



*Original Research*

---

## **Does Time Heal all Wounds? A Case Study on Rival Perceptions Before and After Conference Realignment**

CODY T. HAVARD<sup>1‡</sup>, DANIEL L. WANN<sup>2‡</sup>, TIMOTHY D. RYAN<sup>1‡</sup>, and NORMAN O'NEAL<sup>1†</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Kemmons Wilson School of Hospitality and Resort Management, The University of Memphis, Memphis, TN, USA; <sup>2</sup>Department of Psychology, Murray State University, Murray, KY, USA

<sup>†</sup>Denotes graduate student author, <sup>‡</sup>Denotes professional author

---

### ABSTRACT

*International Journal of Exercise Science* 10(6): 823-832, 2017. The current longitudinal case study investigated how conference realignment and beginning new annual competitions impacted fan rival perceptions for fans of the Texas A&M Aggies, Missouri Tigers, and Texas Christian University Horned Frogs. In particular, fan rival perceptions before and after conference realignment were compared to determine if significant differences were present. Findings indicate that history plays an important role in rivalry as fans of teams sharing long-standing rivalries with schools in their previous conference (i.e., Texas A&M/Texas and Missouri/Kansas) did not differ in their rival perceptions before or after conference realignment. On the other hand, rival perceptions of TCU fans significantly differed in their perceptions of Boise State (previous rival) and Baylor (current rival) before and after conference realignment. Implications for sport managers are discussed.

**KEY WORDS:** Sport rivalry, conference realignment, fan perceptions, sport fans, intercollegiate athletics

### INTRODUCTION

The current longitudinal case study investigated the impact of conference realignment on fans of the Texas A&M Aggies, Missouri Tigers, and Texas Christian University (TCU) Horned Frogs. In 2011, Texas A&M and Missouri announced they would be leaving the Big 12 Conference (Big 12) to start competing in the Southeastern Conference (SEC) beginning in the 2012-2013 academic year. That same year, TCU announced they would be joining the Big 12 Conference, therefore leaving the Mountain West Conference (MWC), (and the Big East Conference even though they had yet to play in the conference). Fans of the three schools believed that changing conference affiliation was in their best interests (5); however, the three schools had very different stories and took different paths to arrive at their decisions.

Both Texas A&M and Missouri were leaving the Big 12 where they shared storied histories with several schools. Texas A&M shared historical rivalries with numerous schools from their time in the defunct Southwest Conference (SWC), the Texas Longhorns at the top of the list. Missouri shared rivalries with several schools in the Big 12 dating back to when the conference was known as the Big 8, and even Big 6 Conference. The Kansas Jayhawks are known as the biggest rival to Missouri. In the SEC, the majority of Texas A&M fans adopted LSU (10, 11), which they share history with, although not to the extent they do with Texas. Missouri fans, on the other hand, identified Arkansas (10, 11), a team they had only played a handful of times before conference realignment.

TCU was a member of the SWC, and, subsequent to the conference folding, held membership in several different conferences before joining the MWC in 2005, where the team considered a rival by most fans was Boise State (10, 11). In 2010, TCU had agreed to join the Big East Conference, but backed out when they were invited membership by the Big 12, where they began membership in 2012. Fans at TCU saw joining the Big 12 as the end of a long journey to rejoin historical rivalries with old SWC foes (5). The renewed rivalry most anticipated by fans was one with the Baylor Bears (10, 11).

The purpose of the current case study was to compare fans rival perceptions toward teams they considered to be their biggest rivals in their previous and current conferences before and after conference realignment. For example, do fans of Texas A&M feel differently toward Texas or LSU now than they did before the Aggies joined the SEC? This question was originally investigated the anticipated impact of conference realignment by asking fans to rate their perceptions of rival teams in their team's prior conference as well as the conference they were joining (10). The authors found that fans reported stronger negative perceptions of the rival team in the conference they were leaving than the anticipated rival in the new conference. In particular, fans were less likely to support their current rival against another team than they were to support the anticipated rival in the new conference.

