



What is Rivalry and Where We Go From Here

Cody T. Havard

Abstract Of the many ways, sport can positively impact individuals and society as a whole, it also possesses the ability to separate people into groups, with an unfortunate side effect being in-group bias and out-group derogation. This chapter provides an overview of the rivalry phenomenon and discusses an organization's role in responsibly promoting rivalry. Sport managers and researchers have to collectively engage in open dialogue to find solutions to some of the negative consequences of rivalry. If sport truly is a catalyst for bringing people from diverse backgrounds together, managers and researchers must look at practices and work toward providing solutions that can not only help the sport product, but ultimately provide a positive influence on society as a whole.

Keywords Rivalry · Fan behavior · In-group bias · Out-group derogation · Responsible promotion

At this time in society, supporters of competing groups, whether that be political parties, religious ideology, racial makeup, and others, seem to be separating from each other at a rapid rate.¹ When, as a group member,

¹Recent findings in television viewership and politics suggest that people are possibly less divided on major issues (Blakely et al., 2019). However, in the age of social media, and with personalities on social media drawing distinct lines between groups and ideology, one may not see this in their everyday lives.

one can consume similar viewpoints and consume differing perspectives with the primary goal of attacking the source, most people choose not to engage in respectable discourse with someone outside of their perceived group (Leetaru, 2018). Further, with the increasing popularity of using online social media and non-face-to-face communication, people don't have to interact with those they disagree with, and instead can only engage with people who share their characteristics or ideology (Nelson, 2014). As this behavior continues, it becomes increasingly difficult to bring people of diverse backgrounds, beliefs, and ideologies together. To this end, managers like to promote sport as a medium that can bring people together. Therefore, this perspective discusses the issue of sport fans and rivalry, and its potential impact on the sport setting and society.

Sport can do many things for individuals, such as provide feelings of belonging to a group (Festinger, 1954; Wann, 2006a, 2006b), feelings of vicarious achievement through a team's victory (Bandura, 1977), ability to meet others (Wann, Brame, Clarkson, Brooks, & Waddill, 2008), and opportunities to share characteristics with other group members (Tajfel, 1981). In that, sport possesses the capacity to bring people together, which is a popular sentiment used in popular media and in the public sector. However, sport also has the capacity to highlight differences between groups, real or perceived, which is usually the case between teams that identify as rivals. Because sport brings head-to-head competition, it places two groups of opposing sides in face-to-face comparison.

Rivalry is synonymous with sport, and more attention has been paid to the phenomenon in the past decade. Rivalry is different from mere competition in that the participants (e.g., players, coaches, fans) place higher importance on the relationship and treat outcomes as part of a narrative that includes past and future competitions (Converse & Reinhard, 2016). Because rivalry is a popular phenomenon in sport, managers have used it to promote the sport product.² Additionally, rivalry carries many positive consequences that have been, and should be, used by managers to promote the sport product.³ However, much like in politics where two candidates and their supporters compete head to head can lead to group members interacting with each other in negative ways, sport

²Rivalry positively influences fan consumption (Havard, Shapiro, & Ridinger, 2016; Mahony & Moorman, 1999; Sanford & Scott, 2016; Wann et al., 2016).

³Rivalry increases feelings of uniqueness (Berendt & Uhrich, 2016; Berendt, Uhrich, & Thompson, 2018) and group cohesion (Delia, 2015; Smith & Schwartz, 2003).

unfortunately has the ability to produce the same outcomes. These group differences are most prominently on display in sport when teams identified as rivals are competing as the symbiotic competitive nature of rival and competing teams does not always spill over to fans.⁴ If sport is in fact an avenue to bring people together, we must analyze and better understand when rivalry rises to a level that could, and sometimes does, result in deviance and fan aggression.

This chapter serves three purposes. First, an overview of the current knowledge on the rivalry phenomenon is presented, including a discussion of what constitutes a rival and a rival competition, so that researchers and managers can better understand fan rivalry and behavior between group members. This understanding is important because it can drive future study and also help managers plan for contests between rival teams and fan groups. Second, a discussion of an organization's role in developing and promoting rivalry, including examples of responsible and irresponsible promotion of rivalry by sport organizations. The aim of this discussion is to provide readers with guidance regarding how rivalry competitions, and the rivalry phenomenon, should be promoted in an effort to gain the positive consequences of rivalry while working to avoid some of the negative outcomes such as fan deviance and violence. Finally, this perspective serves as a call to action for researchers and practitioners regarding future avenues to better understand rivalry among fans. This is important as researchers and practitioners have to work together to better understand and promote rivalry in sport.

At this time, a note of clarification regarding the use of managers, researchers, and practitioners is offered. Managers are used to describe all working in the sport field, regardless of profession, whereas researchers and practitioners are used to distinguish between those in academia and in the front office. If sport, as many claim, is a catalyst for bringing diverse individuals and groups together, then managers must take a constructive and critical look inward and examine where our field can improve. In that, we must identify the problem and discuss ways to address the issue through both research and practice. One such area is the way that rivalry is used to promote the sport product, as doing so in an irresponsible manner can work to negate much of the positive outcomes sport claims to provide society.

⁴Teams that compete during games also have to work together toward a common goal of attaining success for the league (Mullin, Hardy, & Sutton, 2014).

FANDOM AND FAN RIVALRY

A sport fan can be described as someone who feels she/he has a personally important connection to a sports team (Wann, Melnick, Russell, & Pease, 2001). Individuals identify with sport teams for numerous reasons (Wann, 1995) and typically do so in hope that the team will in some way reflect positively on herself/himself (Tajfel, 1974; Tajfel & Turner, 1979).⁵ To this end, fans can adopt and celebrate the characteristics of a chosen group (Ashmore, Deaux, & McLaughlin-Volpe, 2004; Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990), which in turn can positively impact an individual's socio-psychological well-being (Branscombe & Wann, 1991; Wann, 2006b; Wann et al., 2008). Further, an individual's affinity for a team fluctuates throughout their life cycle based on personality traits and significant events (Brown-Devlin, Devlin, & Vaughn, 2017; Devlin & Brown, 2017; Funk, 2008; Toma, 2003),⁶ which makes fan engagement all the more important for sport organizations and managers.

