscript of an article published by Elsevier in Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport, available online at <u>https://www.jsams.org/article/S1440-2440(19)30777-7/fulltext</u>. It is not the copy of record. Copyright © 2020, Elsevier.

28	Conclusions. The present study provides encouraging evidence that, by implementing a
29	structure of shared leadership and by promoting athlete leaders' identity leadership skills, the 5R ^s
30	program is able to improve the team's functioning and the well-being of its members.
31	Keywords: Shared leadership, Athlete leadership, Leadership development, Team functioning
32	Practical Implications
33	• The 5R ^s program strengthens the capacity of leaders to cultivate a shared team identity (i.e., to
34	engage in identity leadership).
35	• Promoting identity leadership helped athletes to remain motivated and to sustain their
36	commitment to team goals, while athletes in the comparison group showed a decrease in
37	motivation and goal commitment over the course of the season.
38	• Developing athletes' ability to engage in identity leadership has a beneficial impact on the
39	team's functioning and on their teammates' well-being.
40	

Δ	1
-	1

Introduction

42 "The leaders who work most effectively, it seems to me, never say I. And that's not because they 43 have trained themselves not to say "I". They don't think "I". They think "we", they think team."¹ 44 In recent years, sports leadership research has established the importance of leadership sources other than the coach, thereby emphasizing the role of high-quality leaders within the team (i.e., 45 athlete leaders) and how these leaders can contribute to their team's success². The importance of these 46 47 leaders within the team has inspired a shift in sports leadership research away from the traditional 48 models of hierarchical leadership (with the coach as hierarchical leader) towards horizontal (or flatter) 49 forms of shared leadership (in which the coach shares the lead with athlete leaders). This shift can also be seen in organizational research, which has established that shared leadership constitutes a better 50 predictor of team functioning than vertical leadership ³⁻⁵. 51 52 Despite its benefits, implementing an effective structure of shared leadership in practice is not 53 straightforward. Moreover, there is only sparse research that assists practitioners in this transition. 54 Accordingly, coaches will typically encounter multiple uncertainties in their transition towards a more 55 horizontal leadership structure in their team. These uncertainties can take many forms. First, coaches 56 might be concerned about losing control of their team or they might be doubtful about how to get 57 started. Even when coaches are convinced about the benefits of shared leadership, some doubts might 58 remain. For example, coaches might have hesitations about which players to assign as leaders, or they 59 might be unsure about which on-field and off-field roles these players can fulfill. Further, coaches 60 might want to help these athlete leaders to improve their leadership skills, but not know how they should do this. The 5R Shared Leadership Program – shortened as 5R^s – is designed to address these 61 concerns and help coaches to implement a structure of shared leadership by 6,7 : (1) identifying the best 62 63 leaders in the team; (2) defining what roles those leaders should fulfill; and (3) developing the 64 leadership skills of the appointed athlete leaders. In what follows, we will elaborate on the nature of the $5R^{s}$ program and the way in which it tackles each of these hurdles, before outlining the 65 66 experimental test of its effectiveness.

To tackle the first challenge of identifying the best leaders, the present program uses *Shared Leadership Mapping* to create leadership networks through social network analysis ⁶⁻⁸. Compared to

69 previous individualistic approaches (i.e., looking only at the team captain as formal leader) or dyadic 70 approaches (i.e., looking at the bidirectional relationship between leader and follower), social network 71 analysis places the entire group at the center of the analysis. Team members who appear most central 72 in the leadership network (thus being perceived as the best leaders in a certain leadership role) are then 73 appointed as leader in that specific leadership role.

74 A second challenge relates to the nature of the role and according responsibilities that are assigned to the athlete leaders. In this regard, Fransen, Vanbeselaere, De Cuyper, et al.⁹ identified four 75 76 distinct leadership roles that athlete leaders can occupy (i.e., task, motivational, social, and external 77 leader). Although players and coaches often expect the team captain to excel in each of these four 78 roles, previous work has showed that, in practice, team captains can only rarely meet these high expectations.^{9, 10} This should not be a problem, though, as in fact, researchers have previously 79 80 demonstrated that teams in which different players occupy these leadership roles (i.e., teams with 81 shared leadership) report greater identification with the team, increased motivation, higher team confidence, and tend to perform better ⁹. 82