To date, Texas A&M, Missouri, and TCU have played in their new conferences at least three seasons. In an attempt to determine how time influences out-group perceptions, a study was conducted to measure the manner in which fans perceive and behave toward rivals in their previous and current conferences (11). The authors found that fans reported more negative perceptions of the current rival for off-field characteristics such as rival fan behavior and academic prestige of the rival team. On the other hand, fans reported more negative perceptions of the former rival for on-field characteristics such as likelihood to support the rival against another team and the amount of satisfaction they experience when their favorite team beats the rival in direct competition. Further, fans reported they were more likely to consider committing anonymous acts of aggression toward participants and fans of the former rival than the current rival. These findings indicated that even though fans often tried to move forward with their newly minted primary rival team after conference realignment, they still hold some animosity toward their former rivals (11). In an attempt to further understand how time influences out-group perceptions, the current case study sought to investigate fan

perceptions of their former rival and current rival teams before and after conference realignment.

Understanding how conference realignment impacts rival perceptions is important because fans have an inherent need to identify opposing teams as rivals in which their favorite team can compare (5). Further, conference affiliation plays an important role in fan rival perceptions (4, 7, 17), and a new rivalry in a premier sport such as football can fundamentally alter the relationships schools and teams share in other sports (9). Findings from the current case study provide sport managers with practical findings of three teams in intercollegiate athletics.

Social Identity Theory (SIT) (18) has been frequently used to investigate rivalry in sport, and the phenomenon has been used by numerous researchers as a variable to study fan behavior (1, 2, 12, 14, 16, 21, 22). SIT states that the groups a person belongs to in some way say something about them (18). In other words, people want to identify with others, and groups, that share similar characteristics to them and can reflect positively on their self and social perception. However, more recently attention has been paid to what causes and contributes to the rivalry phenomenon in sport. Rivalry has been defined as “a fluctuating adversarial relationship existing between two teams, players, or groups of fans, gaining significance through on-field competition, on-field or off-field incidences, proximity, demographic makeup, and/or historical occurrence(s)” (6, p. 51). Further, history and close competition between teams are very important antecedents and contributing factors to rivalry (3, 13, 19).

Based on the importance of history and close competition in forming and maintaining rivalries, we compared data for the three schools to investigate the influence conference realignment had on fan rival perceptions. In particular, the authors asked participants to provide their perceptions of rival teams in the current and future conferences before the teams made the athletic move (10). Because the three focal schools have competed in their new conferences for at least three seasons, the authors compared data from fans of Texas A&M, Missouri, and TCU following the 2015 season (11) to the data collected in the 2012 season to examine whether conference realignment impacted their perceptions of rival teams in the previous and current conference. Fans’ perceptions of the biggest rival in the previous and current conference were compared to determine if (a) playing in a new conference and (b) not playing the former rival annually impacted the perceptions they reserved of the rival schools.

**Texas A&M:** The majority of Texas A&M fans indicated the Texas Longhorns as their biggest rival in the Big 12, and a smaller majority indicated the LSU Tigers as the main rival in the SEC. Texas A&M has played Texas 118 times and has a 37-76-5 record against the Longhorns. Before the rivalry went on hiatus, it was the third-longest in college football, beginning in 1894 and ending in 2011 when Texas A&M announced it would begin athletic competition in the SEC.

The Aggies have played the LSU Tigers 54 times and have a 20-31-3 record. Before Texas A&M joined the SEC, the two teams occasionally met in pre-conference or post-season games.

The longest period of consecutively played games between Texas A&M and LSU was from 1960-1975. We expect that the history between Texas A&M and their rival schools will impact how fans perceive their rivals before and after conference realignment (3, 13, 19). Specifically, because Texas A&M shares a history with the Texas Longhorns, we expect that fan perceptions of Texas will not differ before and after conference realignment. Additionally, despite sharing a moderate history, because Texas A&M and LSU have only recently started playing on a consistent annual basis, we also expect that fan perceptions of LSU will not differ before and after conference realignment. Therefore, we present the following hypothesis:

H1: Fans of the Texas A&M Aggies will not report significantly different perceptions of the (a) Texas Longhorns or the (b) LSU Tigers following conference realignment.