The innate human characteristic to believe one is successful (Bandura, 1977; Crocker & Park, 2004; Deci, 1975) not only leads individuals to seek positive attributes of the self that can be used to compare to others (Madrigal, 1995; Turner, 1975), it also influences individuals to highlight successes and failures based on group affiliation (Tajfel, 1978). In short, when members of rival groups interact (Sherif, 1966), they tend to display bias toward the in-group and derogation toward the out-group (Rubin & Hewstone, 1998; Tajfel, 1978). While it is true that comparison between two groups can be healthy, it is also the case that out-group negativity can turn into aggression and deviant behavior if not properly controlled (Lee, 1985; Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, & Sherif, 1961),⁷ leading for calls of responsible promotion of rivalry competitions and relationships (Dalakas & Melancon, 2012; Havard, Gray, Gould, Sharp, & Schaffer, 2013; King, 2014).

⁵For example, someone who sees themselves as a hard worker may want to identify with teams sharing that blue-collar or hardworking mentality (Aden, 2008; Kohan, 2017).

⁶Proximity to a team, ties to an alma mater, family structure, change in financial resources can all influence identification and consumption of a team.

⁷For example, a healthy comparison among rival fans would be family members ribbing each other about their preferred teams. Unhealthy behavior would be the family members becoming upset and displaying negativity toward each other based on the teams they follow.

Definitions, Antecedents, and Characteristics of Rivalry

The rivalry phenomenon has commonly been discussed within social identity theory (SIT), or the belief that membership in a group tells something about someone on a private and public level (Tajfel, 1981). SIT helps explain the associative tendencies people display based on perceived success and failure of a team (Cialdini et al., 1976; Snyder & Fromkin, 1980; Snyder, Lassegard, & Ford, 1986) in an attempt to protect image and self-esteem (Madrigal, 1995; Vohs & Heatherton, 2001). Further, because fans that share a strong bond with a team have a more difficult time after a team's loss (Wann & Branscombe, 1990), they may try to find ways to derogate an opponent (Cialdini & Richardson, 1980) or focus on attributes in which their team is superior to a competitor (Bernache-Assollant, Chantal, Bouchet, & Kada, 2018).

In sport, when the phenomenon of rivalry is addressed, many different definitions have been used (Table 2.1). Further, there are also several tested characteristics and antecedents of rivalry that have been offered such as competition, proximity, parity, competition for personnel, cultural similarities and differences, and perceived fairness (Kilduff, Elfenbein, & Staw, 2010; Tyler & Cobbs, 2015). It is sometimes difficult to tell between a competition and a rivalry competition, in which these characteristics, antecedents, and definitions can be used to help clarify. Within social psychology, rival competitions are discussed as those competitions that are *embedded* in group members' psyches (Converse & Reinhard, 2016; Kilduff et al., 2010). Further, three key qualities of rivalry are their subjective nature, dependence on shared history, and that they carry consequences for those engaged, either directly or vicariously with the competition. These qualities thus separate a rival game from others. In short, teams that are rivals share a competitive history in which members of both groups see the relationship being influenced by previous games while looking at how current outcomes will impact the legacy of their favorite teams along with the rivalry.

It is also important to note that fans play a large role in deciding who to identify as a rival. In fact, in most studies on the subject, fans identify teams they see as biggest rival rather than report on one a priori. Because individuals feel an inherent need to identify a rival (Havard & Eddy, 2013), they often identify multiple teams in which to compare (Wann

Table 2.1 Definitions/Descriptions of rivalry, rival groups, and rival competitions

<i>Source</i>	<i>Consequence of Rivalry</i>
Kilduff et al. (2010, p. 945)	A subjective competitive relationship that an actor has with another actor that entails increased psychological stakes of competition for the focal actor, independent of the objective characteristics of the situation
Havard, Gray et al. (2013, p. 51)	A fluctuating adversarial relationship, existing between two teams, players, fans, or groups of fans, gaining significance through on-field competition, on-field or off-field incidences, proximity, demographic makeup, and/or historical occurrence(s)
Tyler & Cobbs (2015, p. 230)	A rival group is a “highly salient out-group that poses an acute threat to the identity of the in-group or to the in-group members’ ability to make positive comparisons between their group and the out-group”
Converse & Reinhard (2016, p. 193)	A rival competition is “one in which the images of self and other are represented in the context of competition (e.g., associate with memories of past competitions), and in which the expected pattern of future interaction is therefore competitive”

et al., 2016),⁸ and report differing perceptions of those teams (Havard & Reams, 2018; Tyler & Cobbs, 2017).⁹ For instance, examples of teams identifying, and being identified by multiple rivals, and perceptions and strengths of those rivals are available on sites such as www.SportRivalry.com and www.KnowRivalry.com.¹⁰

⁸It is common for fans to identify multiple rival teams: one to which they aspire, one in which they share competitive balance, and one to which they favorably compare.

⁹Degree of animosity toward rival teams can be influenced by variables such as conference/league affiliation (Cobbs, Sparks, & Tyler, 2017; Havard & Reams, 2016; Havard, Wann, & Ryan, 2013, 2017) and contest outcomes (Havard, Reams, Gray, 2013; Leach & Spears, 2009).

