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**Abstract**

The present research examined the link between passion displayed by team members during the singing of national anthems at UEFA Euro 2016 and team performance in the tournaments’ 51 games. Drawing on social identity theorising, we hypothesised a positive relationship between passion and performance. Consistent with this hypothesis, results showed that teams that sang national anthems with greater passion went on to concede fewer goals. Moreover, results provided evidence that the impact of passion on the likelihood of winning a game depended on the stage of the competition: in the knockout stage (but not the group stage) greater passion was associated with a greater likelihood of victory. Extending recent reviews that highlight the importance of social identity processes in sporting contexts, these results suggest that team members’ identity-based expression of passion for the collective can be an important predictor of subsequent performance.
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**Singing it for “us”: Team passion displayed during national anthems is associated with subsequent success**

*England manager Roy Hodgson observes that it is common for players to show pride at representing their country by singing the national anthem. "You very rarely play against opponents and they haven't got their hands on their hearts and singing their anthem as loud as they can," said Hodgson* (BBC News, 2014).

National anthems have historically been used to create, re-enforce, and evolve national identities — specifically, by creating societal bonds, reinforcing loyalty among the citizenry, and motivating patriotic action (Celuro, 1993). One of the chief contexts in which anthems are encountered in contemporary societies is international sporting competitions. In these, team games are routinely preceded by the teams and supporters having the opportunity to sing their national anthem — something that they do with varying degrees of gusto. Yet, is the singing of national anthems an activity that team members do just out of obligation, or is it, in fact, an activity that has relevance to the events that follow? In particular, to what extent is a team’s passion associated with their subsequent performance? These are the questions that the present paper examines.

To date the research literature offers little insight into the influence of people’s relationship to, and use of, national anthems in sport. Away from sport, however, scholars have shown that singing — including the singing of national anthems — has important psychological and social consequences. At a group level, evidence suggests that compared to people who participate in other group activities, those who participate in group singing are more cooperative on a subsequent task (Good & Russo, 2016). Moreover, evidence indicates that group singing makes emotional experiences more positive (Dingle, Williams, Jetten, & Welch, 2017) and leads to greater experienced connectedness/belonging (Brisola & Cury, 2015; Dingle, Brander, Ballantyne, & Baker, 2013). It thus appears that, especially when it is done in a group, singing has a range of important positive psychological consequences for teams and their members that may have downstream effects on collaboration and performance.

Beyond the general benefits of singing together, teams are also likely to derive benefits from singing national anthems. Here research indicates that leaders use anthems (in addition to other symbols such as flags) to bring their country together and legitimate their own authority (see Mead, 1980). Further, Celuro (1995) asserts that national anthems are an important strand of a nation’s symbols, rituals, and traditions because they define a nation’s identity. At the same time, national identity is displayed in its national anthem. National anthems are seen to emphasize heritage and national values, and to distinguish nations from one another, thereby reaffirming identity boundaries (Celuro, 1993). It is this relevance of national anthems for the expression of identity that is the theoretical focus of this study. We use a social identity perspective to examine the effect of players’ (more or less) passionate behaviour during national anthems on performance at the UEFA Euro 2016 football tournament.

**The Social Identity Approach**

The social identity approach encompasses two social psychological theories: social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and self-categorisation theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). Formally, *social identity* refers to an “individual’s knowledge that he [or she] belongs to certain social groups together with some emotional value and significance to him [or her] of this group membership” (Tajfel, 1972, p. 292). In these terms, social identity is the part of a person’s self-concept associated with an *internalised* group membership such that their sense of self (who they think they are) is defined in terms of “we” and “us”. In sporting contexts this may manifest itself in people's understanding of themselves as members of a particular team (e.g., “us German players”).

As Turner (1982) pointed out, social identity can be distinguished from the notion of *personal identity* which refers to self-definition in terms of unique attributes (where the self is understood as “I” and “me”). Self-categorisation theory asserts that when, and to the extent that, an individual defines themselves (i.e., self-categorises) as “we” and “us” (i.e., such that they socially *identify* with a given group), they will see the world from the perspective of that group — so that it is a basis for both value and meaning.