83 After implementing a structure of shared leadership by identifying leaders in the four 84 leadership roles, a next step is to further develop the leadership skills of the appointed leaders. In this regard, the Social Identity Approach to Leadership¹¹ has shown that leaders are only effective to the 85 extent that they are able to create a shared social identity in their team. Slater and Barker¹² were the 86 87 first to apply this principle in sport (in a study of an elite disability soccer team). More specifically, 88 they demonstrated that teaching leaders how to create and strengthen a sense of shared identity in the 89 team had a positive impact on the identity leadership displayed by staff, on the team's social 90 identification, and on the number of practice hours that were completed away from training camps. Building upon previous research, the 5R^S program (1) encourages a structure of shared 91 leadership (through Shared Leadership Mapping ⁶⁻⁸) and (2) further develops participants' 92 93 leadership potential by teaching athlete leaders how to represent and advance a shared social identity (based on the 5*R leadership program* developed in an organizational setting 13). More 94 specifically, the leaders, together with their team, are guided throughout five phases in which 95

they learn hands-on how to foster a shared identity, thereby improving their identity

97 leadership skills (for more information on the specific content of each phase, see Fransen,

Haslam, Steffens, et al. 6,7).

99 Although there is an extended theoretical framework underpinning the $5R^{s}$ program, thus far only qualitative data from case studies have shed light on the effectiveness of the program. 100 101 Accordingly, the main aim of the current study is to investigate the effectiveness of the $5R^{s}$ program in 102 an experimental intervention study, which comprises both an experimental and a comparison condition 103 (each involving four teams). In the experimental condition, a structure of shared leadership was implemented by means of Shared Leadership Mapping⁸, after which the identity leadership skills of 104 the appointed leaders were further developed. Furthermore, because of our interest in the 5R^s 105 106 program's effectiveness, the current study investigated basketball teams during their regular 107 competition. Across the variables of interest (dependent measures) and over the course of the 108 intervention, we expected that participants in the 5R^S condition would show a more positive 109 development than those in the comparison condition (indicative of an interaction effect). Following Fransen, Haslam, Steffens, et al. 6,7, we expected that the identity leadership skills of athlete leaders in 110 111 the $5R^{s}$ condition would improve significantly over the course of the program, and more so than the 112 identity leadership skills of athlete leaders in the comparison group (H1). Based on the development of 113 leaders' identity leadership skills in the 5R^s program, we expected players in the experimental 114 condition to show a greater increase in team identification than players in the comparison group (H2). Furthermore, in line with the underpinning theorizing ^{6, 11}, we expected that teams which completed 115 5R^s program would function more effectively ¹⁴⁻¹⁶ than teams in the comparison group. More 116 specifically, we expect athletes in the 5R^s condition to show greater increases in their intrinsic 117 118 motivation (H3a), in their commitment to their team's goals (H3b), in their confidence in the team's 119 abilities (H3c), as well as in their performance (H4), compared to athletes in the comparison condition. Furthermore, Haslam, Jetten, Cruwys, et al.¹⁷ emphasize that social identity is central to good health, 120 121 as a strong sense of shared social identity is a source of a number of key psychological resources. One 122 example of such a psychological resource is social support, as shared social identity is a basis not only

for people to give and receive more social support, but also for people to construe received support more positively. In line with these theoretical claims, we expect that participation in the 5R^S program will improve athletes' well-being ^{18, 19}. More specifically, compared to athletes in the comparison group, athletes in teams that participate in 5R^S are expected to report lower levels of burnout (H5a), and to feel healthier (H5b).

128

Methods

129 An a-priori power analysis (Gpower 3²⁰), based on the results of a previous study with a similar experimental design²¹, indicated that 84 participants would be sufficient to detect a significant 130 131 (condition X time) interaction effect with a power of .96 and an alpha of .05. After contacting the head 132 coaches of 16 Belgian competitive basketball teams, eight head coaches agreed to participate. The 133 main reason for non-participation was the requisite time investment. The eight participating teams 134 belonged to eight different clubs, ruling out contamination effects. All participating teams played at 135 the national competitive level (i.e., third highest league in Belgium). The athletes (N = 96) were on average 25.90 years old (SD = 5.84) and had played for 7.92 years (SD = 5.99) for their current team. 136 137 Five athletes dropped out during the study (e.g., because of a long-term injury). Team sizes ranged 138 from 10 to 15 athletes (M = 12, SD = 1.55).

139 When contacting the coaches, we informed them that the study included an intervention and 140 provided them with the required timing for the sessions. If the coach agreed to participate for the 141 complete data collection and intervention, that team was assigned to the intervention group (i.e., four 142 teams). If not, we asked the coach whether he was willing to have the team only complete the data 143 collection, resulting in a comparison group also consisting of four teams. We gathered data by administering questionnaires at two points in time. The first round of data collection (T1) took place in 144 December, three to four months after the start of the competitive season. Immediately after the first 145 146 phase of data collection, the intervention group participated in the 5R Shared Leadership Program $(5R^{s})$ while the comparison group received no intervention. Data were collected from both groups a 147 second time (T2) five months later, at the end of the competitive season. All participants participated 148 149 voluntarily in the study and were assured that their data would be treated confidentially. The research 150 was approved by the ethical committee of the first author's university (G-2017 11 996).