¹⁰www.KnowRivalry.com features information about the most heated fan rivalries in college athletics and lists of teams that identify and are identified as rivals most frequently using the Sport Rivalry Fan Perception Scale (SRFPS: Havard, Gray et al., 2013). www.KnowRivalry.com contains data on rival relationships that are updated regularly for college

Consequences of Rivalry

Rivalry has been found to influence characteristics like perceived credibility or trust of others (MacDonald, Schug, Chase, & Barth, 2013), and the way people evaluate the actions of in-group and out-group members (Maass, Salvi, Arcuri, & Semin, 1989; Partridge & Wann, 2015).¹¹ In-group stereotyping has been exhibited by college students (Wenger & Brown, 2014),¹² political party supporters (Westen, Blagov, Harenski, Kilts, & Hamann, 2006)¹³ between US Arab and Israeli citizens (Bruneau & Saxe, 2010),¹⁴ and people making judgments about group members loyalty and honor in *whistle-blowing* situations (Hildreth & Anderson, 2018). Examples of positive and negative consequences of rivalry in sport are shown in Table 2.2. For instance, while rivalry in sport can increase participant effort and group cohesion (Leach et al., 2008), it can also lead people to consider unethical behavior (Kilduff, Galinsky, Gallo, & Reade, 2016).

Reactions to Rival Misfortune

Sport fans can experience similar amounts of joy from a rival team's failure to that following a favorite team's victory (Mahony & Howard, 1998). For example, direct competition with a rival influences both fans' physical reactions (Hilman, Cuthbert, Bradley, & Lang, 2004) and their public display of support (Zillman, Bryant, & Sapolsky, 1989). However, when direct competition between groups is absent, individuals often have to find other variables that can be used to derogate the rival (Cialdini & Richardson, 1980; Havard, Ryan, & Workman, 2019).

Heider (1958) discussed the idea of *schadenfreude* and taking pleasure in the demise of another, which has also been described as counter-empathy (Vanman, 2016). In fact, group members can enjoy and

and professional leagues in the United States and abroad using a social networking approach in which 100 rivalry points are allocated among identified rival teams.

¹¹ People stereotype positive actions to the in-group and negative actions to the out-group, and will distance from shameful in-group behavior if necessary.

¹² College students held both implicit and explicit favorability for favorite teams and negativity for rival teams.

¹³ Supporters found ways to delegitimize potentially harmful stories about favored candidate.

¹⁴ Out-group negativity influenced implicit and explicit reactions to the in-group and out-group.

Table 2.2 Positive and negative consequences of rivalry on individuals and organizations

<i>Positive consequences</i>	<i>Negative consequences</i>
<p><i>Preparation and Goal Attainment</i></p> <p>The presence of rivalry leads to improvement on views and goals strategies, and influences individuals to increase their personal effort when preparing for or competing against a rival team (Converse & Reinhard, 2016; Kilduff, 2014; Kilduff, Elfenbein, & Staw, 2010)</p>	<p>The presence of rivalry made participants less willing to accept feedback from out-group members, and influenced managers to act in unethical ways to gain competitive advantages (Hobson & Inzlicht, 2016; Kilduff et al., 2016)</p>
<p><i>Group Membership and Affiliation</i></p> <p>The presence of rivalry influenced individuals to experience an increased feeling of uniqueness from other groups, and a closer bond with in-group members (Berendt & Uhrich, 2016; Berendt, Uhrich, & Thomson, 2018; Delia, 2015; Smith & Schwartz, 2003)</p>	<p>The presence of rivalry influenced fans to report more negativity toward out-group fan behavior, especially among peripheral in-group members, and leads to more negative evaluations of out-group players/participants (Noel, Wann, & Branscombe, 1995; Wann et al., 2016)</p>
<p><i>Consumption and Action</i></p> <p>The presence of rivalry increases fan excitement, engagement, and consumption actions such as game attendance, watching and reading about games, wearing favorite team merchandise, paying price premiums for content, and likelihood to watch a rival play a game not featuring the favorite team (Havard, Shapiro, & Ridinger, 2016; Kimble & Cooper, 1992; Kwak, Kwon, & Lim, 2015; Mahony & Moorman, 1999; Sanford & Scott, 2016; Tyler, Morehead, Cobbs, & DeSchrive, 2017)</p>	<p>People were less willing to experience personal pain in place of an out-group member and were more willing to help in-group members in an emergency situation than out-group members (Hein, Siliani, Preuschoff, Batson, Singer, 2010; Levine, Prosser, Evans, & Reicher, 2005)</p>
<p><i>Messaging and Interpretation</i></p> <p>Rivalry influences fan perceptions and attitudes toward league messaging and sponsored products and services (Angell, Gorton, Bottomley, & White, 2016; Bee & Dalakas, 2013; Dalakas & Levin, 2005; Davies, Veloutsou, & Costa, 2006; Nichols, Cobbs, & Raska, 2016)</p>	<p>Rival perceptions influenced the way people interpreted an indiscretion by the out-group, and exposure to a negative story involving rival teams lead to negative perceptions and attitudes toward both brands (Bee, King, & Stornelli, 2019; Havard & Eddy, 2019; Havard, Ferrucci, & Ryan, 2019)</p>

even hope for an out-group, or out-group member's, failure (Cikara, Botnick, & Fiske, 2011; Elsbach & Bhattacharya, 2001; Leach, Spears, Branscombe, & Doojse, 2003; Zillman & Cantor, 1976).¹⁵ Seeing another person experience failure or misfortune can influence one's self-esteem and other human needs, even if the out-group misfortune is undeserved (Berndsen, Tiggemann, & Chapman, 2017; Brambilla & Riva, 2017). This was the case with the Cleveland Browns that exhibited *schadenfreude* online following the death of Art Modell (Dalakas, Melancon, & Sreboth, 2015).¹⁶ However, it should also be noted that *schadenfreude* can decrease as the perceived severity of the out-group misfortune increases (Berndsen & Feather, 2016). Similarly, Havard (2014) also described Glory Out of Reflected Failure (GORFing), or the tendency of fans to experience joy when their biggest rival loses to another team as a competitive aspect of *schadenfreude* where the rivalry phenomenon *has* to be present in order to be activated (Havard, Wann, & Ryan, 2018).¹⁷ For example, contemporary investigations in *schadenfreude* involve the favorite team experiencing failure, whereas evidence suggests that GORFing can exist regardless of favorite team competitive outcomes (Havard, Inoue, & Ryan, 2018). Fans of the Auburn Tigers celebrating when their rival Alabama Crimson Tide lost to Clemson in the 2017 College Football Championship is such an example (Cooper, 2017).

