Review of: ""Same team, different colours": Examining the association between shared identity and interoperability in multi-agency discussion-based exercises"

Michael J. Platow[1]

1 Australian National University

Review of

"Same team, different colours": Examining the association between shared identity and interoperability in multi-agency discussion-based exercises

This paper presents an interesting mixed-methods analysis of processes outlined in the social identity approach as they pertain to intergroup collective and collaborative efforts among members of pre-existing organizations. Broad support for these processes was obtained. I found this to be an interesting and valuable paper that can contribute to the continuing development of social identity principles and to helping solve pressing practical problems. My comments below are intended as an attempt to engage the authors in an academic discussion rather than identification of insurmountable flaws.

Conceptually, the authors make reference to a 2022 paper that emphasized that "responders will identify with their superordinate group…better if they are able to maintain their sub-group identities." I believe this, and it is consistent with previous social identification work in multiculturalism. Unfortunately, the authors have not developed this point any further, either conceptually in subsequent paragraphs or empirically in their methods or interpretation of qualitative data. Even some reflection on this process in the Discussion would be valuable.

Although a case for social identity processes was well made, a critic may reasonably ask why the processes currently identified are uniquely associated with social identification and not, say, simple interpersonal liking. The social identification questions focused on subjective bonds, which critics of this approach may argue do not uniquely capture the processes of social self-categorization and social identification.

The authors' analysis of common fate (which dates back to at least Campbell, 1958, in developing a subjective sense of groupness) is interesting and valid. But why do the authors focus on common fate as opposed to common purpose? At the same time, the authors seem to equate shared goals (common purpose?) with shared identity. I can see when and how this can happen, but I also can see when it won't. Competing teams, for example, share the goal to beat the other team. Here there is (a type, at least, of) a common goal without a shared identity.

In terms of data analyses, I was wondering whether baseline or post-test social identification would interact with baseline

JESIP to predict the JESIP outcome; or whether the change in social identification from baseline to post-test would serve as an independent or interactive predictor.

The authors rightly conclude that "participants did experience a sense of shared identity during the exercise." But from the data presented, it appears that participants experienced this at baseline, too. What is the implication of this?

Some minor errors:

If I'm reading the document correctly, it appears as if the authors report post-exercise identity as M=5.99 at one place and M=5.90 at another place. If I'm incorrect in this, it would still be valuable to clarify the differences.

The word "data" is plural, so text should be changed throughout from "data was" to "data were."