151 With respect to the intervention, we divided the first four phases of the 5R^s Program into two sessions. The first session consisted of the research confederate guiding the team through the first two 152 153 phases of 5R^S (i.e., Readying and Reflecting), while the second session consisted of the Representing and the Realizing phase (for more information on the content of the phases, see 6,7). As the final 154 155 'Reporting' phase is an evaluation phase that was meant to be completed two months after the 156 previous phases, we combined this phase with the second phase of data collection. The first two 157 sessions were completed during a practice session of the team. Depending on the availability of the 158 teams and their training schedule, we tried to deliver these two interventions within the maximal time 159 frame of two weeks. A research confederate with a strong theoretical background in the underpinning literature that informs the 5R^s program led each session. The 5R^s program adopts a bottom-up 160 approach by encouraging the appointed athlete leaders to coordinate small-group brainstorm 161 162 discussions during each session, thereby ensuring that all team members take part in the program. After these two workshops with the team, the research confederate followed up by contacting the 163 coach by phone every two to three weeks. This follow-up was an informal conversation, aiming to 164 165 check on the progress of the team and to remind the coach of the previously presented guidelines. 166 During this process, no coaches dropped out.

With respect to the measures included in this study, participants rated their agreement with the listed statements on scales ranging from 1 (*completely disagree*) to 7 (*completely agree*) for all the constructs described below (with exception of the health and performance measures). The internal consistencies of each of the scales are reported in Table 1 on the diagonal.

With respect to identity leadership, the 15-item Identity Leadership Inventory ²² was used to assess the extent to which leaders were perceived to represent, create, advance, and embed a sense of shared social identity in their teams (e.g., "The leaders within my team embody what the team stands for"). As we were interested in the overarching concept of identity leadership, we used a composite score rather than the four subscales.

Team identification was assessed using a 12-item measure developed by Bruner, Boardley,
and Côté ²³, who adapted the 12 identification items of three-factor model of social identity from
Cameron ²⁴ to be used in sporting contexts. A sample item is "I have a lot in common with other

8

members of this team." Similar to identity leadership, we were interested in the overarching concept ofteam identification and thus used the composite score.

181 Intrinsic motivation was assessed using the relevant subscale of the Behavioral Regulation in 182 Sport Questionnaire ²⁵. We chose to include only this subscale because intrinsic motivation represents 183 the hallmark of volitional functioning^{26, 27} and to ensure that the questionnaire would not become too 184 long for athletes to remain focused. This subscale consisted of two items: "I play basketball because it 185 is fun" and "I play basketball because I like it".

186 The five-item scale suggested by Klein, Wesson, Hollenbeck, et al. ²⁸ assessed participants'

187 commitment to the team's goals (e.g., "I am strongly committed to pursuing our team's goals").

188 Team confidence was assessed by the Collective Efficacy Questionnaire for Sports (CEQS ²⁹),

189 including the five items that loaded most highly on each subscale: ability, effort, unity, persistence,

190 and preparation (e.g., "My team has the ability to demonstrate a strong work ethic").

As a measure of performance, athletes indicated their team's performance during the previous
month on an 11-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (*very poor*) to 10 (*very good*) at both T1 and T2.

Burnout was assessed by the 15-item Athlete Burnout Scale ³⁰, an example item being "I feel

194 physically exhausted from my sport participation."

Following the suggestion of Khan, Hopkins, Tewari, et al. ³¹, we assessed participants' health using three items from the internationally-used core module of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Health Related Quality of Life Measure. After reading the stem "Since the start of the season, how would you describe your...", participants rated their "physical health", "state of mind", and "energy levels" on scales from 1 (*very bad*) to 7 (very *good*).

200

Results

The means, standard deviations, correlations, and Cronbach alphas of all variables are presented in Table 1. As our data adopts a 2 (experimental group vs. comparison group) X 2 (T1 vs. T2) design, our main focus of analysis is the investigation of these 2 X 2 interaction effects. To account for the clustered nature of our data (i.e., players belonging to teams) we conducted multilevel regression modelling. We included time as Level 1-predictor, condition as Level 2-predictor, and a random intercept as Level 3-predictor to control for biased results that can occur due to nesting of the

data. The results are presented in Table 2. The analysis revealed a significant interaction effect for
perceptions of leaders' identity leadership. In line with H1, Figure 1 shows that participation in the
5R^S program increased leaders' ability to create a shared sense of 'us' within their team, an effect that
was not observed in the comparison group. Furthermore, in contrast with the comparison group, the
5R^S program strengthened players' identification with their team, confirming H2.