It is important to note that feelings of *schadenfreude* and GORFing are not necessarily bad in the sport setting. After all, rivalry is something that adds a great deal of excitement to sport. For example, a form of rivalry or *lack of fondness* can help increase fan engagement as previously discussed. Further, the positive psychological consequences of *schadenfreude* and GORFing to the fan also should not be overlooked, as the loss of a rival can bring joy, and sometimes help to temper feelings of disappointment from a favorite team's loss. It is in severe instances,

¹⁵ Feelings of *schadenfreude* can be influenced by characteristics such as in-group inferiority (Leach & Spears, 2009), envy or dislike of the out-group or its members (Hareli & Weiner, 2002) and expected outcomes or prestige of the out-group (Cikara & Fiske, 2012).

¹⁶ Art Modell was owner of the Cleveland Browns when the team moved to Baltimore.

¹⁷ Individuals can experience *schadenfreude* if a non-rival group experiences failure, such as a highly successful team or personality in popular culture. In order for *schadenfreude* to activate, an individual *must* identify the group as a rival.

when fans take their derogation too far that significant issues arise. So, this perspective is not meant to label these outcomes as something that should be avoided; rather, these are things managers have to be cognizant of and monitor for the overall benefit of consumers and the organization. In other words, managers and researchers should strive to find a line or cutoff in which they engage fans by raising their interest in the product without encouraging overly negative feelings that lead to deviant or violent behavior.

Fan Deviance and Violence

Fandom allows otherwise rationale people to act and react in irrational ways (Dwyer, Greenhalgh, & LeCrom, 2015). For example, an individual is not likely to cheer seeing someone getting tackled while walking to work; however, fans do so loudly when a player from the favorite team tackles an opponent. This behavior can be enhanced when rivalry is in play as games between rivals are viewed as more violent than non-rivalry games (Raney & Kinally, 2009), and this belief and behavior is on display at many rivalry games, as shown in Table 2.3. Ledgerwood and Chaiken (2007) assert that the salience regarding group boundaries influence conflict toward out-group members. Further, social learning theory (SLT) states that individuals learn behaviors from watching others (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1961). For example, exposure to aggressive stimuli influenced children to behave aggressively toward an inanimate object. To this end, rivalries in sport, and the way they are promoted by organizations and the media (e.g., showing players and fans interacting in a negative manner), serve to heighten salience of in-groups (i.e., favorite teams), illustrate aggressive behavior, and thereby could encourage greater negativity toward out-groups (i.e., rival teams and supporters). Simple group differentiation and superiority, even imagined, is enough to cause negativity between groups (Bland, 2017), and a group believed to be in charge or of superior standing may treat the minority group in negatives ways (Smith, 2011; Zimbardo, 2008). Contemporary examples include derogatory statements about and deviant conversations between rival group members regarding consumer products on the Internet (Ewing, Wagstaff, & Powell, 2013; Phillips-Melancon &

Table 2.3 Fan deviance/violence examples around rivalry or high-profile games

<i>Team(s)</i>	<i>Incident</i>
Alabama Crimson Tide	Fan was charged with sexual indecency when he placed his genitals on a passed-out LSU Tigers fan following the 2012 college football national championship game (Simerman, 2012)
Alabama Crimson Tide	Harvey Updyke sentenced to prison for poisoning famous trees near Auburn University's campus following the Tigers winning the 2011 football national championship (Gray, 2015)
Argentine Superliga's Superclasico	A stampede of fans in 1968 killed 71 people and injured another 150 during a match between rivals River Plate and Boca Juniors, leading to many theories regarding the cause of the stampede (Coates, n.d.)
Australian Football League's West Coast	Fans cheered a player from their team that punched a rival player causing severe damage, even after the perpetrator showed remorse for his actions (Hinds, 2018)
Dallas Cowboys	With other fans and personnel presents, a Green Bay Packers supporter was assaulted by a Dallas Cowboys fan following a 2016 NFL playoff game (Healy, 2017)
Italian Serie A's Lazio	In 1979, a fan was killed after being hit in the eye by a flare shot by opposing fans from rival Roma during the Capital Derby (Fantauzzi, 2018)
Paris Saint-Germain vs. Red Star Belgrade	In 2018, UEFA charged PSG and Red Star Belgrade after rival fans clashed following a Champions League Game (UEFA charges PSG, 2018)
San Francisco Giants	Bryan Stow severely injured when he was beaten by opposing fans following a rivalry game outside the San Francisco Giants stadium (Rocha, 2015)

Dalakas, 2014; Tucker, 2017).¹⁸ Finally, recent findings assert that low self-esteem leads to out-group derogation through the amount of collective narcissism an individual experiences (Golec de Zavala et al., 2019). In other words, as an individual's self-esteem decreases, collective narcissism (i.e., my group is the best) increases, which also increases derogation toward a targeted out-group.

Even as people who follow sport are not significantly different in trait aggression from those that do not follow sport (Wann, Fahl, Erdmann, & Littleton, 1999), a wealth of research suggests that 1–2% of fans report they are *Definitely Willing* to consider the most heinous act of aggression (e.g., physical harm or murder) toward a rival if the incident were kept completely anonymous (Havard, Wann et al., 2013, 2017; Wann, Haynes, McLean, & Pullen, 2003; Wann, Peterson, Cothran, & Dykes, 1999; Wann & Waddill, 2013). While these percentages may not seem very high or alarming, looking at the conservative figure of 1% sends a stark message regarding rival fan behavior and potential risks to managers and organizations, especially considering some of the largest capacities in sport exceeding 100,000 spectators.¹⁹ Further, these statistics are important because managers want fans to be excited and bring an extra level of fun and joy to a game against a rival team. However, managers also do not want people engaging in deviant and violent actions as these can have severe repercussions for an organization and its fans.

