

1 **Title: Psychological Characteristics of Developing Excellence in elite**
2 **youth football players in English professional academies**

3

4 Running head: PSYCHOLOGICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF DEVELOPING
5 EXCELLENCE IN ELITE YOUTH FOOTBALL

6 Chris Saward^{a*}, John G. Morris^a, Mary E. Nevill^a, Antoinette M.
7 Minniti^b and Caroline Sunderland^a

8 ^aSport, Health and Performance Enhancement (SHAPE) Research Group,
9 Department of Sport Science, School of Science and Technology, Nottingham Trent
10 University, Clifton Lane, Nottingham, UK, NG11 8NS; ^bAmerican Psychological
11 Association, Education Directorate, Washington, DC.

12 *Corresponding Author: Dr Chris Saward. Address: Sport, Health and Performance
13 Enhancement (SHAPE) Research Group, Department of Sport Science, School of
14 Science and Technology, Nottingham Trent University, Clifton Lane, Nottingham,
15 UK, NG11 8NS. Tel: +441158483842. Email: chris.saward@ntu.ac.uk

16

17

18

19

20

21 *Key Words:* psychological characteristics, talent development, youth soccer, football
22 academies

1 **Abstract**

2 This mixed-longitudinal prospective study examined the development of psychological
3 characteristics of developing excellence in relation to the career progression of elite youth
4 football players. In a 20-month period, 111 academy football players aged 11-16 completed
5 the Psychological Characteristics of Developing Excellence Questionnaire (PCDEQ) on 1-5
6 occasions. This combination of single and repeated assessments resulted in a mixed-
7 longitudinal sample of 226 completed PCDEQs. Players were then prospectively tracked,
8 and their scholarship status assessed at follow-up, at age U17. Multilevel modelling revealed
9 that coping with performance and developmental pressures scores increased with age, and
10 that Category 1-2 academy scholars (4.35 ± 0.61) scored higher than Category 3-4 academy
11 scholars (3.99 ± 0.67) and non-scholars (4.02 ± 0.78) ($p < .05$). Evaluating performances and
12 working on weaknesses scores increased with age for Category 1-2 academy scholars (U12-
13 U14 vs. U15-U16 = 5.16 ± 0.48 vs. 5.38 ± 0.45), compared to non-scholars (U12-U14 vs.
14 U15-U16 = 5.11 ± 0.59 vs. 5.03 ± 0.71) ($p < .05$). Imagery use during practice and
15 competition scores decreased with age (U12-U14 vs. U15-U16 = 4.45 ± 0.66 vs. $4.29 \pm$
16 0.70) ($p < .05$). A blend of PCDEs may facilitate optimal career progression. Football
17 academies should develop players' PCDEs, with a particular focus on developing their
18 coping skills and their ability to realistically evaluate performances and work on
19 weaknesses.

20

21

22

23

24

25 *Key Words:* psychological characteristics, talent development, youth soccer, football
26 academies

27 Word Count: 4549

1 **Introduction**

2 Talent development programmes in football aim to increase the likelihood that
3 players progress from academy to senior football (Gledhill, Harwood, & Forsdyke,
4 2017). However, between the 2009/10 and 2017/18 seasons, the percentage of
5 players having grown up in England accounted for around just 40% of minutes
6 played in the English Premier League, indicating a reliance on players developed
7 outside the English academy system (Poli, Ravenel, & Besson, 2019). In response to
8 this, the English Premier League are currently implementing a long-term strategy
9 aimed at promoting a world-leading talent development system, namely, The Elite
10 Player Performance Plan (EPPP) (Premier League, 2011). The EPPP proposes a
11 multidisciplinary approach to developing players with an emphasis on technical,
12 physical, psychological and social elements. This approach is supported by recent
13 research that has suggested that development in football is dependent on various
14 factors (Huijgen, Elferink-Gemser, Lemmink, & Visscher, 2014). However, until
15 recently, there has been less focus on the psychological aspects of development,
16 especially in an English professional football academy context (Gledhill et al., 2017;
17 Murr, Feichtinger, Larkin, O'Connor, & Höner, 2018).