**Missouri:** The majority of Missouri fans identified the Kansas Jayhawks as the biggest rival in the Big 12 and Arkansas in the SEC. Missouri and Kansas have played football 120 times, beginning in 1891, and Missouri holds a 57-54-9 advantage. Conversely, the Tigers have played Arkansas in football only seven times and hold a 4-3 overall advantage. The game has recently received the name Battle Lines Rivalry in an attempt to build excitement around the rivalry (15). Due to the rivalry that Missouri shares with Kansas, and the short relationship with Arkansas, we expect that rival perceptions will not differ before and after conference realignment. Therefore, we hypothesize:

H2: Fans of the Missouri Tigers will not report significantly different perceptions of the (a) Kansas Jayhawks or the (b) Arkansas Razorbacks following conference realignment.

**TCU:** The vast majority of TCU fans identified the Baylor Bears as their rival in the Big 12. TCU shares a long history with the Baylor Bears, dating to their time in the Southwest Conference (SWC). The two teams first played in 1899, and belonged to the same conference from 1923 to 1995 when the SWC disbanded. Over this period of time, the rivalry, known as *The Revivalry* because of both schools' religious ties, grew in intensity. Currently, TCU has a 53-52-7 record against Baylor, making it the most competitively balanced rivalry measured in the current case study. Conversely, TCU fans identified Boise State and Utah as rivals in the MWC. The Boise State Broncos were used because they were identified most in the 2013 sample, and enough participants identified Boise State following the 2015 season to allow a statistical comparison. TCU only played Boise State four times (two wins, two losses), and only once as members of the MWC. Therefore, because history of competition is so important to the establishment and on-going health of a rivalry combined the competitiveness of TCU and Baylor, we expected that fan perceptions of Baylor would differ significantly before and after realignment. Further, because the teams only played four times, and no longer play on an annual basis, we expect TCU fans' perceptions of Boise State would also differ before and after conference realignment. The following hypothesis was offered:

H3: Fans of the TCU Horned Frogs will report significantly less negative perceptions of the (a) Boise State Broncos and more negative perceptions of the (b) Baylor Bears following conference realignment.

## METHODS

### *Participants*

Data from 2012, before conference realignment (10), and participant responses collected following the 2015 season (11) were used in the current study. Data in both the 2012 and 2015 samples were gathered by posting a link to an online survey using Qualtrics software on non-specific team websites (Texas A&M-[www.texags.com](http://www.texags.com); Missouri-[www.blockm.com](http://www.blockm.com); TCU-[www.killerfrogs.com](http://www.killerfrogs.com)). In both data collections, respondents took about 10 minutes to complete the survey and were offered a chance to win a \$25 VISA Gift Card for participation.

For the current case study, 107 participant responses before conference realignment (i.e., 2012) were compared with 223 responses following realignment (i.e., 2015). For a breakdown of school-specific fans used in both samples, see Table 1. In both samples, the majority of respondents were male and Caucasian. See (10) and (11) for participant and instrument descriptive information.

### *Protocol*

Participants rated their attachment with their favorite team using the seven-item Sport Spectator Identification Scale (SSIS: 20) and their perceptions of their rival teams using the 12-item, four-factor Sport Rivalry Fan Perception Scale (SRFPS: 6). Items in the SSIS and SRFPS displayed reliability (see 10, 11).

### *Statistical Analysis*

Analysis was performed in SPSS 24. A series of Analysis of Variance (ANOVAs) and Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVAs) were used to test the hypotheses. Because multiple MANOVAs were utilized to test the hypotheses, a significance level of .025 was used.