Support was found for H3a and H3b, as we found that participants in the 5R^s program were 212 213 able to maintain their levels of intrinsic motivation (H3a) and commitment to team goals (H3b) (i.e., a 214 maintenance effect), while participants in the comparison group experienced a decrease in motivation 215 and commitment over the course of the season. In contrast to our expectations, we observed no 216 significant interaction effect with respect to athletes' team confidence (H3c) and their subjective 217 perceptions of the team's performance (H4). With respect to burnout (H5), the data provided partial 218 support; while a trend could be observed in line with our hypothesis ^a, in that players in the 219 comparison group seemed to experience an increase in burnout in the season, while players' burnout in 220 the intervention group remained constant, the interaction effect was not significant (H5a). However, 221 the results indicated that participants who took part in the $5R^{s}$ program felt healthier than participants 222 who did not (H5b). This finding also held when investigating the three items individually (physical 223 health: $\beta = .71$, p < 0.01; state of mind: $\beta = .58$, p < 0.05; energy levels: $\beta = .48$, p < 0.05).

224

Discussion

The present study is the first to provide an experimental test of the effectiveness of the 5R Shared Leadership Program. In line with the main hypotheses, the study found that 5R^s successfully improved the ability of athlete leaders to create and advance a shared sense of 'us', which was reflected by an increase in the perceived identity leadership skills and a strengthened team identification in the intervention group, in contrast to the comparison group. Furthermore, participation in the program inspired team members to stay motivated and remain committed to common team goals, while participants in the comparison group experienced a decline in their

^a Upon further investigation, T-tests revealed that the comparison group underwent a significant increase in burnout throughout the season (t(35) = -2.07, p < 0.05) whereas the intervention group experienced no significant changes.

motivation and commitment over the course of the season. Furthermore, the 5R^S program was
successful in enhancing players' feelings of well-being, compared to the comparison group. These
findings are in line with previous research outlining the benefits of high-quality athlete leadership,
both for team functioning and well-being ^{2, 32, 33}.

However, some results of the present research were not in line with our expectations. In 236 contrast to previous research ^{5, 7, 17}, our findings did not provide any evidence for an enhanced team 237 238 confidence and team performance. A potential explanation for these unexpected results is the 239 difference in the design of the study. More specifically, the relationship between high-quality athlete leadership and both team confidence and performance has primarily been demonstrated using 240 experiments of shorter duration (completed within an hour) and using experimental teams (instead of 241 242 actual teams). The design of the current study differed in two ways; first, the duration between the two 243 measurement points was about six months (instead of an hour), and second, we worked with existing 244 teams (instead of a more controlled experimental design with newly-composed teams). Furthermore, the dynamic nature of team confidence¹⁸ might have caused variations in players' confidence in their 245 246 team's abilities that are unrelated to our 5R^s program (e.g., winning or losing a game, an injury of a 247 star player, the strength of the opponent teams, etc.). Similarly, these factors could also have 248 influenced athletes' subjective perceptions of the team's performance. Future research should 249 therefore use more frequent measures which are more controllable (e.g., effort) to provide further 250 insight into whether (and when) the $5R^{s}$ program impacts these outcomes.

Additionally, based on previous social cure research ^{18, 34}, we expected that team members who identify strongly with their team would also experience improved health and well-being. The present research provided support for this hypothesis with respect to athletes' perceived health, but not with respect to their levels of burnout (although a trend could be observed, such that burnout significantly increased in the comparison group but not in the intervention group).

An alternative explanation for these non-significant findings in team confidence, subjective performance, and burnout can be found in the lack of a follow-up upon completion of the program. In the present study, the research confederate only worked with the team for two workshops (in the first two weeks), and was afterwards only in contact with the coach by phone. This limited amount of

10

contact with the team might have negatively influenced the effectiveness of the program. A closer
follow-up with the appointed leaders and the players might have improved the intervention's
effectiveness.

Additionally, we should note that the timing of the implementation of our 5R^s program may 263 not have been ideal. Because the teams completed the program during the second half of the 264 265 competitive season, teams might have felt restricted in what they could achieve before the end of the 266 season. More specifically, athletes might have already known that they (or other team members) 267 would leave the team next season. This might have negatively influenced their motivation to participate in an intervention program that aimed to create and strengthen the team's identity as well as 268 to implement goals to improve the team's functioning. Future studies that implement the 5R^s program 269 270 in the first half of the season could provide more insight in whether the adopted timing impacts its 271 effectiveness.