18 In a series of papers, Collins and colleagues (e.g., Abbott & Collins, 2004; Hill,
19 MacNamara & Collins, 2015; MacNamara, Button, & Collins, 2010a, 2010b; MacNamara
20 & Collins, 2011, 2013, 2015) proposed that psychological components underpin a young
21 athlete's capacity to learn and exploit the opportunities available in the environment.
22 MacNamara et al. (2010a, 2010b) conducted retrospective semi-structured interviews
23 with several world-class athletes and their parents. Inductive analyses revealed that, when
24 they were younger, a range of psychological components appeared to support their
25 progression towards excellence. These components are termed psychological

1 characteristics of developing excellence or PCDEs, and include a blend of characteristics,
2 attitudes, behaviours, and psychological skills, such as commitment, imagery, coping with
3 pressure, and actively seeking social support (MacNamara et al., 2010a; MacNamara &
4 Collins, 2011). The use of appropriate PCDEs allowed athletes to optimise development
5 opportunities, adapt to setbacks, and effectively negotiate key transitions encountered
6 during development, thus providing young athletes with the capacities to strive to realise
7 their potential (MacNamara et al., 2010a, 2010b). MacNamara and Collins (2013)
8 provided quantitative support for this proposition by using the Psychological
9 Characteristics of Developing Excellence Questionnaire (PCDEQ) (see methods for
10 details) to compare ‘poor developers’ and ‘good developers’ amongst 192 elite youth
11 athletes (mean age = 15.94) from rugby, hockey, and football. Each participant was
12 classified as a poor or good developer based on their coach’s subjective rating of the
13 athlete’s behaviour in, and attitude towards, their sport. Good developers were superior to
14 poor developers based on their PCDEQ scores, specifically with regards to the support for
15 long-term success given by significant others, coping with performance and
16 developmental pressures, and evaluating performance and working on weaknesses.

17 The PCDE approach also suggests that the use of PCDEs is context-specific, and
18 PCDEs are developed with age as performers progress towards senior excellence
19 (MacNamara et al., 2010b). With regards to the context-specific nature of PCDEs,
20 although MacNamara and Collins (2013) included football players within their sample of
21 team sports athletes, a specific exploration of the role of PCDEs in academy football is
22 required, as this context may differ compared to rugby and hockey for example. Indeed,
23 research into other sports, such as orienteering, has shown limited differences in PCDEQ
24 scores between senior elite performers recalling their developmental years and performers
25 from national elite youth development programmes from Britain and Switzerland

1 (Newton & Holmes, 2017). With regards to the development of PCDEs, MacNamara et
2 al. (2010b) suggested that young athletes develop and refine PCDEs as they progress
3 towards elite senior performance, in response to changing demands and opportunities
4 associated with different stages of development and the macro and micro transitions
5 encountered on the pathway to excellence (see Côté, 1999, for a discussion on stages of
6 development). For example, athletes' commitment, motivation, and determination became
7 especially important in the later stages of career progression, when athletes were
8 advancing to the elite senior standard. However, no research has examined age-related
9 changes in PCDEs in academy football, so such research is warranted to understand how
10 PCDEs develop in elite youth football players, and thus support practitioners in
11 moderating aspects of the development environment to better support players within
12 different age groups.

13 Previous research has considered psychological components of development
14 in elite youth football, from a variety of perspectives, for example in relation to self-
15 regulation (e.g., Toering, Elferink-Gemser, Jordet, & Visscher, 2009), coping skills
16 (e.g., Van Yperen, 2009), and motivation (e.g., Höner & Feichtinger, 2016). It has
17 been argued that each of these components could be considered as PCDEs (Dohme,
18 Backhouse, Piggot, & Morgan), however, the PCDE approach is considered a more
19 appropriate perspective from which to study the psychological components related to
20 talent development in elite youth football for several reasons. Firstly, the PCDE
21 approach provides a more comprehensive examination of psychological components
22 related to talent development, as opposed to considering single components in
23 isolation, e.g., self-regulatory skills are just one of the components considered by the
24 PCDE approach. Secondly, the PCDE approach was purposefully developed to
25 consider psychological components in a talent development context, and is grounded

1 in theoretical (Abbott & Collins, 2004) and empirical evidence (MacNamara et al.
2 2010a, 2010b) in this regard. Thus, the PCDE approach specifically relates to
3 psychological components relevant to the talent development process, as opposed to
4 only in relation to sport performance, for example. For instance, the PCDEQ
5 assesses a young athlete's use of coping skills in relation to developmental pressures
6 as well as sports performance.

7 Nevertheless, previous work not explicitly adopting a PCDE approach has clearly
8 contributed to our understanding of the psychological components related to career
9 progression in football (see Gledhill et al., 2017 and Murr et al., 2018 for reviews). For
10 example, Van Yperen (2009) showed that high levels of goal commitment, appropriate
11 coping strategies, and the seeking of social support were important in determining the
12 career success of 65 professional academy football players aged 14-18. However, Van
13 Yperen (2009) is one of the few studies to adopt a prospective design when examining
14 psychological components related to career progression (see Murr et al., 2018). An issue
15 with most previous work is that it has tended to compare young players of varying
16 standards (e.g., elite vs. sub-elite) cross-sectionally (e.g., Crust, Nesti, & Littlewood,
17 2010, Toering et al., 2009). Such study designs can only provide information on current
18 accomplishments and not future successes. Conversely, a prospective design is able to
19 assess elite youth football players at a younger age and subsequently determine their
20 playing status later in their careers, which allows the psychological components relating
21 to their potential to progress to be examined.