## RESULTS

**Texas A&M:** Before examining perceptions of rivals, we initially conducted analysis to insure that fan identification with the Texas A&M Aggies was not altered by conference realignment. To do this, two ANOVAs (one for each fan sample) were computed using conference realignment (before and after) as the grouping variable and identification with Texas A&M as the measure and no significant differences were present [LSU Before and After Realignment:  $F(1, 159) = 0.079, p = 0.780$ ; Texas Before and After Realignment:  $F(1, 170) = 0.025, p = 0.875$ ]. After establishing that team identification was not different before and after conference realignment, we could then test the impact of conference realignment on perceptions of both the Texas Longhorns and the LSU Tigers.

Two MANOVA's with a 0.025 significance level were used to compare Texas A&M fans' perceptions of the (a) Texas Longhorns and (b) LSU Tigers (dependent variables) before and after conference realignment. No significant differences were found regarding perceptions of either the Texas Longhorns [Pillai's Trace 0.040,  $F(4, 167) = 1.73, p = 0.145$ ] or LSU Tigers

[Pillai's Trace 0.14,  $F(4, 156) = 0.55, p = 0.698$ ], signaling that conference realignment did not change Texas A&M fans perceptions of the two teams. Hypothesis 1 was supported (Table 1).

**Table 1.** N, Means, and Standard Deviations for Texas A&M, Missouri, and TCU fans before and after conference realignment.

Favorite Team	Rival Team	Realignment (n)	Rival Indirect Competition		Rival Academic Prestige		Rival Fan Sportsmanship		Sense of Satisfaction	
			M	SD	M	SD	M	SD	M	SD
			Texas A&M	Texas	Pre (39)	6.36	1.08	2.10	0.96	4.89
Aggies (H1)	Longhorns	Post (133)	6.68	0.89	2.18	1.34	5.04	1.49	<b>6.45</b>	0.90
	LSU Tigers	Pre (39)	3.74	1.74	4.91	1.36	5.67	1.33	5.91	1.05
Missouri Tigers (H2)	Kansas	Pre (43)	6.64	0.74	4.64	1.57	5.11	1.38	<b>5.88</b>	1.00
	Jayhawks	Post (45)	6.80	0.69	4.54	1.46	5.30	1.29	<b>6.18</b>	0.87
TCU Horned Frogs (H3)	Arkansas	Pre (40)	4.08	1.67	4.63	1.18	4.37	1.15	5.70	1.05
	Razorbacks	Post (37)	4.36	1.08	4.19	1.29	4.13	1.00	5.29	0.94
TCU Horned Frogs (H3)	Boise State	Pre (24)	3.75	1.69	5.11	1.62	2.97	1.39	6.15*	0.86
	Broncos	Post (14)	2.69	1.62	5.45	1.36	3.26	1.37	5.05*	1.27
TCU Horned Frogs (H3)	Baylor	Pre (25)	4.15**	1.98	2.52	1.15	3.77**	1.27	<b>6.35</b>	0.72
	Bears	Post (45)	5.54**	1.02	2.73	1.44	4.99**	1.12	<b>6.01</b>	0.99

\*Significant difference at .025 level. \*\*Significant difference at .001 level.

**Missouri:** Once again, two preliminary ANOVAs were conducted to determine if level of identification fans have with Missouri (in each sample) was impacted by conference realignment (before and after) and these analyses did not yield significant results [Arkansas Before and After Realignment:  $F(1, 75) = 1.44, p = 0.234$ ; Kansas Before and After Realignment:  $F(1, 86) = 0.106, p = 0.746$ ].

Because team identification did not differ before and after conference realignment, two MANOVAs with a significant level of .025 were used to examine Hypothesis 2. Neither MANOVA yielded a significant finding [Kansas: Pillai's Trace 0.051,  $F(4, 83) = 1.11, p = 0.356$ ; Arkansas: Pillai's Trace 0.066,  $F(4, 72) = 1.28, p = 0.286$ ], indicating that conference realignment has not impacted Missouri fans' perceptions of either team. Hypothesis 2 was supported (Table 1).