272 Reflecting on the strengths of the present research, a primary strength is its experimental design (intervention vs comparison condition). By including a comparison group, we were able to 273 274 clearly identify the unique impact of the 5R^s program in this study. Furthermore, by working with 275 actual basketball teams during the competitive season, we could test the intervention effectiveness in a 276 real-world setting. A second strength is that instead of working with the team captain only, we use 277 social network analysis to identify the best leaders in the team on four different leadership roles (i.e., 278 task, motivational, social, and external leader). Third, 5R^s involves all team members in its different 279 workshops, so that leaders and followers work actively together towards a shared team identity. While 280 in other programs leaders are often developed independent of the context and the team that they are 281 expected to lead, this approach takes into consideration the collective environment in which leadership plays out ³⁵. 282

Besides these strengths, also some limitations should be noted. An important limitation of our study is the self-selection procedure for including coaches in the intervention group (i.e., the fact that this was dependent on their willingness to participate). However, one could also argue that because the participating coaches were more open to the idea of shared leadership and team identification, they might already have been attuned to these aspects, thereby limiting room for improvement. This

288 assumption is indeed reflected by the fact that at T1 the teams in the intervention condition reported significantly higher levels of identity leadership (t = 2.69, p < 0.01) than teams in the comparison 289 290 condition, as well as stronger team identification (t = 3.67, p < 0.001). Furthermore, the teams in the 291 intervention condition showed higher baseline values than teams in the comparison condition with 292 respect to team confidence (t = 2.83, p < 0.01) and subjective performance (t = 3.61, p < 0.01). These 293 higher baseline values in the intervention condition possibly contributed to the fact that we did not 294 observe significant changes in these measures as further improvement within these teams might have 295 been more challenging^b. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that in contrast to the coaches, the players 296 (who were the key interest of this study and who completed the questionnaires), did not self-select into 297 5R^s, thereby limiting the impact of coaches' self-selection bias on the results.

A second limitation of the study is that, due to the large time investment the $5R^{s}$ program required, we tracked eight teams (of which only four teams participated in $5R^{s}$). Future researchers could validate the reliability and generalizability of our findings by examining the intervention in a larger number of teams and in different settings (other sports, youth level, different contexts such as walking or fitness groups).

Based on the present study and previous research findings that demonstrate the benefits of high-quality athlete leadership ^{2, 19, 32}, coaches might be well advised to introduce shared leadership structures into their teams. This will not only benefit the team's functioning and the wellbeing of its members, but also the leadership status of the coach. In fact, Fransen, Mertens, Cotterill, et al. ³⁶ recently demonstrated that coaches who empower players in their team to lead are perceived as better coaches than those who choose to lead alone in a hierarchical top-down fashion.

Furthermore, by encouraging their athlete leaders to engage in identity leadership, coaches can
promote the creation and strengthening of a shared team identity. This will in turn help athletes to
remain intrinsically motivated and committed to the team's goals until the end of the competitive

^b We conducted a sensitivity analysis to investigate whether baseline differences might have influenced our results. For this purpose, we performed a repeated measures analysis including the respective T1 variable as a covariate. These analyses confirmed all our previous findings: significant (time x group) interaction effects for athlete leaders' identity leadership, athletes' team identification, intrinsic motivation, goal commitment, and well-being. Moreover, in line with our previous findings, no significant interaction effect was found for team confidence, burnout, and performance.

season. Also, in light of the increasing concern about athletes' well-being, the present study providessome preliminary insights into how fostering identity leadership within a group, and creating a

314 stronger social identity, can nurture athletes' health.

315 Conclusion

316 The present study provides evidence of the effectiveness of the 5R Shared Leadership

317 program. Results revealed that the $5R^{s}$ program has the ability to strengthen the capacity of leaders to

318 create a shared sense of social identity (a sense of 'us-ness') within their team. Additionally, the

319 program helped team members to remain motivated and committed to the team goals and improved

320 their health and well-being. These results provide encouraging evidence that it is possible to improve

team functioning through a program that promotes identity leadership and thereby helps leaders to

322 follow Peter Drucker's advice and "think we", not just "I".