22 Previous research not explicitly adopting the PCDE approach has also contributed
23 to our understanding of how psychological components develop in elite youth football
24 players (e.g., Crust et al., 2010; Feichtinger & Höner, 2015; Reeves, Nicholls, &
25 McKenna, 2009). For example, Reeves et al. (2009) showed differences in the stressors

1 experienced, and coping strategies employed, by early adolescent (12-14 years) versus
2 late adolescent (15-18 years) academy football players. However, once again, such
3 research tends to cross-sectionally compare players of differing ages, and so any within-
4 player changes in psychological components are not accounted for, indicating a need for a
5 more longitudinal approach.

6 Another issue is that talent development studies in football have tended to
7 consider either the relationship between psychological components and future playing
8 standard, or the development of these psychological components, but not both (cf. Zuber
9 Zibung, & Conzelmann, 2015, 2016). The drawback to single-assessment prospective
10 designs, such as that adopted by Van Yperen (2009), is that the psychological components
11 of young football players are only assessed once, at one age group, in this case aged 14-
12 18. Thus, it is assumed that the range and level of psychological components important
13 for career progression are the same for a 14-year-old and an 18-year-old, which may not
14 be the case (MacNamara et al., 2010b). Indeed, it is possible that different developmental
15 patterns relate to varied future accomplishments, yet despite recent calls, this is rarely
16 considered in studies of talent development in football (Murr et al., 2018).

17 Therefore, repeatedly assessing the PCDEs of elite youth football players across
18 age and then prospectively tracking players to determine their future playing standard
19 would allow the examination of how the development of PCDEs are associated with
20 future playing standard. The purpose of the present study was to examine the
21 development of psychological characteristics of developing excellence in relation to the
22 career progression of elite youth football players in English professional academies.

23

24 **Methods**

25 *Participants and design*

1 A total of 111 elite male youth football players aged 11-16, belonging to two
2 Category 2 English professional academies participated in the study. Players were
3 considered elite based on their participation in a world-class talent development
4 system, as prescribed by the EPPP (Swann, Moran, & Piggott, 2015). In a 20-month
5 period between 2012 and 2013, players completed the PCDEQ (MacNamara &
6 Collins, 2011) on 1-5 occasions, (mean \pm SD completed PCDEQs per player: 2.0 \pm
7 1.1). This combination of single and repeated assessments resulted in a mixed-
8 longitudinal sample of 226 completed PCDEQs. Players were then prospectively
9 tracked. A key indicator of career progression in football is whether and where
10 players are offered a full-time 2-year scholarship at a professional academy at U17,
11 as this is considered a crucial step towards becoming a professional player (Holt &
12 Dunn, 2004; Mills, Butt, Maynard, & Harwood, 2012). Therefore, at U17, players'
13 career progression was classified in the following manner: those completing a
14 scholarship at a Category 1-2 academy (considered by EPPP as the most optimal
15 talent development systems) (n=35), those completing a scholarship at a Category 3-
16 4 academy (considered by EPPP as less optimal talent development systems) (n=28),
17 or those not completing a scholarship at a professional academy (n=48). This design
18 allowed for the relationship between age-related changes in PCDEs and eventual
19 scholarship status to be examined.

20 *Instrument*

21 The PCDEQ is designed to assess athletes' use of PCDEs in sport. In developing and
22 validating the PCDEQ, an exploratory factor analysis with a sample of 363 youth
23 athletes revealed a 59-item, 6-factor solution that, post-rotation, explained 42% of
24 the total explained variance (MacNamara & Collins, 2011). The six factors included:
25 imagery use during practice and competition (Factor 2), coping with performance

1 and developmental pressures (Factor 3), ability to organize and engage in quality
2 practice (Factor 4), and evaluating performances and working on weaknesses (Factor
3 5), and two factors (Factor 1: support for long-term success and Factor 6: support
4 from others to compete to my potential) that contained items associated with how
5 significant others promote and reinforce PCDEs. Items consisted of statements such
6 as ‘I am willing to push myself really hard’ (example item from Factor 4, ability to
7 organise and engage in quality practice). For each item, participants were asked to
8 respond on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (very unlike me) to 6 (very like
9 me). The internal consistency of the PCDEQ was shown to be excellent, with a
10 Cronbach alpha of 0.91. Furthermore, the internal consistency of each subscale was
11 shown to be good, with factor Cronbach alpha’s ranging from 0.70-0.87
12 (MacNamara & Collins, 2011). Moreover, in terms of ecological validity, the
13 PCDEQ successfully discriminated between coach-rated ‘poor developers’ and
14 ‘good developers’ amongst 285 elite youth athletes aged 16 (MacNamara & Collins,
15 2013).