Consistent with this idea, high levels of group identification have generally been found to be associated with greater commitment to, and investment in, group activities (for reviews see Ellemers, de Gilder, & Haslam, 2004; Haslam, 2004). For example, Mael and Ashforth (1992) found that alumni of a religious college were more likely to contribute funds to the college, to attend college functions, and to send their children there to the extent that they identified highly with it. Likewise, in work contexts, van Knippenberg and van Schie (2000) found that individuals’ identification with their workgroup was a strong predictor of a range of work-related variables, including job satisfaction, job involvement, and intention to continue working for the organisation. And studies of German schoolteachers by Christ, van Dick, Wagner, and Stellmacher (2003) showed that the teachers’ identification with relevant collectives (e.g., their profession, school, or department) was the key predictor of their willingness to ‘go the extra mile’ through acts of organisational citizenship that underpinned future success (e.g., attending conferences, helping colleagues in need; for meta-analytic evidence, see Lee, Park, & Koo, 2015; Ng, 2015).

Turning to the field of sport, here too it is likely that group identification is a determinant of group-based commitment — and, through this, performance (for reviews, see Rees, Haslam, Coffee, & Lavallee, 2015; Slater, Coffee, Barker, & Evans, 2014). In particular, the extent to which people invest in a given sporting collective and with its associated activities should be contingent on how strongly they identify with that collective. Suggestive of this pathway, an analysis of leaders’ media communication at the London 2012 Olympic Games observed that leaders of successful teams (i.e., those that won more medals) were more likely to project a sense of shared values and vision that served to communicate and build a sense of shared identity (Slater, Barker, Coffee, & Jones, 2015). Although Slater and colleagues’ study did not examine the direct impact of these efforts, it is likely that these also served to enhance team performance. Indeed, more direct evidence of the link between identification and performance comes from programmatic research by Fransen and colleagues (2015; 2016) which has found that when a leader inspires confidence in team players this serves to increase their team identification and, through this, their performance on a relevant sporting activity (e.g., a football dribbling task). Social identity theorising, and the evidence that supports it, thus suggests that a team with a strong (vs. weak) sense of shared identity is likely to show greater collective effort and performance. In the current study, we estimate the level of displayed passion by athletes during the singing of their national anthem as an observational indicator of passion. Turning to the passion literature provides further support for our assertions.

**Passion**

The Dualistic Model of Passion defines passion as a strong inclination towards an activity that is important, liked (even loved), and in which an individual invests a significant amount of time and energy (Vallerand, 2015; Vallerand et al., 2003). Two types of passion are differentiated by the process through which the activity is internalised as part of the self. First, harmonious passion (HP) results from an autonomous internalisation of the activity into an individual’s identity (e.g., via genuine love). Second, obsessive passion (OP) results from a controlled internalisation of the activity into an individual’s identity (e.g., via extrinsic benefits). Broadly, evidence indicates that compared to OP, HP is associated with more adaptive psychological, behavioural, and performance outcomes (see Curran, Hill, Appleton, Vallerand, & Standage, 2015). For instance, HP facilitates, whereas OP is either unrelated or undermines, flow (Vallerand et al., 2003), basic need satisfaction (Verner-Filion, Vallerand, Amiot, & Mocanu, 2017), and adaptive goal orientations (Vallerand et al., 2008).

In performance terms, there is growing evidence that both HP and OP contribute positively to performance attainment through deliberate practice via two distinguishable pathways (Vallerand et al., 2007; 2008; Verner-Filion et al., 2017). In short, HP leads to performance excellence through an optimal motivational pathway (e.g., approach goals) whereas OP may lead to performance excellence through a sub-optimal motivational pathway (e.g., approach and avoidance goals). Our study extends understanding by examining the associations between observable team-based passion and objective team performance in international athletes.

To date, researchers have yielded valid and reliable data using self-report measures of passion (e.g., by using The Passion Scale; Vallerand et al., 2003). In addition to self-report measures, there are also other observational methods that allow researchers to estimate passion. Drawing from studies in the social identity paradigm, the use of observational estimation has been used when continued access to participants is impractical. For example, the BBC Prison Study (Reicher & Haslam 2006) created an environment of inequality that resembled a prison and a core element of this study was the observation of the participants’ behaviour (e.g., verbal interactions and body language) as an indicator of, amongst other things, levels of social identification and depression. In addition, it is also noteworthy that while self-report measures of passion capture the internal, experienced dimension of passion, observational measures of passion capture the external (performative), communicative dimensions of passion. Informed by these observational methods and to build on previous studies of passion, we estimate the level of passion displayed by athletes during the singing of their national anthem prior to an international game.