Summary of Current Knowledge

To this point, the general knowledge and contemporary understanding regarding rivalry in sport have been presented. From SIT and the introduction of an out-group, to the consequences of rivalry and out-group indirect failure, the phenomenon plays an important role in not only the way the sport product is promoted, but also the way sport fans consume and internalize meanings of in-group and out-group membership. The focus of this perspective now moves toward a discussion of

¹⁸ Ewing, Wagstaff, & Powell (2013)—fans of Ford and Holden (GM) in Australia; Phillips-Melacnon & Dalakas (2014)—fans Apple and Android phones; Tucker (2017)—fans of *Marvel* and *DC Comics*.

¹⁹ Number of fans within a venue that have indicated willingness to consider heinous acts of aggression toward a rival team using the conservative 1% figure (Capacity/Number of Fans)—100/1; 1000/10; 10,000/100; 100,000/1000.

what managers, both researchers and practitioners, can do in order to help better understand rivalry and alleviate some of the negative consequences that accompany it.

ORGANIZATIONAL ROLE IN RIVALRY

The wording used by organizations to promote rivalry can also highlight negative behavior between groups (e.g., *Hate, War, Battle*, etc.). Two studies focused on the outcomes associated with sport managers and organizations' promotion of rivalry games. First, in the United States, where teams, organizations, and league commonly try to play up the animosity between rival teams, Havard, Wann, and Grieve (2018) found that using the word "Hate" rather than "Rivalry" to promote a rivalry increased level of out-group animosity. On the international sport stage, Berendt and Urich (2017) found that acknowledging rather than downplaying or ignoring the history of rivalry and animosity actually helped to decrease out-group derogation. These findings are interesting as sport managers on the international stage typically try to downplay rivalry matches while those in the United States try to magnify the animosity between teams.

The online activity, and boldness, of fans is further enhanced by messages and promotions such as "Hate Week." Other media avenues are also responsible for spreading these messages of animosity. For example, a popular radio talk show in an NBA market previously featured a segment labeled "Reasons to Hate (Opposing Team)," where the hosts would use the roster of a visiting team to make derogatory comments about each opponent. For most fans, these types of radio segments and skits performed at live contests are for entertainment purposes only and understand that they do not give fans the right to physically harm rival players or fans. However, the 1% discussed earlier may find justification and even encouragement in these examples as a sign the organization and affiliated groups encourage deviant and dangerous behavior. Because the Internet is so important to group member consumption and perceptions (McClung, Eveland, Sweeney, & James, 2012; Moyer, Pokrywczynski, & Griffin, 2015; Mudrick, Miller, & Atkin, 2016), it is important that organizations are aware of how their behavior toward a rival can influence fans via the online environment. Further, highly identified group members are more likely to engage in verbal and instrumental aggression toward an out-group (Wann, Carlson, & Schrader, 1999; Wann, Waddill,

Bono, Scheuchner, & Ruga, 2017), which makes it all the more important that organizations and managers show caution in the way they use online mediums, particularly when rivalry is present.

Another area where organizations have to be cognizant of their influence on fan behavior is the public displays of out-group derogation in the form of skits and promotions. For example, skits that in some way promote negativity between opposing groups, they should be aware that through their actions they are placing out-group fans in negative situations and can be held legally and financially liable for fan behavior.²⁰ Further, the finding of the Connecticut Supreme Court that gun maker Remington Outdoor could be held liable for the way they advertise their products (Gershmann & McWhirter, 2019) points to a potential shift in organizations being able to distance from the actions of consumers and bring more scrutiny to the way products and services are promoted. Other examples of organizational messaging potentially encouraging out-group deviance and violence are shown in Table 2.4. It is vitally important that organizations better understand their roles in promoting rivalry in a responsible manner, because aside from a moral obligation to provide fans with a fun and safe environment in which to consume the sport product, failing to do so can expose an organization to outcomes that inhibit consumption of their product.²¹

Organizations must have to be aware of their responsibilities regarding rivalry and fan behavior. For example, if two get into a fight regarding a rivalry game, especially in or around their facility, and one fan suggests the organization promoted this negative behavior, managers are going to try and distance the organization from the behavior (e.g., we don't condone that behavior). This stance becomes difficult when organizations use skits,

²⁰A common example is a *fan* (employee of the home team) acting obnoxiously to the jeers of the home crowd, then getting covered in silly string or confetti, possibly even subjected to physical aggression to the enjoyment and cheering of the crowd.

²¹If a physical altercation between fans occurs at a game, organizations can be negatively impacted in three ways. First, possible legal ramifications warrant attention. For instance, if someone involved in the altercation is injured, the organization can be held liable for events occurring on their property (e.g., Bryan Stow). Second, other fans may choose to decrease their consumption of the sport product, which in turn leads to a loss of fan engagement and revenue. Finally, an individual could influence the consumption of other potential consumers through negative word of mouth (Huete-Alcocer, 2017; Lau, 2001; Litvin, Goldsmith, & Pan, 2008).