16 ***Procedure***

17 Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the Ethical Advisory Committee at
18 [Institution]. Prior to taking part in the study, players and their parents or guardians
19 were provided with a written and verbal summary outlining the purpose, procedures
20 involved, possible risks and benefits, and the voluntary and confidential nature of the
21 research. Written assent was obtained from players and written consent was obtained
22 from parents or guardians.

23 Across a 20-month period, the PCDEQ was administered approximately
24 every 4 months. On each occasion, to aid the understanding of the players, the
25 meaning of some common words within items of the PCDEQ were defined prior to

1 completing the questionnaire. For example, the words ‘imagery, mental practice, and
2 mental rehearsal’ were explained as ‘using all your senses to create or recreate an
3 experience in your mind’. These definitions were posted in large print throughout the
4 room so that players could refer to definitions during the completion of the
5 questionnaire. The questionnaire was conducted in a small group setting (10-15
6 players) under the supervision of two researchers who were also able to support
7 player understanding as appropriate. Players were reminded to complete the
8 questionnaire on their own and be honest when answering questions. Players were
9 reassured that their answers would remain strictly confidential. The questionnaire
10 took between 20 and 30 minutes to complete.

11 *Data analysis*

12 The final mixed-longitudinal sample consisted of 226 completed questionnaires. From the
13 226 completed questionnaires, there were 338 (2.5%) missing responses across all items.
14 Data were considered missing at random and were replaced using single imputation.
15 Missing items were imputed using completed item responses from the same subscale via
16 regression analyses in the software package R (v.3.2.0) (Kabacoff, 2011). The internal
17 consistency of each subscale of the PCDEQ was examined with Cronbach’s alpha, using
18 IBM SPSS (v.24).

19 Due to the hierarchical structure of the data, i.e., PCDEQ completion
20 occasions nested within players, multilevel modelling was used to examine the
21 development of each PCDE factor score (MLwiN v 3.00, Bristol, U.K.). As an
22 extension of standard statistical models such as ANOVA, multilevel modelling does
23 not require the same number of measurement occasions per individual and the
24 temporal spacing of measurements may vary between players (Rasbash, Steele,
25 Browne, & Goldstein, 2017). Hence, this statistical technique is well suited to the

1 current data structure. Multilevel models describe the underlying trends of a
2 particular component in the population (fixed part), and also models the unexplained
3 variation around the mean trend for that component (random part) (Twisk, 2003).

4 Multilevel modelling was used to examine the development of each PCDEQ
5 factor score in turn. For each model, a two-level hierarchical structure was defined,
6 with measurement occasion (level 1) nested within player (level 2). Relevant
7 parameters were systematically added to a baseline model to observe their effect on
8 explaining and partitioning variation in the development of players' PCDE factor
9 score. Parameters were accepted or rejected on the basis of changes in model fit, as
10 indicated by differences in -2 loglikelihood, and the effect of explanatory variables
11 on the outcome variable, as indicated by z-scores. The baseline model included a
12 given PCDEQ factor score as the outcome variable, a fixed intercept, and a fixed age
13 term (centred at 14 years) as a single explanatory variable. From the baseline model,
14 the first model tested was a random intercept model, which involved allowing the
15 intercept to randomly vary to examine variance in the level of PCDEQ factor score
16 between players. The subsequent model tested was a random slope model, which
17 involved allowing the slope for age to randomly vary to examine variance between
18 players' development in the PCDEQ factor score. Next, the fixed effect of
19 scholarship status on the PCDEQ factor score was examined, and finally, the fixed
20 effect of the interaction between age and scholarship status on the PCDEQ factor
21 score was examined. Following each analysis, the assumption that variation in
22 intercepts were normally distributed with an average of zero, was checked (Twisk,
23 2003). Statistical significance was accepted at the 95% confidence level ($p < .05$).
24 Mean (SD) were used to describe the average and variability of data.

25 **Results**

1 The internal consistency for all subscales of the PCDEQ was good, with Cronbach
2 alphas of 0.88, 0.84, 0.78, 0.76, 0.74, and 0.71 for Factors 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6,
3 respectively. The mean (SD) PCDEQ factor scores by age group and scholarship
4 status are displayed in Table 1. Table 2 shows the multilevel models for the
5 development of PCDEs. Modelling indicated that there was no effect of age or
6 eventual scholarship status on scores for support for long-term success (Factor 1),
7 ability to organize and engage in quality practice (Factor 4), and support from others
8 to compete to my potential (Factor 6) ($p > .05$).