**The Current Study**

In the present research we explore the hypothesis that passion for the group and its symbols — in this case national anthems — can play an important role in team performance. There are at least two important reasons why this is likely to be the case. First, athletes’ displayed passion is likely to be an indicator of their own degree of identification with, and love for, their team. That is, team members will only feel passionate about a team when they also derive a sense of satisfaction from being a member of it and see it as an important part of who they are (see also Leach et al., 2008). Further, if an individual feels passionate about an activity then that activity is likely to be central to their identity, and, then, its likely to be associated with adaptive psychological, behavioural, and performance outcomes. Second, passion is also likely to have a communicative function in signaling to others (i.e., fellow team members, the audience, and their opponents) that they are motivated to stand up for the group, and to champion its interests. Both of these factors should have positive implications for team performance.

The present study seeks to address this hypothesis by examining the link between collective passion displayed during the singing of national anthems and team performance in UEFA Euro 2016. The design and purpose of this study was twofold. First, wesought to explore the associations between athletes’ displays of passion and team performance (goals scored, goals conceded, and game outcome). Here we hypothesised that passion would be positively correlated with goals scored (H1a), negatively correlated with goals conceded (H1b), and that teams who displayed more passion would be more likely to win (H1c). Second, we sought to examine whether stage of competition (group vs. knockout stage) moderated the relationships between passion and performance. Here we anticipated that in the knockout stage of a competition — when “push comes to shove” and a team needs to be at its very best in order to succeed — passion will matter most for performance. We thus hypothesised that as game importance increased (i.e., in the knockout stage) so to would the strength of the relationships between passion and goals scored (H2a), goals conceded (H2b), and game outcome (H2c).

**Method**

**Sample**

The UEFA European Championship is a quadrennial international football tournament of the best football teams in Europe as established by a pre-qualifying tournament. Euro 2016 involved 24 teams who competed in 51 matches (36 group stage; 15 knockout stage) from the 10th June to 10th July 2016. As there were two anthems per game, our analyses are based on 102 national anthems.

**Measures and Procedure**

Following institutional ethical approval, footage of teams singing national anthems immediately before kick-off were accessed through BBC (www.bbc.co.uk) and ITV (www.itv.com) websites, which provided official sources for media coverage of Euro 2016 in the United Kingdom.

**Passion**. Two independent observers were provided with a definition of passion as “a strong inclination toward an activity that people like [or even love], that they find important, and in which they invest time and energy” (Vallerand et al., 2003, p. 757) and asked to rate each team’s passion during the singing of their national anthem on a scale from 1 (*very low*) to 7 (*very high*). The observers considered: (1) *verbal* indicators including whether, and to what extent, each athlete engaged in singing (e.g., greater intensity indicates greater passion); and (2) *non-verbal* indicators including the athletes’ facial expression (e.g., the level of focus on athletes’ faces) and body language (e.g., how closely the athletes stood together, the extent to which they put their arms around one another). The observers were sport psychology postgraduates and there was a high degree of correspondence in their ratings (*r* = .88, *p* < .001). In cases where there was a difference of one point, raters’ scores were averaged to create a single score for each team’s anthem. In cases where there was a difference of two or more scale points (*N* = 6 cases; 5.88%) discrepancies were resolved by discussion.

**Stage of competition.** The stage of the competition (group stage vs. knockout stage) was recorded. As knockout games cannot end in a draw, matches were only won or lost in the knockout stage. Overall, there were 72 games (win/loss *n* = 25 each; draw *n* = 22) in the group stage and 30 games (win/loss *n* = 15) in the knockout stage.

**Goals scored, goals conceded, and game outcome.** The number of goals scored and conceded by each team were recorded, together with the outcome of each game (loss, draw, or win).