323		References
324	1.	Drucker PF. Managing the non-profit organization: Practices and principles, Oxford,
325		Butterworth-Heinemann; 1992.
326	2.	Cotterill ST, Fransen K. Athlete leadership in sport teams: Current understanding and
327		future directions. Int Rev Sport Exerc Psychol. 2016; 9(1):116-133.
328	3.	Nicolaides VC, LaPort KA, Chen TR, et al. The shared leadership of teams: A meta-
329		analysis of proximal, distal, and moderating relationships. Leadersh Q. 2014;
330		25(5):923-942.
331	4.	D'Innocenzo L, Mathieu JE, Kukenberger MR. A meta-analysis of different forms of
332		shared leadership-team performance relations. J. Manag. 2016; 42(7):1964-1991.
333	5.	Wang D, Waldman DA, Zhang Z. A meta-analysis of shared leadership and team
334		effectiveness. J. Appl. Psychol. 2014; 99(2):181-198.
335	6.	Fransen K, Haslam SA, Steffens NK, et al. All for us and us for all: Introducing the 5R
336		Shared Leadership Program. Manuscript submitted for publication. 2019.
337	7.	Fransen K, Mertens N, Haslam SA, et al. All for us and us for all: Introducing the 5R
338		Shared Leadership Program. Conference: International Conference on Social Identity
339		in Sport. Stirling, Scotland: Conference handbook ICSIS 2019; 2019:20.
340	8.	Fransen K, Van Puyenbroeck S, Loughead TM, et al. Who takes the lead? Social
341		network analysis as pioneering tool to investigate shared leadership within sports
342		teams. Soc. Networks. 2015; 43:28-38.
343	9.	Fransen K, Vanbeselaere N, De Cuyper B, et al. The myth of the team captain as
344		principal leader: extending the athlete leadership classification within sport teams. J.
345		Sports Sci. 2014; 32(14):1389-1397.

- Fransen K, Cotterill ST, Vande Broek G, et al. Unpicking the Emperor's New Clothes:
 Perceived Attributes of the Captain in Sports Teams. *Frontiers in Psychology*. 2019;
 10(2212).
- Haslam SA, Reicher SD, Platow MJ. *The new psychology of leadership: Identity, influence and power*, New York, Psychology Press; 2011.
- Slater MJ, Barker JB. Doing Social Identity Leadership: Exploring the Efficacy of an
 Identity Leadership Intervention on Perceived Leadership and Mobilization in Elite
 Disability Soccer. *J Appl Sport Psychol.* 2019; 31(1):65-86.
- Haslam SA, Steffens NK, Peters K, et al. A Social Identity Approach to Leadership
 Development: The 5R Program. J. Pers. Psychol. 2017; 1(1):1-12.
- 356 14. Fransen K, Haslam SA, Steffens NK, et al. Believing in us: Exploring leaders'
- 357 capacity to enhance team confidence and performance by building a sense of shared
 358 social identity. *J Exp Psych Appl.* 2015; 21(1):89-100.
- 15. Fransen K, Haslam SA, Mallett CJ, et al. Is perceived athlete leadership quality related
- 360 to team effectiveness? A comparison of three professional sports teams. J. Sci. Med.
- *Sport.* 2017; 20(8):800-806.
- 362 16. Fransen K, Steffens NK, Haslam SA, et al. We will be champions: Leaders'
- 363 confidence in 'us' inspires team members' team confidence and performance. *Scand. J.* 364 *Med. Sci. Sports.* 2016; 26(12):1455-1469.
- 17. Haslam C, Jetten J, Cruwys T, et al. *The new psychology of health: Unlocking the*
- *social cure*, Routledge; 2018.
- 36718.Haslam SA, Steffens NK, Peters K, et al. Natural but estranged bedfellows: Social
- 368 identity and the missing link between health and leadership, in *Social scaffolding:*
- 369 Applying the lessons of contemporary social science to health, public mental health

- *and healthcare*. Williams R, Bailey S, Kamaldeep B, et al., ed^eds. London, Royal
 College of Psychiatrists, 2016.
- 19. Fransen K, Haslam SA, Steffens NK, et al. Making 'us' better: High-quality athlete
- 373 leadership relates to health and burnout in professional Australian football teams. *Eur*374 *J Sport Sci.* 2019; just-accepted:1-28.
- Faul F, Erdfelder E, Lang A-G, et al. G* Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis
 program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behav. Res. Methods.*2007; 39(2):175-191.
- 378 21. Fransen K, Boen F, Vansteenkiste M, et al. The power of competence support: The
- impact of coaches and athlete leaders on intrinsic motivation and performance. *Scand.*
- 380 J. Med. Sci. Sports. 2018; 28(2):725-745.
- 381 22. Steffens NK, Haslam SA, Reicher SD, et al. Leadership as social identity
- 382 management: Introducing the Identity Leadership Inventory (ILI) to assess and

validate a four-dimensional model. *Leadersh Q.* 2014; 25:1001-1024.