9 *****Table 1 here*****

10 Modelling indicated that imagery use during practice and competition (Factor
11 2) scores significantly decreased with age ($p < .05$). The fit of the model was
12 improved by allowing the intercept and the slope of age to randomly vary ($p < .05$).
13 Modelling showed that coping with performance and developmental pressures
14 (Factor 3) scores significantly increased with age ($p < .05$) and that those who went on
15 to scholarships at Category 1-2 academies had significantly higher scores compared
16 to those who went on to scholarships at Category 3-4 academies and those who did
17 not go onto scholarships ($p < .05$). The fit of the model was improved by allowing the
18 intercept and the slope of age to randomly vary ($p < .05$). The model for evaluating
19 performances and working on weaknesses (Factor 5) indicated that age-related
20 changes differed based on eventual scholarship status. That is, scores increased with
21 age for those who went on to scholarships at Category 1-2 academies, compared to
22 those who did not go onto scholarships ($p < .05$). The fit of the model was improved
23 by allowing the intercept to randomly vary ($p < .05$).

24 *****Table 2 here*****

25 Discussion

1 The current mixed-longitudinal prospective study examined the development of PCDEs in
2 relation to the career progression of elite youth football players. Results revealed age-
3 related changes and an effect of eventual scholarship status on several PCDEs, including a
4 decrease in imagery use during practice and competition with age, an increase in coping
5 with performance and developmental pressures with age, higher levels of coping with
6 performance and developmental pressures in eventual Category 1-2 scholars, and an
7 increase in evaluating performances and working on weaknesses with age for eventual
8 Category 1-2 scholars.

9 A range of PCDEs have been shown to be important in talent development
10 processes in several sports (MacNamara et al., 2010a, 2010b; MacNamara & Collins,
11 2013, 2015; Newton & Holmes, 2017). Based on the mean (SD) PCDEQ factor scores
12 displayed in Table 1, the current sample of U12-U16 elite youth football players
13 displayed high scores on all factors of the PCDEQ, in relation to elite youth individual
14 and team sport athletes and elite youth and senior orienteers (e.g., the mean \pm SD of
15 Cohen's *d* differences across all factors in the current sample vs. elite youth team sport
16 athletes in MacNamara and Collins (2013) = 0.33 ± 0.20 , and vs. British elite youth
17 orienteers in Newton and Holmes (2017) = 0.38 ± 0.19). This indicates that in general,
18 players possess high levels of a range of PCDEs. However, only some factors changed
19 with age and related to career progression.

20 Coping with performance and developmental pressures scores increased with
21 age, possibly due to the increased demands placed on players as they progress on the
22 pathway to excellence. The current findings support previous qualitative research
23 that has also shown age-related differences in the coping skills of elite youth football
24 players (Reeves et al., 2009), suggesting that facilitating the development of

1 appropriate coping skills may be important in supporting elite youth football players
2 at different stages of an academy development system.

3 Having superior scores on the coping with performance and developmental
4 pressures factor between ages 11-16 was also found to be important in determining
5 career progression (Category 1-2 > Category 3-4 and Non-scholars= $4.35 \pm 0.61 >$
6 3.99 ± 0.67 and 4.02 ± 0.78). This finding is congruent with a previous study using
7 the PCDEQ in elite youth team sport athletes aged 16, whereby coach-rated ‘good
8 developers’ outscored ‘poor developers’ (4.27 ± 0.77 vs. 3.87 ± 0.86) (MacNamara
9 & Collins, 2013). Current findings also support literature examining coping skills not
10 using the PCDEQ in talented football players (Holt & Dunn, 2004; MacNamara &
11 Collins, 2013; Mills et al., 2012; Van Yperen, 2009). For example, interviews with
12 academy players aged 16, and their coaches, suggested that progression to
13 professional senior status in football required high levels of resilience, which
14 involved employing appropriate coping strategies (Holt & Dunn, 2004; Mills et al.,
15 2012). It is noteworthy that in the current study, superior coping skills differentiated
16 eventual Category 1-2 scholars from eventual Category 3-4 scholars, as well as
17 eventual non-scholars, suggesting that this factor seems useful for distinguishing the
18 excellent developers from the very good developers, which is a unique finding. The
19 current findings also extend previous literature by simultaneously considering both
20 the development of coping skills and the role of coping skills in predicting future
21 success. Furthermore, the coping skills assessed by the PCDEQ related to
22 developmental pressures, as well as performance pressures, suggesting that it is more
23 directly aligned to coping with the challenges of talent development processes than
24 previous work. In summary, it would appear that a range of coping skills may

1 facilitate progression through an academy system toward elite status, and so
2 academies should support the development of these skills in their players.