**Results**

**Main Analysis**

Table 1 presents means, standard deviations (*SD*s), and zero-order correlations between variables. To test our hypotheses, we ran a series of regressions. For ease of interpretability, we *Z*-standardised our independent variable passion in all subsequent analyses. To test our main hypothesis (H1), we ran a series of linear regressions for the analysis of the continuous dependent variables (a) goals scored and (b) goals conceded and then a logistic regression for the analysis of the ordinal dependent variable (c) game outcome (loss, draw, win coded as –1, 0, and +1). In order to test our secondary hypothesis (H2; moderation by stage of competition), we ran a series of step-wise hierarchical regressions by entering the *Z*-standardised variable passion at Step 1, stage of competition at Step 2, and then additionally the interaction term between passion and stage of competition at Step 3. Results are presented in Tables 2 and 3.

**Goals scored.** As shown in Table 2, a linear regression revealed no evidence of a relationship between passion and goals scored, *b* = .05, 95%CIs [–.16, .25], *SE* = .10, *R*2Model = .002, Δ*R*2 = .002, providing no support for H1a. To test H2a, we conducted a step-wise regression by entering stage of competition at Step 2, and the interaction term between passion and stage of competition as Step 3. Results indicated a non-significant main effect for stage of competition at Step 2, *b* = .15, 95%CIs [–.05, .36], *SE* = .11, *R*2Model = .023, Δ*R*2 = .021, and a non-significant interaction between passion and stage of competition at Step 3, *b* = .14, 95%CIs [–.06, .33], *SE* = .15, *R*2Model = .042, Δ*R*2 = .019, providing no support for H2a.

**Goals conceded.** Analysis yielded a significant negative relationship between passion and goals conceded, *b* = –.21, 95%CIs [–.41, –.01], *SE* = .10, *R*2Model = .042, Δ*R*2 = .042, supporting H1b. Entering stage of competition at Step 2 revealed a significant main effect for stage of competition, *b* = .21, 95%CIs [.01, .41], *SE* = .10, *R*2Model = .080, Δ*R*2 = .038 (indicating that teams conceded more goals during the knockout stage). Finally, adding the interaction term at Step 3, yielded a non-significant interaction between passion and stage of competition, *b* = –.15, 95%CIs [–.34, .03], *SE* = .10, *R*2Model = .103, Δ*R*2 = .024, providing no support for H2b.

**Game outcome.** As shown in Table 3, an ordinal logistic regression indicated no direct relationship between passion and game outcome, *b* = .32, 95%CIs [–.06, .69], *SE* = .19, Nagelkerke’s *R*2N = .03, providing no support for H1c. Entering stage of competition and the interaction term revealed a non-significant main effect for stage of competition, *b* = .14, 95%CIs [–.68, .95], *SE* = .42, Nagelkerke’s *R*2N = .03. However, it also revealed a significant interaction between passion and stage of competition, *b* = –.83, 95%CIs [–1.65, –.01], *SE* = .42, Nagelkerke’s *R*2N = .07, providing support for H2c. To decompose the interaction, we calculated logits for low to high passion in the group and knockout stages respectively. As presented in Figure 1, results indicated that the likelihood of winning in the group stage did not increase substantially with increasing levels of passion: the logit at low passion of 1 was 2.42, while at high passion of 7, it was 2.61. However, there was a significant relationship between passion and performance in the knockout stage: the logit for game outcome was .58 at low passion (i.e., 1), but then increased to 4.08 at high passion (i.e., 7).

**Sensitivity Analysis**

We conducted additional analyses in order to test the robustness of the results. This involved conducting the same analysis without extreme cases (+/– 3SD). We removed the result of the France–Iceland game which France won 5–2. These exclusions did not substantially change the pattern of results for goals scored (Step 1: *b* = -.01, 95%CIs [–.20, .18], *SE* = .10, *R*2Model = .000, Δ*R*2 = .000; Step 2: *b* = -.03, 95%CIs [–.22, .17], *SE* = .10, *R*2Model = .011, Δ*R*2 = .011; Step: 3 *b* = .09, 95%CIs [–.09, .27], *SE* = .09, *R*2Model = .021, Δ*R*2 = .009), or goals conceded (Step 1: *b* = –.17, 95%CIs [–.35, .02], *SE* = .10, *R*2Model = .030, Δ*R*2 = .030; Step 2: *b* = .14, 95%CIs [–.05, .33], *SE* = .10, *R*2Model = .050, Δ*R*2 = .020; Step 3: *b* = –.10, 95%CIs [–.27, .08], *SE* = .09, *R*2Model = .061, Δ*R*2 = .011).