Table 2.4 Organizational messaging that potentially promotes Fan deviance and violence

<i>Team(s)</i>	<i>Message/Promotion</i>
Memphis Grizzlies (NBA)	Grizz, the mascot of the Memphis Grizzlies body, slammed a faux San Antonio Spurs mascot during a timeout in the 2015 league playoffs to excite the home crowd (Diaz, 2016) ^a
Memphis Grizzlies (NBA)	A promotional giveaway for a game against the Los Angeles Clippers was a pair of flip flops, playing on the <i>Los Angeles Floppers</i> moniker popular among rival team fans at the time ^b
Fox Sports 1 (College Football)	Ran an advertisement for the 2017 college football season that glamorized the animosity and negative behavior between rival teams, players, and fans, using words such as <i>hate</i> and <i>enemy</i> to describe rival teams (Fox's Big Ten, 2017) ^c
University of Missouri/University of Arkansas	To promote their new rivalry in the Southeastern Conference, administrators used the name <i>Battle Line</i> rivalry to excite fans (Livingston, 2015)

^aVideo this skit can be viewed at <https://www.sbnation.com/lookit/2016/4/23/11493186/grizzlies-mascot-jumps-off-a-ladder-and-flattens-a-spurs-mascot>

^b*NOTE* when Chris Paul played for the Clippers, the two teams built a heated, and sometimes deviant rivalry. Further Paul and the team had a reputation of “flopping” during games in order to get favorable calls

^cLink for College Football on FOX and FS1: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=QLWm77g2zAg>

phrases, or promotional messages that include negative wording or otherwise increase out-group animosity. The messaging used by organizations play a role in promoting positive or negative fan perceptions and behavior toward a rival team and their supporters. On the other hand, sport organization employing practices meant to illicit positive feelings, and decrease negative feelings, between out-groups would be correct in asserting they do not condone deviant or violent behavior. Replicating the findings of Havard, Wann et al. (2018) regarding promotional messaging and further testing using secondary and primary field data would help validate these practices.

REFERENCES

- Aden, R. C. (2008). *Huskerville: A story of Nebraska football, fans, and the power of place*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland and Company Inc.
- Angell, R. J., Gorton, M., Bottomley, P., & White, J. (2016). Understanding fans' responses to the sponsorship of a rival team. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 16(2), 190–213. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2015.1135975>.
- Ashmore, R. D., Deaux, K., & McLaughlin-Volpe, T. (2004). An organizing framework for collective identity: Articulation and significance of multidimensionality. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(1), 80–114. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.130.1.80>.
- Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 8(2), 80–114.
- Bandura, A., Ross, D., & Ross, S. A. (1961). Transmission of aggression through imitation of aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 63, 575–582.
- Bee, C., & Dalakas, V. (2013). Rivalries and sponsor affiliation: Examining the effects of social identity and argument strength on responses to sponsorship-related advertising messages. *Journal of Marketing Communications*, 21(6), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527266.2013.828768>.
- Bee, C., King, J., & Stornelli, J. (2019). Are you with us or against us? *The role of threat and anger in sport sponsorships*. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.02.048>.
- Berendt, J., & Uhrich, S. (2016). Enemies with benefits: The dual role of rivalry in shaping sport fans' identity. *European Sport Management Quarterly*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2016.1188842>.
- Berendt, J., & Uhrich, S. (2017). Acknowledging versus ignoring the identity-relevance of rivalry: Why endorsing dual identities decreases spectator aggression and downplaying makes things worse. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 2(1), 1–24.
- Berendt, J., Uhrich, S., & Thompson, S. A. (2018). Marketing, get ready to rumble: How rivalry promotes distinctiveness for brands and consumers. *Journal of Business Research*, 88, 161–172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2018.03.015>.
- Bernache-Assollant, I., Chantal, Y., Bouchet, P., & Kada, F. (2018). On predicting the relationship between team identification and supporters' post-game identity management strategies: The mediating roles of pride and shame. *Current Psychology*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-018-9927-2>.
- Berndsen, M., & Feather, N. T. (2016). Reflecting on schadenfreude: Serious consequences of a misfortune for which one is not responsible diminish previously expressed schadenfreude; the role of immorality appraisals and more emotions. *Motivation and Emotion*, 40. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-016-9580-8>.

- Berndsen, M., Tiggemann, M., & Chapman, S. (2017). “It wasn’t your fault, but.....”: Schadenfreude about an undeserved misfortune. *Motivation and Emotion*, 41(6). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-017-9639-1>.
- Blakely, J., Watson-Currie, E., Shin, H., Valenti, T., Saucier, C., & Boisvert, H. (2019). Are you what you watch? Tracking the political divide through TV preferences. *Media Impact Project Report from Norman Lear Center, USC Annenberg*.
- Bland, K. (2017). Blue eyes, brown eyes: What Jane Elliott’s famous experiment says about race 50 years on. *The Republic*. Retrieved from: <https://www.azcentral.com/story/news/local/karinabland/2017/11/17/blue-eyes-brown-eyes-jane-elliotts-exercise-race-50-years-later/860287001/>.
- Brambilla, M., & Riva, P. (2017). Self-image and schadenfreude: Pleasure at others’ misfortune enhances satisfaction of basic human needs. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 47, 399–411. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2229>.
- Branscombe, N. R., & Wann, D. L. (1991). The positive social and self concept consequences of sports team identification. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 15(2), 115–127. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019372359101500202>.
- Brown-Devlin, N., Devlin, M. B., & Vaughn, P. W. (2017). Why fans act that way: Using individual personality to predict BIRGing and CORFing behaviors. *Communication & Sport*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2167479517725011>.
- Bruneau, E. G., & Saxe, R. (2010). Attitudes towards the outgroup are predicted by activity in the precuneus in Arabs and Israelis. *NeuroImage*, 52, 1704–1711. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuroimage.2010.05.057>.
- Cialdini, R. B., Borden, R. J., Thorne, A., Walker, M. R., Freeman, S., & Sloan, L. R. (1976). Basking in reflected glory: Three (football) field studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 366–375.
- Cialdini, R. B., & Richardson, K. D. (1980). Two indirect tactics of impression management: Basking and blasting. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 406–415.
- Cikara, M., Botnick, M. M., & Fiske, S. T. (2011). Us versus them: Social identity shaped neural responses to intergroup competition and harm. *Psychological Science*, 22, 306–313. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610397667>.
- Cikara, M., & Fiske, S. T. (2012). Stereotypes and schadenfreude: Affective and physiological markers of pleasure at outgroup misfortunes. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3, 63–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550611409245>.
- Coates, P. (n.d.). River vs. Boca ’68: The tragedy of La Puerta 12. *The Football Pink*. Retrieved from: <https://thefootballpink.com/posts/2018/10/19/river-vs-boca-68-the-tragedy-of-la-puerta-12>.