- Bruner MW, Boardley ID, Côté J. Social identity and prosocial and antisocial behavior
 in youth sport. *Psychol Sport Exerc.* 2014; 15(1):56-64.
- 24. Cameron JE. A Three-Factor Model of Social Identity. *Self and Identity*. 2004;
 387 3(3):239-262.
- 388 25. Lonsdale C, Hodge K, Rose EA. The behavioral regulation in sport questionnaire
- 389 (BRSQ): instrument development and initial validity evidence. *J Sport Exerc Psychol.*390 2008; 30(3):323-355.
- 391 26. Ryan RM, Deci EL. Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in
 392 motivation, development, and wellness, Guilford Publications; 2017.
- 393 27. Ryan RM, Deci EL. Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic
- motivation, social development, and well-being. *Am. Psychol.* 2000; 55(1):68-78.

395 28. Klein HJ, Wesson MJ, Hollenbeck JR, et al. The assessment of goal commitment: A
396 measurement model meta-analysis. *Organ. Behav. Hum. Decis. Process.* 2001;
207 85(1):22.55

397 85(1):32-55.

398 29. Short SE, Sullivan P, Feltz D. Development and preliminary validation of the
399 collective efficacy questionnaire for sports. *Meas Phys Educ Exerc Sci.* 2005;

400 9(3):181-202.

- 401 30. Raedeke TD, Smith AL. Development and preliminary validation of an athlete burnout
 402 measure. *J Sport Exerc Psychol.* 2001; 23(4):281-306.
- 403 31. Khan SS, Hopkins N, Tewari S, et al. Efficacy and well-being in rural north India: The
 404 role of social identification with a large-scale community identity. *Eur J Soc Psychol.*

ç , ,

- 405 2014; 44(7):787-798.
- 406 32. Fletcher D, Arnold R. A Qualitative Study of Performance Leadership and
 407 Management in Elite Sport. *J Appl Sport Psychol.* 2011; 23(2):223-242.
- 408 33. Fransen K, Haslam SA, Mallett CJ, et al. Is perceived athlete leadership quality related
- 409 to team effectiveness? A comparison of three professional sports teams. J. Sci. Med.
- 410 *Sport.* 2017; 20(8):800-806.
- 411 34. Steffens NK, Haslam SA, Schuh SC, et al. A meta-analytic review of social
- 412 identification and health in organizational contexts. *Personality and Social Psychology*413 *Review*. 2017; 21(4):303-335.
- 414 35. Day DV, Fleenor JW, Atwater LE, et al. Advances in leader and leadership
- 415 development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *Leadersh Q.* 2014;
- 416 25(1):63-82.
- 417 36. Fransen K, Mertens N, Cotterill ST, et al. From Autocracy to Empowerment: Teams
- 418 with Shared Leadership Perceive their Coaches to be Better Leaders. *J Appl Sport*
- 419 *Psychol.* 2019:1-23.
- 420

Tables

421

422 Table 1

423 Means, standard deviations, and correlations between all the included variables. Cronbach's alphas are presented in italics on the diagonal.

	М	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. T1 Identity leadership	5.44	.71	(.92)															
2. T2 Identity leadership	5.54	.82	.48***	(.96)														
3. T1 Team identification	5.46	.81	.56***	.45***	(.87)													
4. T2 Team identification	5.52	1.02	.47***	.72***	.69***	(.94)												
5. T1 Intrinsic motivation	6.52	.72	.24*	.11	.17	.09	(.78)											
6. T2 Intrinsic motivation	6.35	.87	.26*	.46***	.37**	.37**	.30**	(.73)										
7. T1 Goal commitment	5.84	.89	.34**	.04	.14	.01	.17	09	(.79)									
8. T2 Goal commitment	5.48	.94	.29*	.39***	.13	.27*	.17	.42***	.46***	(.75)								
9. T1 Team confidence	5.27	.84	.48***	.49***	.46***	.46***	.23*	.20	.09	.18	(.84)							
10. T2 Team confidence	5.17	.89	.44***	.69***	.39**	.56***	.02	.18	.08	.25*	.60***	(.85)						
11. T1 Burnout	2.77	.94	29**	30**	24*	24*	54***	32**	33**	39**	28**	19	(.90)					
12. T2 Burnout	2.90	1.10	28*	32**	21	26*	26*	50***	28*	52***	17	21	.63***	(.93)				
13. T1 Self assessed health	5.18	1.02	.05	.02	02	03	.40***	.07	$.22^{*}$.11	.18	01	51***	40***	(.71)			
14. T2 Self assessed health	5.31	.97	.36**	.37**	.23*	.40***	.28*	.44***	.28*	.20	.21	.28**	35**	50***	.51***	(.79)		
15. T1 Performance	6.74	1.56	.26*	.22	.34**	$.28^{*}$.20	.24*	10	.16	.45***	.22	12	22	09	07	0	
16. T2 Performance	7.09	1.88	.14	.13	12	.01	.19	.24	.07	.35**	.22	12	23	12	02	.04	.22	0

p < 0.05; p < 0.01; p < 0.01; p < 0.001

° as 'Performance' was a single-item question, no Cronbach's alpha could be calculated

424

This is an accepted manuscript of an article published by Elsevier in Journal of Science and Medicine in Sport, available online at https://www.jsams.org/article/S1440-2440(19)30777-7/fulltext. It is not the copy of record. Copyright © 2020, Elsevier.