**Discussion**

This study sought to test the hypothesis that the passion a football team displayed during singing of its national anthem would be a positive predictor of goals scored and game outcome (H1a, H1c) and a negative predictor of goals conceded (H1b). We also hypothesised that these patterns would be more pronounced in the knockout stages of a tournament (H2). Consistent with H1b, analysis indicated that teams that sang their anthems more passionately conceded fewer goals. However, there was no evidence that passion was related to goals scored (H1a) or game outcome (H1c). There was also no evidence that the relationship between passion and goals scored (H2a) or goals conceded (H2b) was moderated by stage of the competition. Nevertheless, there was evidence that the relationship between passion and game outcome varied as a function of the stage of competition. Specifically, in line with H2c, the amount of passion that teams displayed during the singing of national anthems predicted a greater likelihood of winning in the knockout, but not the group, stage.

The present study is the first to examine — and find evidence of — the relationship between identity-based passion (as indicated by passionate national anthem singing) and team performance in top-flight sporting competitions. In doing so its findings substantiate the thrust of recent reviews that highlight the significance of social identity processes in sporting contexts (Rees et al., 2015; Slater et al., 2014). Our proposition that a passionate rendition of one’s national anthem is likely to be related to better team performance was based on two lines of evidence and underlying processes. First, that a team that displays greater passion has a stronger sense of social identity, and that this is likely to feed positively into their collective effort and performance (Fransen et al., 2015; 2016). Second, that being passionate towards an activity is positively associated with adaptive psychological, behavioural, and performance outcomes for that team (see Curran et al., 2015). Supporting these claims, results indicated that team’s passionate renditions of their national anthem before a game were associated with them conceding fewer goals during the game that followed. Accordingly, greater passion may manifest itself more in defensive than attacking play because, for example, it is in defense that players’ passion is more likely to take the form of “putting one’s body on the line”. A third process that may explain why the opponents scored fewer goals could be through effects *on* the opposing team. To illustrate, passionate renditions of one’s national anthem signals a sense of team unity that may have intimidated the opposition who then experienced performance decrements (i.e., were less likely to score). It is widely speculated, for example, that this social identity dynamic is central to the impact of New Zealand rugby players’ haka (Jackson & Hokowhitu, 2002).

Speaking further to these issues, our study provides evidence that a greater likelihood of victory was associated with greater passion during national anthems in the knockout (not the group) stage of competition. These results align with evidence that high levels of group identification are central for group performance under conditions where performance is most important for the group (e.g., see Ellemers et al., 2004; Haslam, 2004). Clearly, as a tournament progresses into its knockout stage the stakes are higher, and at this point success (or failure) will have greater implications for the group. It is at this point, then, that teams are most dependent on their members demonstrating a willingness to put themselves on the line for the group. Here too, by using a novel observational estimation of passion, our findings advance the passion literature (e.g., Verner-Filion et al., 2017) by showing that passionate renditions of national anthems are associated with greater likelihood of victory in the most important international matches.

The existing literature on national anthems also helps us to make sense of this finding. Cerulo (1995) observed that highly focussed and cohesive teams have core symbols or rituals that reflect a “symbolic shorthand” (p. 100). These ensure — and serve to communicate — that core meaning(s) of the group are “in the forefront of the collective’s attention” (p. 100). In-line with the observations of Roy Hodgson with which we opened this article, teams with a strong sense of shared identity may thus embrace national anthems as a representation of their team’s (and their country’s) identity and this in turn may be a catalyst for more passionate performance for “us” and performance decrements for “them” (see also van Dick & Schuh, 2010). In other words, displaying passion in this way is likely to both reflect and foster a sense of shared identity, and, as other evidence suggests, this can have profound implications for performance (e.g., Fransen et al., 2015; 2016).