- Cobbs, J., Sparks, D., & Tyler, B. D. (2017). Comparing rivalry effects across professional sports: National Football League fans exhibit most animosity. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 26(4), 235–246.
- Converse, B. A., & Reinhard, D. A. (2016). On rivalry and goal pursuit: Shared competitive history, legacy concerns, and strategy selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 110(2), 191–213. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000038>.
- Cooper, J. (2017). Photo: Auburn fans roll Toomer's Corner after Alabama loses to Clemson. *Saturday Down South*. Retrieved from: <https://www.saturdaydownsouth.com/auburn-football/photo-auburn-fans-roll-toomers-corner-alabama-loses-clemson/>.
- Crocker, J., & Luhtanen, R. (1990). Collective self-esteem and ingroup bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58(1), 60–67. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.58.1.60>.
- Crocker, J., & Park, L. E. (2004). The costly pursuit of self-esteem. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130(3), 392–414. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.130.3.392>.
- Dalakas, V., & Levin, A. M. (2005). The balance theory domino: How sponsorship may elicit negative consumer attitudes. *Advances in Consumer Research*, 32, 91–97.
- Dalakas, V., & Melancon, J. P. (2012). Fan identification, schadenfreude toward hated rivals, and the mediating effects of Importance of Winning Index (IWIN). *Journal of Services Marketing*, 26, 51–59. <https://doi.org/10.1108/08876041211199724>.
- Dalakas, V., Melancon, J. P., & Sreboth, T. (2015). A qualitative inquiry on schadenfreude by sport fans. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 38(2), 161–179.
- Davies, F., Veloutsou, C., & Costa, A. (2006). Investigating the influence of a joint sponsorship of rival team on supporter attitudes and brand preferences. *Journal of Marketing Communication*, 12(1), 31–48.
- Deci, E. L. (1975). *Intrinsic motivation*. New York: Plenum.
- Delia, E. B. (2015). The exclusiveness of group identity in celebrations of team success. *Sport Management Review*, 18, 396–406. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2014.10.006>.
- Devlin, M. B., & Brown-Devlin, N. (2017). Using personality and team identity to predict sports media consumption. *International Journal of Sport Communication*, 10, 371–392. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ijsc.2017-0050>.
- Diaz, H. (2016, April 23). Grizzlies mascot jumps off a ladder and flattens a Spurs mascot through a table. *SBNation*. Retrieved from: <https://www.sbnation.com/lookit/2016/4/23/11493186/grizzlies-mascot-jumps-off-a-ladder-and-flattens-a-spurs-mascot>.

- Dwyer, B., Greenhalgh, G. P., & LeCrom, C. W. (2015). Exploring fan behavior: Developing a scale to measure sport eFANgelism. *Journal of Sport Management*, 29, 642–656. <https://doi.org/10.1123/JSM.2014-0201>.
- Elsbach, K. D., & Bhattacharya, C. B. (2001). Defining who you are by what you're not: Organizational disidentification and the National Rifle Association. *Organization Science*, 12(4), 393–413.
- Ewing, M. T., Wagstaff, P. E., & Powell, I. H. (2013). Brand rivalry and community conflict. *Journal of Business Research*, 66, 4–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2011.07.017>.
- Fantauzzi, M. A. (2018, May 1). Vincenzo Paparelli: Death in the terrace. *The Laziali*. Retrieved from: <https://thelaziali.com/2018/05/01/vincenzo-paparelli-death-in-the-terrace/>.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A theory of social comparison processes. *Human Relations*, 7, 117–140.
- Fox's Big Ten football team promos, ranked by how murderous they are. 2017. *Cleveland.com*. Retrieved from: https://www.cleveland.com/osu/2017/08/foxs_big_ten_football_team_pro.html.
- Funk, D. C. (2008). *Consumer behavior for sports and sporting events: Marketing action*. Oxford, UK: Elsevier.
- Gershman, J., & McWhirter, C. (2019, March 14). Manufacturer of AR-15 can be sued over Sandy Hook Massacre, court rules. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved from: <https://www.wsj.com/articles/manufacturer-of-ar-15-can-be-sued-over-sandy-hook-massacre-court-rules-11552579520>.
- Golec de Zavala, A., Fererico, C. M., Sedikides, C., Guerra, R. Lantos, D., Mrozinski, B., Cyprianska-Nezlek, M., & Baran, T. (2019). Low self-esteem predicts out-group derogation via collective narcissism, but this relationship is obscured by in-group satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* (Forthcoming). <https://www.apa.org/pubs/journals/psp/index>.
- Gray, J. (2015, November 27). Harvey Updyke poisoned Toomer's Corner oaks 5 years ago. *AL.com*. Retrieved from: https://www.al.com/news/index.ssf/2015/11/harvey_updyke_poisoned_toomers.html.
- Hareli, S., & Weiner, B. (2002). Dislike and envy as antecedents of pleasure at another's misfortune. *Motivation and Emotion*, 26(4), 257–277. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A%3A1022818803399>.
- Havard, C. T. (2014). Glory Out of Reflected Failure: The examination of how rivalry affects sport fans. *Sport Management Review*, 17, 243–253. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2013.09.002>.
- Havard, C. T., & Eddy, T. (2013). Qualitative assessment of rivalry and conference realignment in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Issues in Intercollegiate Athletics*, 6, 216–235.