3 Results revealed that evaluating performances and working on weaknesses
4 was particularly important in the development of elite youth football players. This
5 factor relates to the extent to which young athletes realistically evaluate their
6 performances, regardless of win or loss outcome, and work on their weaknesses for
7 future progression (MacNamara & Collins, 2011). For optimal career progression,
8 i.e., on to a Category 1-2 scholarship, evaluating performances and working on
9 weaknesses improved with age. MacNamara and Collins (2013) showed that in elite
10 youth team sports athletes aged 16, coach-rated ‘good developers’ displayed higher
11 scores than ‘poor developers’ on evaluating performances and working on
12 weaknesses (4.99 ± 0.72 vs. 4.56 ± 0.85). Furthermore, British elite youth orienteers
13 scored particularly highly on this factor (4.97 ± 0.79), and in-depth interviews with
14 their coaches revealed that it was a major focus of talent development processes in
15 this context (Newton & Holmes, 2017). The current study is the first to provide
16 evidence that this unique factor is important in the development of elite youth
17 football players. Previous work has shown the importance of potentially-related
18 factors such as achievement motivation (Höner & Feichtinger, 2016; Zuber et al.,
19 2015, 2016) and self-regulation (Toering et al., 2009). However, unlike most
20 previous work, the current study considers the factor in relation to both age-related
21 change and future career success (Murr et al., 2018), and provides evidence that
22 unique developmental trajectories may exist for those players who demonstrate
23 excellent career progression. Therefore, in elite youth football players aged 12-16, it
24 may be important to improve one’s ability to evaluate performances and work on
25 weaknesses throughout development to overcome obstacles, learn from setbacks, and

1 adjust to key transitions on the pathway towards excellence (MacNamara et al.
2 2010b).

3 The current study suggested that imagery use during practice and competition
4 decreased with age. This may seem surprising given that qualitative studies have
5 consistently shown imagery to be important for development into an elite senior athlete
6 (Durand-Bush & Salmela, 2002; Gould, Dieffenbach, & Moffett 2002; MacNamara et
7 al., 2010a, 2010b). However, despite the reduction in imagery use during practice and
8 competition, the mean scores of U15-U16 players in the current study were similar or
9 higher compared to elite youth and senior orienteers (Newton & Holmes, 2017) and elite
10 youth individual and team sport athletes (MacNamara & Collins, 2013) (e.g., average
11 imagery use during practice and competition scores in U15-16 players in the current study
12 vs. elite youth team athletes aged 16 in MacNamara and Collins, 2013 = 4.29 ± 0.70 vs.
13 3.89 ± 0.99 , respectively). Therefore, elite youth football players aged 11-16 years engage
14 in relatively high levels of imagery usage, suggesting that it may be useful in engaging in
15 their current context, i.e., being a member of a professional academy. However, its usage
16 decreased with age and it was not a determinant of future career progression in football.

17 A possible explanation for imagery usage decreasing with age is that in the
18 English elite youth football context under consideration, at younger ages the explicit and
19 overt use of imagery may be considered more acceptable, whereas as players move
20 towards senior professional status, cultural issues may reduce the likelihood that players
21 engage in imagery behaviours, or report its usage via the PCDEQ (Champ, Nesti,
22 Ronkainen, Tod, & Littlewood, 2018; Pain & Harwood, 2004). Further, in two recent
23 reviews of the psychological components associated with effective talent development in
24 football, none of the quantitative studies reviewed, examined the role of imagery in
25 relation to talent development (Gledhill et al., 2017; Murr et al., 2018), and imagery was

1 not reported as a key factor for development in any of the qualitative studies reviewed
2 (Gledhill et al., 2017). Therefore, there is a need to investigate the development of
3 imagery processes in elite youth football players in relation to talent development in
4 greater depth.

5 ***Practical implications***

6 The EPPP aims to increase the number and quality of home-grown players
7 progressing through the academies of professional football clubs in England. A focus
8 of the strategy is improving aspects such as coaching provision and sport science
9 support, which includes consideration of the technical, physical, psychological and
10 social elements of player development. The current study suggests that psychological
11 elements are indeed important for the development of players. The present findings
12 support the propositions of MacNamara et al. (2010a, 2010b) that a blend of PCDEs
13 may allow players to negotiate different stages of development and eventually
14 progress to elite levels of performance. The ability to cope with performance and
15 developmental pressures and evaluate performances and work on weaknesses
16 appeared to be particularly important for progression. Therefore, academies could
17 assist players in developing a repertoire of coping strategies, pertinent to the
18 challenges of particular stages of development. Assisting players in making realistic
19 evaluations of their own performances and to support them to work on areas of
20 weakness may also support their development. This may entail regular discussions
21 with players, encouraging them to reflect on key aspects of their performance and
22 supporting them in developing strategies to target areas for improvement.