**Limitations and Future Research**

This study is not without limitations. First, it must be underscored that we observed passion but did not measure team members’ experience of passion or social identification. In future research, it would therefore be worthwhile trying to tap these constructs as experienced by athletes and to conduct longitudinal, cross-lagged studies that afford examination of the extent to which passion is a driver and/or consequence of social identification, as well as their combined impact on performance. Moreover, self-report measures of passion would have distinguished between harmonious and obsessive passion, which have been found to have “two roads to performance” (e.g., Verner-Fillion et al., 2017). It would therefore be valuable in future work to disentangle these different forms of passion and examine their potentially distinct relationships with team performance. In this regard too, a second limitation is that we were not able to augment third-party measures of observed passion from players themselves (e.g., from physiological data). Certainly, it can be useful to complement observational data with measures of this form and this should be a goal for future research. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that studies that have combined observational, self-report, and physiological measures of social identity-related processes have reported a high correlation between them (Reicher & Haslam, 2006).

A third limitation is that performance was only assessed in terms of game outcome (loss, draw, or win). Although victory is often cited as the ultimate aim of elite sport, there would be value in obtaining other more nuanced measures (e.g., pass completion) that would provide insights into more subtle aspects of team performance. Finally, our study was observational (and hence correlational) rather than experimental, and therefore we are not in a position to make definitive statements about cause and effect. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that the findings here align closely with those of experimental research that has established a causal link between manipulated team identification and performance (Fransen et al., 2015; 2016). A weakness of that research, though, was that the researchers could not be sure that the processes they examined ‘scaled up’ to high-stakes elite sporting competition. In this regard, the key contribution of the present research is that it allows us to be more confident that they do.

**Implications and Conclusion**

The finding that, broadly speaking, greater displayed passion has positive implications for team performance in important games has practical implications. Nevertheless, we caution against over-simplified inferences here — for example, that, in order to win more matches, coaches should simply instruct their players to display more passion during national anthems. For our point is that it is what identity-based passion *represents psychologically* (i.e., identification with, and enthusiasm for, the group) that is of utmost importance. If players are genuinely passionate because they identify strongly with their nation and its team, this is likely to have positive ramifications but if they only show passion because they have been instructed to do so then this is unlikely to be a recipe for success. In short, you do not just have to sing like you mean it, you actually have to mean it.

This point is similar to one made by Steffens and Haslam (2013) in their examination of successful and unsuccessful Prime Ministerial campaign speeches. In this, the authors analysed candidates’ use of personal (e.g., “I”) and collective (e.g., “we”) pronouns and found that successful leaders (i.e., those who went on to win the election) used collective language more often than unsuccessful counterparts. The implication, though, is not that in order to succeed leaders should be liberal in their references to “we” and “us”, but rather that their success is dependent on the extent to which they engage with, and aim to speak on behalf of, a collective identity (one consequence of which is that they are likely to use more collective pronouns). Likewise, the core implication of our findings is that there is value in activities that help to develop and promote a sense of shared social identification — and that this should be a focus for both theory and practice in sport (e.g., as suggested by Rees et al., 2015; Slater et al., 2014).

**References**

BBC News (2014). World Cup 2014: England players told to sing anthem. Retrieved from <http://www.bbc.co.uk/sport/football/27658211> on 6th August, 2016.

Brisola, E. B. V., & Cury, V. E. (2015). Singing your troubles away: The experience of singing from a psychological standpoint – contributions from a heuristic research. *The Humanistic Psychologist, 43,* 396-408. doi: 10.1080/08873267.2015.1047934

Celuro, K. A. (1993). Symbols and the world system: National anthems and flags. *Sociological Forum, 8*, 243-271.

Cerulo, K. A. (1995). *Identity designs: The sights and sounds of a nation*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.

Christ, O., Van Dick, R., Wagner, U., & Stellmacher, J. (2003). When teachers go the extra- mile: Foci of organizational identification as determinants of different forms of organizational citizenship behavior among schoolteachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *73*, 329- 341.

Curran, T., Hill, A. P., Appleton, P. R., Vallerand, R. J., & Standage, M. (2015). The psychology of passion: A meta-analytical review of a decade of research on intrapersonal outcomes. *Motivation and Emotion, 39*, 631-655. http://doi.org/ 10.1007/s11031-015-9503-0.