- 425 *Table 2*
- 426 The results of the multilevel regression modeling, including time as a level 1-predictor, condition as a level
- 427 2-predictor, and a level 3 random intercept. The table displays interaction effects between the two
- 428 conditions.
- 429

Interv	rention	Compa	rison	Interaction	Standard	
conc	lition	condi	tion	effect (β)	error (SE)	
M (SD)	M (SD)	M (SD)	M(SD)			
(T1)	(T2)	(T1)	(T2)			
5.64 (.64)	5.96 (.62)	5.25 (.73)	5.11 (.79)) .50**	.17	
5.75 (.77)	6.21 (.61)	5.17 (.74)	4.83 (.88)) .76***	.15	
6.64 (.58)	6.71 (.49)	6.40 (.83)	5.98 (1.00)) .59**	.19	
5.80 (.80)	5.74 (.85)	5.88 (.97)	5.22 (.96)) .65**	.20	
5.51 (.65)	5.42 (.86)	5.03 (.95)	4.93 (.87)) .02	.18	
2.60 (.91)	2.62 (1.11)	2.93 (.95)	3.18 (1.02	2) .31	.20	
5.12 (1.20)	5.49 (.95)	5.25 (.81)	5.12 (.97)) .62**	.30	
7.32 (.83)	7.78 (1.34)	6.17 (1.89)	6.43 (2.09	9) .00	.39	
	M (SD) (T1) 5.64 (.64) 5.75 (.77) 6.64 (.58) 5.80 (.80) 5.51 (.65) 2.60 (.91) 5.12 (1.20) 7.32 (.83)	Intervention condition M (SD) (T1) M (SD) (T2) 5.64 (.64) 5.96 (.62) 5.75 (.77) 6.21 (.61) 6.64 (.58) 6.71 (.49) 5.80 (.80) 5.74 (.85) 5.51 (.65) 5.42 (.86) 2.60 (.91) 2.62 (1.11) 5.12 (1.20) 5.49 (.95) 7.32 (.83) 7.78 (1.34)	InterventionComparison $condition$ $condition$ $M (SD)$ $M (SD)$ $(T1)$ $(T2)$ $5.64 (.64)$ $5.96 (.62)$ $5.75 (.77)$ $6.21 (.61)$ $5.75 (.77)$ $6.21 (.61)$ $5.75 (.77)$ $6.21 (.61)$ $5.75 (.77)$ $6.21 (.61)$ $5.75 (.77)$ $6.21 (.61)$ $5.17 (.74)$ $6.64 (.58)$ $6.71 (.49)$ $6.40 (.83)$ $5.80 (.80)$ $5.74 (.85)$ $5.88 (.97)$ $5.51 (.65)$ $5.42 (.86)$ $5.03 (.95)$ $2.60 (.91)$ $2.62 (1.11)$ $2.93 (.95)$ $5.12 (1.20)$ $5.49 (.95)$ $5.25 (.81)$ $7.32 (.83)$ $7.78 (1.34)$ $6.17 (1.89)$	InterventionComparisonconditioncondition M (SD) M (SD) M (SD)(T1)(T2)(T1)5.64 (.64)5.96 (.62)5.25 (.73)5.75 (.77)6.21 (.61)5.17 (.74)4.83 (.88)6.64 (.58)6.71 (.49)6.40 (.83)5.98 (1.00)5.80 (.80)5.74 (.85)5.81 (.65)5.42 (.86)5.03 (.95)4.93 (.87)2.60 (.91)2.62 (1.11)2.93 (.95)3.18 (1.02)7.32 (.83)7.78 (1.34)6.17 (1.89)6.43 (2.09)	Intervention conditionComparison conditionInteraction effect (β) M (SD) 	

p < 0.05; p < 0.01; p < 0.01; p < 0.001430

431

432	Figure legend
433	Figure 1 - The identity leadership of leaders within the team, for both conditions, revealing a significant
434	interaction effect between the 5R ^s condition and the comparison condition ($\beta = .50$, SE = .17 p < 0.01).
435	
436	

- 437 Figure 1
- 438 Perceived identity leadership of athletes within the team, revealing a significant interaction effect between
- 439 the 5R^s intervention condition and the comparison condition ($\beta = .50$, SE = .17, p < 0.01).