23 ***Limitations and future research***

24 The current study provided a mixed-longitudinal examination of the development of
25 PCDEs of elite youth football players aged U12-U16, and then prospectively tracked

1 them to age U17 to determine career progression. As recommended by Gledhill et al.
2 (2017) and Murr et al. (2018), the longitudinal aspects of this design extend
3 previous, purely cross-sectional work that compares youth players across different
4 age groups (e.g., Crust et al., 2010) and varying statuses (e.g., Toering et al., 2009)
5 based on psychological components. Recognising the unique contribution of the
6 current study, it would have been preferable still to assess the PCDEs of a group of
7 elite youth football players at U12 and periodically reassess the same players for the
8 next 8-10 years, where senior playing status could be determined, i.e., adopt a pure
9 longitudinal prospective design. Unfortunately, recruiting and tracking an elite
10 sample over such a period is expensive and suffers from the problem of participant
11 dropout.

12 The use of a single measurement type, particularly a self-report measure such
13 as the PCDEQ, is associated with some common method biases (Podsakoff,
14 MacKenzie, & Podsakoff, 2012). Although there was an attempt to reduce response
15 bias by conducting the PCDEQ away from coaches, reminding participants that all
16 information remained confidential, and encouraging participants to respond honestly,
17 future research should consider other avenues to improve this further. Within the
18 pure longitudinal prospective design proposed above, it would be useful for future
19 work to supplement the PCDEQ with interviews, reflective diaries and participant
20 observations, to better understand the PCDEs used by elite youth football players,
21 how these develop, and how this may relate to career progression.

22

23 ***Conclusion***

24 The current study showed that several PCDEs change with age and may facilitate optimal
25 career progression in elite youth football players aged U12-U16. Coping with

1 performance and developmental pressures and evaluating performances and working on
2 weaknesses appear to be key factors that influence the talent development process. It is
3 recommended that professional football academies encourage the systematic development
4 of these PCDEs in their players. Future research should employ a pure longitudinal
5 prospective design to better explore age-related changes in PCDEs across players'
6 academy careers and into adulthood.

7

1 **Acknowledgements**

2 We would like to thank the academy staff for their support and the players for taking
3 part in the study.

4 **Declaration of interest statement**

5 No potential conflicts of interest.

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 **References**

- 2 Abbott, A., & Collins, D. (2004). Eliminating the dichotomy between theory and
3 practice in talent identification and development: Considering the role of
4 psychology. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 22(5), 395-408.
5 doi:10.1080/02640410410001675324
- 6 Champ, F. M., Nesti, M. S., Ronkainen, N. J., Tod, D. A., & Littlewood, M. A.
7 (2018). An exploration of the experiences of elite youth footballers: The
8 impact of organizational culture. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 1-22.
- 9 Côté, J. (1999). The influence of the family in the development of talent in sport.
10 *The Sport Psychologist*, 13(4), 395-417.
- 11 Crust, L., Nesti, M., & Littlewood, M. (2010). A cross-sectional analysis of mental
12 toughness in a professional football academy. *Athletic Insight Journal*, 2(2).
- 13 Dohme, L-C., Backhouse, S., Piggott, D., & Morgan, G. (2017). Categorising and
14 defining popular psychological terms used within the youth athlete talent
15 development literature: a systematic review. *International Review of Sport
16 and Exercise Psychology*, 10, 134 - 163.
- 17 Durand-Bush, N., & Salmela, J. H. (2002). The development and maintenance of
18 expert athletic performance: Perceptions of World and Olympic Champions.
19 *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, 14(3), 154-171.
20 doi:10.1080/10413200290103473
- 21 Feichtinger, P., & Höner, O. (2015). Talented football players' development of
22 achievement motives, volitional components, and self-referential cognitions:
23 A longitudinal study. *European Journal of Sport Science*, 15(8), 748-756.

- 1 Gledhill, A., Harwood, C., & Forsdyke, D. (2017). Psychosocial factors associated
2 with talent development in football: A systematic review. *Psychology of*
3 *Sport and Exercise, 31*, 93-112.
- 4 Gould, D., Dieffenbach, K., & Moffett, A. (2002). Psychological characteristics and
5 their development in Olympic Champions. *Journal of Applied Sport*
6 *Psychology, 14*(3), 172-204. doi:10.1080/10413200290103482
- 7 Hill, A., MacNamara, A., & Collins, D. (2015). Psycho-behaviourally based features
8 of effective talent development in rugby union: A coach's perspective. *The*
9 *Sport Psychologist, 29*(3), 201-212.
- 10 Holt, N. L., & Dunn, J. G. H. (2004). Toward a grounded theory of the psychosocial
11 competencies and environmental conditions associated with soccer success.
12 *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology, 16*(3), 199-219.
13 doi:10.1080/10413200490437949
- 14 Höner, O., & Feichtinger, P. (2016). Psychological talent predictors in early
15 adolescence and their empirical relationship with current and future
16 performance in soccer. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise, 25*, 17-26.
- 17 Huijgen, B. C., Elferink-Gemser, M. T., Lemmink, K. A., & Visscher, C. (2014).
18 Multidimensional performance characteristics in selected and deselected
19 talented soccer players. *European Journal of Sport Science, 14*(1), 2-10.
20 doi:10.1080/17461391.2012.725102
- 21 Kabacoff, R. (2011). *R in Action*. Shelter Island, New York: Manning Publications
22 Co.
- 23 MacNamara, A., Button, A., & Collins, D. (2010a). The role of psychological
24 characteristics in facilitating the pathway to elite performance. Part 1:

- 1 Identifying mental skills and behaviours. *The Sport Psychologist*, 24(1), 52-
2 73.
- 3 MacNamara, A., Button, A., & Collins, D. (2010b). The role of psychological
4 characteristics in facilitating the pathway to elite performance. Part 2:
5 Examining environmental and stage-related differences in skills and
6 behaviors. *The Sport Psychologist*, 24(1), 74-96.
- 7 MacNamara, A., & Collins, D. (2011). Development and initial validation of the
8 Psychological Characteristics of Developing Excellence Questionnaire.
9 *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 29(12), 1273-1286.
10 doi:10.1080/02640414.2011.589468
- 11 MacNamara, A., & Collins, D. (2013). Do mental skills make champions?
12 Examining the discriminant function of the psychological characteristics of
13 developing excellence questionnaire. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 31(7), 736-
14 744. doi:10.1080/02640414.2012.747692
- 15 MacNamara, A., & Collins, D. (2015). Profiling, exploiting, and countering
16 psychological characteristics in talent identification and development. *The*
17 *Sport Psychologist*, 29(3), 73-81.
- 18 Mills, A., Butt, J., Maynard, I., & Harwood, C. (2012). Identifying factors perceived
19 to influence the development of elite youth football academy players. *Journal*
20 *of Sports Sciences*, 30, 1593-1604.
- 21 Murr, D., Feichtinger, P., Larkin, P., O'Connor, D., & Höner, O. (2018).
22 Psychological talent predictors in youth soccer: A systematic review of the
23 prognostic relevance of psychomotor, perceptual-cognitive and personality-
24 related factors. *PloS one*, 13(10), e0205337.

- 1 Newton, J. A., & Holmes, P. S. (2017). Psychological characteristics of champion
2 orienteers: Should they be considered in talent identification and
3 development? *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, 12(1),
4 109-118.
- 5 Pain, M. A., & Harwood, C. G. (2004). Knowledge and perceptions of sport
6 psychology within English soccer. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 22(9), 813-
7 826.
- 8 Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2012). Sources of method
9 bias in social science research and recommendations on how to control it.
10 *Annual Review of Psychology*, 63, 539-569.
- 11 Poli, R., Ravenel, L., and Besson, R. (2019). Mapping the origin of English Premier
12 League players (2009-2019) *CIES Football Observatory Monthly Report*, 43,
13 1-6.
- 14 Premier League (2011). *Elite Player Performance Plan*. London: Premier League.
- 15 Rasbash, J., Steele, F., Browne, W. J., & Goldstein, H. (2017). *A User's Guide to*
16 *MLwiN, v3.00*. Centre for Multilevel Modeling, University of Bristol.
- 17 Reeves, C. W., Nicholls, A. R., & McKenna, J. (2009). Stressors and coping
18 strategies among early and middle adolescent Premier League academy
19 soccer players: Differences according to age. *Journal of Applied Sport*
20 *Psychology*, 21, 31-48.
- 21 Swann, C., Moran, A., & Piggott, D. (2015). Defining elite athletes: Issues in the
22 study of expert performance in sport psychology. *Psychology of Sport and*
23 *Exercise*, 16, 3-14.
- 24 Toering, T. T., Elferink-Gemser, M. T., Jordet, G., & Visscher, C. (2009). Self-
25 regulation and performance level of elite and non-elite youth soccer players.

- 1 *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 27(14), 1509-1517.
- 2 doi:10.1080/02640410903369919
- 3 Twisk, C. (2003). *Applied longitudinal data analysis for epidemiology: A practical*
- 4 *guide*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- 5 Van Yperen, N. W. (2009). Why some make it and others do not: Identifying
- 6 psychological factors that predict career success in professional adult soccer.
- 7 *Sport Psychologist*, 23(3), 317-329.
- 8 Zuber, C., Zibung, M., & Conzelmann, A. (2015). Motivational patterns as an
- 9 instrument for predicting success in promising young football players.
- 10 *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 33(2), 160-168.
- 11 Zuber, C., Zibung, M., & Conzelmann, A. (2016). Holistic patterns as an instrument
- 12 for predicting the performance of promising young soccer players—a 3-years
- 13 longitudinal study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7, 1088.