Dingle, G. A., Brander, C., Ballantyne, J., & Baker, F. A. (2013). ‘To be heard’: The social and mental health benefits of choir singing for disadvantaged adults. *Psychology of Music*, *41*(4), 405-421.

Dingle, G. A., Williams, E., Jetten, J., & Welch, J. (2017). Choir singing and creative writing enhance emotion regulation in adults with chronic mental health conditions. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *56*(4), 443-457.

Ellemers, N., De Gilder, D., & Haslam, S. A. (2004). Motivating individuals and groups at work: A social identity perspective on leadership and group performance. *Academy of Management Review*, *29*, 459-478.

Fransen, K., Haslam, S. A., Steffens, N. K., Vanbeselaere, N., De Cuyper, B., & Boen, F. (2015). Believing in ‘us’: Exploring leaders’ capacity to enhance team confidence and performance by building a sense of shared social identity. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied*, *121*, 89-100.doi: 10.1037/xap0000033.

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.

Good, A., & Russo, F. A. (2016). Singing promotes cooperation in a diverse group of children. *Social Psychology, 47*(6), 340-344. doi: 10.1027/1864-9335/a000282

Haslam, S. A. (2004). *Psychology in organizations: The social identity approach*. (2nd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Jackson, S. J., & Hokowhitu, B. (2002). Sport, tribes, and technology: The New Zealand All Blacks haka and the politics of identity. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, *26*(2), 125-139.

Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M. L. W., Pennekamp, S. F., Doosje, B., Ouwerkerk, J. W., & Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-investment: A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(1), 144–165. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.144

Lee, E. S., Park, T. Y., & Koo, B. (2015). Identifying organizational identification as a basis for attitudes and behaviors: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 141*, 1049-1080. doi: 10.1037/bul0000012.

Mael, F. A., & Ashforth, B. E. 1992. Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 13: 103-123. doi:10.1002/job.4030130202.

Mead, R. (1980). The national anthem. In S. Sadie (Ed.), *The new grove dictionary of music and musicians* (pp.46-75). London: Macmillan.

Ng, T. W. (2015). The incremental validity of organizational commitment, organizational trust, and organizational identification. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, *88*, 154-163. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2015.03.003.

Rees, T., Haslam, S. A., Coffee, P., & Lavallee, 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

Slater, M. J., Barker, J. B., Coffee, P., & Jones, M. V. (2015). Leading for Gold: Social identity leadership processes at the London 2012 Olympic Games. *Qualitative Research in Sport, Exercise, and Health, 7*, 192-209. doi:10.1080/2159676X.2014.936030

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*, 672-685. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14623943.2014.944126>.

Steffens, N. K., & Haslam, S. A. (2013). Power through ‘Us’: Leaders’ use of we-referencing language predicts election victory. *PLoS ONE, 8*, e77952: doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0077952.

Tajfel, H. (1972). Social categorisation. English manuscript of “La categorisation sociale”. In S. Moscovici (Ed.), *Introduction à la Psychologie Sociale* (Vol. 1, pp. 272-302). Paris: Larosse.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *The psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33-47). Monterey, CA: Brooks-Cole.

Turner, J. C. (1975). Social comparison and social identity: Some prospects for intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *5*, 5-34.

Turner, J. C. (1982). Towards a cognitive redefinition of the social group. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations* (pp. 15-40). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorisation theory*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Vallerand, R. J. (2015). *The psychology of passion: A dualistic model*. New York: Oxford.

Vallerand, R. J., Mageau, G., Ratelle, C., Léonard, M., Blanchard, C., Koestner, R., & Marsolais, J. (2003). Les Passions de l’Âme: On obsessive and harmonious passion. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85*, 756–767. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.85.4.756.

Vallerand, R. J., Mageau, G. A., Elliot, A. J., Dumais, A., Demers, M.-A., & Rousseau, F. L. (2008). Passion and performance attainment in sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 9,* 373-392. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2007.05.003.