**TCU:** To test for differences in TCU fan' level of identification before and after conference realignment, two ANOVAs (one for each sample) were run, and no significant differences were present [Baylor Before and After Realignment:  $F(1, 68) = 2.301, p = 0.134$ ; Boise State Before and After Realignment:  $F(1, 36) = 0.095, p = 0.760$ ]. Because TCU fan' team

identification did not differ before and after conference realignment, we next ran two MANOVAs using a significance level of 0.025, and both displayed significant differences were present. First, regarding Boise State [Pillai's Trace 0.316,  $F(4, 33) = 3.81, p = 0.012$ ], significant differences were present regarding sense of satisfaction,  $F(1, 36) = 10.30, p = 0.003$ , as TCU fans indicated they would experience less sense of satisfaction in beating Boise State following conference realignment ( $M = 5.05, SD = 1.27$ ) than when the team belonged in the MWC ( $M = 6.15, SD = 0.86$ ).

TCU fan' perceptions toward the Baylor Bears changed after conference realignment [Pillai's Trace 0.318,  $F(4, 65) = 7.58, p < 0.001$ ] regarding out-group indirect competition,  $F(1, 68) = 15.20, p < 0.001$ , and out-group sportsmanship,  $F(1, 68) = 17.13, p < 0.001$ . TCU fans indicated they were less likely to support the Baylor Bears in indirect competition following conference realignment (before realignment:  $M = 4.15, SD = 1.98$ ; after realignment:  $M = 5.54, SD = 1.02$ ) and rated the sportsmanship of Baylor Bears fans more negatively after conference realignment ( $M = 4.99, SD = 1.12$ ) than before TCU joined the Big 12 ( $M = 3.77, SD = 1.27$ ). There were no significant differences for out-group academic prestige and sense of satisfaction gained from beating the Baylor Bears.

## **DISCUSSION**

At this time, it is important to note two possible limitations to the current study. A larger sample size, particularly in the 2012 sample, could impact study results. For this reason, researchers should strive for larger future collections to further determine the influence of conference realignment on rivalry. A second factor that could impact results is the prevalence of highly-identified fans that participate in message boards on team-specific fan pages. In this instance, highly-identified fans were the target audience, however collecting data from a more diverse sample could influence future results.

The results indicated that conference realignment, and playing in the SEC for three seasons, did not impact rival perceptions of Texas A&M fans nor Missouri fans. One explanation for a lack of differences in rival perceptions before and after conference realignment could be the history and frequent competition shared by Texas A&M and Missouri with their traditional rival teams (3, 13, 19). Another explanation could be that the traditional rivals still compete for recruits, resulting in spirited discussion board posts from fans of all teams involved. Further, some non-revenue producing athletic teams have competed against each other since conference realignment. For example, the women's volleyball teams from Texas and Texas A&M have faced each other in post-season competition. The Texas and Texas A&M baseball teams faced each other in post-season competition, and have played non-conference regular season games against each other during the 2016 and 2017 seasons. Finally, it is arguable that from a national perspective the biggest games for the Texas A&M and Missouri football teams did not involve LSU and Arkansas. For example, when Johnny Manziel played at Texas A&M, the Alabama game garnered the most national attention each year.

It is important to note that Texas A&M recently hired LSU's former defensive coordinator for the same position, and Tyler and Cobbs (19) assert that competition for personnel may play a role in increasing the intensity of a rivalry. Additionally, the SEC has started promoting the Missouri and Arkansas football game using the moniker "The Battle Line" (15), and the teams have been slated to play annually as cross-divisional opponents. Revisiting this issue after the teams have competed for longer periods of time may find the presence of differences in rival perceptions.