Vallerand, R. J., Salvy, S.-J., Mageau, G. A., Elliot, A. J., Denis, P. L., Grouzet, F. M. E., et al. (2007). On the role of passion in performance. *Journal of Personality, 75*, 505-533. http://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2007.00447.x.

van Dick, R., & Schuh, S. C. (2010). My boss' group is my group: Experimental evidence for the leader-follower identity transfer. *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, *31*, 551-563. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/01437731011070032.

van Knippenberg, D., & van Schie, E. C. M. (2000). Foci and correlates of organizational identification. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology,* *73*, 137-147. doi: 10.1348/096317900166949.

Verner-Filion, J., Vallerand, R. J., Amiot, C. E., & Mocanu, I. (2017). The two roads from passion to sport performance and psychological well-being: The mediating role of need satisfaction, deliberate practice, and achievement goals. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 30*(1), 19-29. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2017.01.009

Figure 1.

Predicted logits for each passion and stage of competition combination from the passion X stage of competition interaction.

Table 1.

Descriptive statistics and Pearson’s correlation coefficients for passion, goals scored, and goals conceded.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Variable* | Mean (± SD) | 1 | 2 |
|  | Group | Knockout |  |  |
| 1. Passion | 3.63 ± 1.33 | 4.27 ± 1.80 |  |  |
| 2. Goals scored | .96 ± .93 | 1.30 ± 1.24 | .03 |  |
| 3. Goals conceded | .96 ± .93 | 1.30 ± 1.24 | -.20\* | -.16 |

*Note*. \* *p* < .05.

Table 2.

Hierarchical regression analyses for passion predicting team success (goals scored and goals conceded).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Step 1 | Step 2 | Step 3 |
| Variable | *b* | 95% CIs | *SE* | *ß* | *t* | *b* | 95% CIs | *SE* | *ß* | *t* | *b* | 95% CIs | *SE* | *ß* | *t* |
| *Goals Scored* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Passion | .05 | –.16, .25 | .10 | .05 | 0.46 | .02 | –.19, .22 | .11 | .02 | 0.16 | –.01 | –.24, .19 | .11 | –.02 | 0.21 |
| Stage of Competition |  |  |  |  |  | .15 | –.05, .36 | .11 | .15 | 1.46 | .14 | –.07, .35 | .11 | .13 | 1.31 |
| Passion X Stage of Competition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | .14 | –.06, .33 | .10 | .15 | 1.40 |
| *R2* |  |  |  | .00(Δ*R*2=.00) |  |  |  | .02(Δ*R*2=.02) |  |  |  | .04(Δ*R*2=.02) |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *Goals Conceded* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Passion | –.21 | –.41, –.01 | .10 | –.20 | 2.08\* | –.25 | –.45, –.05 | .10 | –.24 | 2.47\* | –.21 | –.41, .01 | .10 | –.20 | 1.98\* |
| Stage of Competition |  |  |  |  |  | .21 | .01, .41 | .10 | .20 | 2.03\* | .22 | .02, .42 | .10 | .22 | 2.20\* |
| Passion X Stage of Competition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.15 | –.34, .03 | .09 | –.16 | 1.61 |
| *R2* |  |  |  | .04\*(Δ*R*2=.04\*) |  |  |  | .08\*(Δ*R*2=.04\*) |  |  |  | .10\*(Δ*R*2=.02) |

*Note.* \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01.

Table 3.

Logistic regression analyses for passion predicting team success (game outcome).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Step 1 | Step 2 | Step 3 |
| *Game Outcome* | *b* | 95% CIs | *SE* | *Wald* | *b* | 95% CIs | *SE* | *Wald* | *b* | 95% CIs | *SE* | *Wald* |
| Passion | .32 | –.06, .69 | .19 | 2.78† | .33 | –.05, .70 | .19 | 2.85† | .88 | .21, 1.54 | .34 | 6.72\*\* |
| Stage of Competition |  |  |  |  | .14 | –.68, .95 | .42 | .10 | .28 | –.60, 1.16 | .45 | .40 |
| Passion X Stage of Competition |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | –.83 | –.1.65, –.01 | .42 | 3.91\* |
| *R2*N |  |  |  | .03† |  |  |  | .03 |  |  |  | .07† |

*Note.* † *p* < .10, \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01; Game outcomes loss, draw, and win coded as –1, 0, and +1, respectively.