However, TCU fans did differ in their perceptions of rivals Boise State and Baylor after conference realignment. This is not surprising, considering that TCU did not share a significant history with Boise State, but did share a long competitive history with Baylor (3, 13, 19). Additionally, TCU and Baylor also are the most competitively balanced rivalry in the current case study, which has been found to influence the formation and intensity of rivalry (3, 12, 18). The two teams tied for first place in the conference for the 2014 season, with Baylor winning the head-to-head matchup. Previous research on rivalry suggests that the outcome of the most recent rivalry game can impact fan rival perceptions (8), and this finding is supported by the current research findings. Another interesting note on TCU deals with their rivalry relationship with Boise State. As mentioned, TCU fans identified multiple teams as rivals in the MWC, and Boise State was used because this was the most represented team in the 2012 sample and allowed for a statistical comparison with the 2015 sample. However, TCU and Boise State may have been labeled a rivalry because they had memorable matchups in football. For this reason, and because they did not play often, their relationship may not represent what is commonly believed to be a rivalry. For example, the TCU/Boise State relationship does not involve some of the important antecedents and characteristics of rivalry that are represented in other, more traditional rivalries (3, 13, 19). Finally, it is also possible that TCU fans felt the athletics teams were moving up a competition level (e.g., from Group of 5 to Power 5), and believed that a refocusing on rivalries in the Big 12 was paramount in supporting their favorite teams.

The current case study provides empirical data to support the assertion that history and competitive balance play a role in the formation and maintenance of a rivalry. This adds to the sport management and rivalry literatures as well as previous work on social identity theory by illustrating how time can impact in-group behavior and derogation. It is important for researchers to revisit this issue in the future in an attempt to identify a time period needed for a new rivalry to supplant an older one in fans minds.

For each school examined in the current study, the findings provide marketers information regarding the teams their fan bases identify as the main current conference rival and how they perceive the rival team. Marketers at these schools should pay attention to way conference realignment can impact fan perceptions of main rivals in the former and current conference. The information regarding how competition realignment has impacted these three fan bases is important for helping marketers understand how the phenomenon has impacted fan perceptions of the identified teams. For example, marketers at Texas A&M and Missouri may want to spend more time promoting the current rival team to engage the fan base. As time

goes on and the focal teams continue to play their current rivals, it can be expected that fan groups begin to identify more with the rival, and perhaps someday supplant their feelings toward the former rival. On the other hand, marketers at TCU should use findings from the current study as support for focusing their promotional intentions on the Baylor Bears in the Big 12.

Findings from the current case study can also help practitioners with other teams changing athletic competition setting. For example, if a team shares a long history with rival team(s) in a conference or league (e.g., Texas A&M and Missouri), then administrators can expect fans to require a longer period of time to adopt a rivalry in the new conference than if the favorite team does not share much history with other teams in their league (e.g., TCU). Even though practitioners may be able to draw comparisons to the current case study, it is important that research be conducted on an individual team basis to better understand specific fan bases.

The current case study investigated how conference realignment and playing at least three seasons in a new conference impacted fan rival perceptions. Findings indicated that history in fact plays a large role in the formation and health of a rivalry. The study of rivalry is important to help sport managers better understand their fan bases and help promote competitive relationships with other teams, and the current case study provides information to help guide future research.

## REFERENCES

1. Dalakas V, Levin AM. The balance theory domino: How sponsorships may elicit negative consumer attitudes. *Adv Consum Res* 32: 91-97, 2005.
2. Davies F, Veloutsou C, Costa A. Investigating the influence of a joint sponsorship of rival teams on supporter attitudes and brand preferences. *J Mark Commun* 12: 31-48, 2006.
3. Havard CT. Glory Out of Reflected Failure: The examination of how rivalry affects sport fans. *Sport Manage Rev* 17: 243-253, 2014. doi: 10.1016/j.smr.2013.09.002
4. Havard CT. Rivalry among teams and conferences in intercollegiate athletics: Does a conference pride phenomenon exist? *J Contemp Athl* 10: 19-32, 2016.
5. Havard CT, Eddy T. Qualitative assessment of rivalry and conference realignment in intercollegiate athletics. *J Issues Intercollegiate Athl* 6: 216-235, 2013.
6. Havard CT, Gray DP, Gould J, Sharp LA, Schaffer JJ. Development and validation of the Sport Rivalry Fan Perception Scale (SRFPS). *J Sport Behav* 36: 45-65, 2013.
7. Havard CT, Reams L. Investigating differences in fan rival perceptions between conferences in intercollegiate athletics. *J Sport Behav* 39: 126-146, 2016.
8. Havard CT, Reams L, Gray DP. Perceptions of highly identified fans regarding rival teams in United States intercollegiate football and men's basketball. *Int J Sport Manage Mark* 14: 116-132, 2013.
9. Havard CT, Shapiro SL, Ridinger LL. Who's our rival? Investigating the influence of a new intercollegiate football program on rivalry perceptions. *J Sport Behav* 39: 385-408, 2016.

10. Havard CT, Wann DL, Ryan TD. Investigating the impact of conference realignment on rivalry in intercollegiate athletics. *Sport Mark Q* 22: 224-234, 2013.
11. Havard CT, Wann DL, Ryan TD. Reinvestigating the impact of conference realignment on rivalry in intercollegiate athletics. *J Applied Sport Manage* 9(2): 25-36, 2017. <https://doi.org/10.18666?JASM-2017-V9-I2-8029>
12. Hillman CH, Cuthbert BN, Bradley MM, Lang PJ. Motivated engagement to appetitive and aversive fanship cues: Psychophysiological responses of rival sport fans. *J Sport Exerc Psychol* 26: 338-351, 2004.
13. Kilduff GJ, Elfenbein HA, Staw BM. The psychology of rivalry: A relationally dependent analysis of competition. *Acad Manage J* 53 943-969, 2010.
14. Levine M, Prosser A, Evans D, Reicher S. Identity and emergency intervention: How social group membership and inclusiveness of group boundaries shape helping behavior. *Pers Soc Psychol Bull* 31: 343-353, 2005. doi: 10.1177/0146167204271651
15. Livingston W. Tiger kickoff: The Battle Line: Manufacturing a rivalry. *Columbia Missourian*, 2014. Retrieved at: [http://www.columbiamissourian.com/sports/tiger-kickoff-the-battle-line-manufacturing-a-rivalry/article\\_3d1a156a-c71b-5975-9db4-09a21b225d92.html](http://www.columbiamissourian.com/sports/tiger-kickoff-the-battle-line-manufacturing-a-rivalry/article_3d1a156a-c71b-5975-9db4-09a21b225d92.html)
16. Raney AA, Kinally W. Examining perceived violence in and enjoyment of televised rivalry sports contests. *Mass Commun Soc* 12: 311-331, 2009.
17. Spinda JSW, Wann DL, Hardin R. Attachment to sports conferences: An expanded model of points of attachment among professional, collegiate, and high school football fans. *Commun & Sport* 4(3): 347-362, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167479515578262>
18. Tajfel H. Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Soc Science Information* 13: 65-93, 1974. doi:10.1177/053901847401300204
19. Tyler BD, Cobbs JB. Rival conceptions of rivalry: Why some competitions mean more than others. *Eur Sport Manage Q* 15: 227-248, 2015. doi: 10.1080/16184742.2015.1010558
20. Wann DL, Branscombe NR. Sports fans: Measuring degree of identification with their team. *Int J Sport Psychol* 24: 1-17, 1993.
21. Wann DL, Grieve FG. Biased evaluations of in-group and out-group spectator behavior at sporting events: The importance of team identification and threats to social identity. *J Soc Psychol* 145: 531-545, 2005.
22. Wann DL, Koch K, Knoth T, Fox D, Aljubaily H, Lantz CD. The impact of team identification and biased predictions of player performance. *Psychol Rec* 56: 55-66, 2006.