- Havard, C. T., & Eddy, T. (2019). The impact of negative media stories on fan perceptions and behavior toward rival teams. *International Journal of Sport Management, 20*, 150–170.
- Havard, C. T., Ferrucci, P., & Ryan, T. D. (2019). Does messaging matter? Investigating the influence of media headlines on perceptions and attitudes of the in-group and out-group. *Journal of Marketing Communications*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13527266.2019.1620838>.
- Havard, C. T., Gray, D. P., Gould, J., Sharp, L. A., & Schaffer, J. J. (2013). Development and validation of the Sport Rivalry Fan Perception Scale (SREPS). *Journal of Sport Behavior, 36*, 45–65.
- Havard, C. T., Inoue, Y., & Ryan, T. D. (2018). Celebrating out-group failure: Investigating the presence of Glory Out of Reflected Failure (GORFing) against rivalry teams. *Journal of Cultural Marketing Strategy, 3*(2), 172–183.
- Havard, C. T., & Reams, L. (2016). Investigating differences in fan rival perceptions between conferences in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 39*, 126–146.
- Havard, C. T., & Reams, L. (2018). Examining differences among primary and secondary rivals: Are fan perceptions, behavioral, and consumption intentions influenced by degree of rivalry? *Journal of Applied Marketing Theory, 8*(1), 28–38.
- Havard, C. T., Reams, L., & Gray, D. P. (2013). Perceptions of highly identified fans regarding rival teams in United States intercollegiate football and men's basketball. *International Journal of Sport Management and Marketing, 14*, 116–132.
- Havard, C. T., Ryan, T. D., & Workman, S. S. (2019). Out-group treatment in higher education: Using rivalry to allow student comparison of in-group and out-group members in NCAA competition divisions. In C. Havard (Ed.), *Understanding rivalry and its influence on sports fans* (pp. 66–86). Hershey, PA: IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-5225-8125-3.ch.003>.
- Havard, C. T., Shapiro, S. L., & Ridinger, L. L. (2016). Who's our rival? Investigating the influence of a new intercollegiate football program on rivalry perceptions. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 39*, 385–408.
- Havard, C. T., Wann, D. L., & Grieve, F. G. (2018). Rivalry versus hate: Measuring the influence of promotional titles and logos on fans. *Journal of Applied Sport Management, 10*(2), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.18666/JASM-2018-V10-I2-8535>.
- Havard, C. T., Wann, D. L., & Ryan, T. D. (2013). Investigating the impact of conference realignment on rivalry in intercollegiate athletics. *Sport Marketing Quarterly, 22*(4), 224–234.
- Havard, C. T., Wann, D. L., & Ryan, T. D. (2017). Reinvestigating the impact of conference realignment on rivalry in intercollegiate athletics. *Journal of Applied Sport Management, 9*, 25–36. <https://doi.org/10.18666?JASM-2017-V9-I2-8029>.

- Havard, C. T., Wann, D. L., & Ryan, T. D. (2018). I love to see them lose: Investigating fan perceptions and behaviors toward rival teams. In C. L. Wang's (Ed.), *Exploring the Rise of Fandom in Contemporary Consumer Culture*. IGI Global: Hershey, PA.
- Healy, J. (2017, January 15). Cowboys fan brawls with Packers fans at AT&T Stadium following playoff loss. *New York Daily News*. Retrieved from: <http://www.nydailynews.com/sports/football/cowboys-fan-brawls-packers-fan-t-stadium-loss-article-1.2947187#>.
- Heider, F. (1958). *The psychology of interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1037/10628-000>.
- Hein, G., Silani, G., Preuschoff, K., Batson, C. D., & Singer, T. (2010). Neural responses to in-group and outgroup members' suffering predict individual differences in costly helping. *Neuron*, 68, 149–160. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neuron.2010.09.003>.
- Hildreth, J. A. D., & Anderson, C. (2018). Does loyalty trump honesty? Moral judgement of loyalty-driven deceit. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 79, 87–94. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2018.06.001>.
- Hillman, C. H., Cuthbert, B. N., Bradely, M. M., & Lang, P. J. (2004). Motivated engagement to appetitive and aversive fanship cues: Psychophysiological responses to rival sport fans. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, 26, 338–351.
- Hinds, R. (2018, August 5). Adulation for Andrew Gaff after attack on Andrew Brayshaw affirms AFL's need for red card rule. *ABC News*. Retrieved from: <http://www.abc.net.au/news/2018-08-06/was-gaffs-attack-on-brayshaw-proof-afl-needs-red-card-rule/10076052>.
- Hobson, N. M., & Inzlicht, M. (2016). The mere presence of an outgroup member disrupts the brain's feedback-monitoring system. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, 11(11). <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsw082>.
- Huete-Alcocer, N. (2017). A literature review of word of mouth and electronic word of mouth: Implications for consumer behaviour. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 1256. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.01256>.
- Kilduff, G. J. (2014). Driven to win: Rivalry, motivation, and performance. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 5, 944–952.
- Kilduff, G. J., Elfenbein, H. A., & Staw, B. M. (2010). The psychology of rivalry: A relationally dependent analysis of competition. *Academy of Management Journal*, 53, 943–969. <https://doi.org/10.5465/AMJ.2010.54533171>.
- Kilduff, G. J., Galinsky, A. D., Gallo, E., & Reade, J. J. (2016). Whatever it takes to win: Rivalry increases unethical behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 59(5), 1508–1534. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2014.0545>.
- Kimble, C. E., & Cooper, B. P. (1992). Association and dissociation by football fans. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 75, 303–309. <https://doi.org/10.2466/PMS.75.4.303-309>.

- King, D. R. (2014). Managing the dark side of competitive rivalry. *Graziadio Business Review*, 17(2). Retrieved from <https://gbr.pepperdine.edu/2014/10/managing-the-datk-side-of-competitive-rivalry>.
- Kohan, R. (2017). *The arena: Inside the tailgating, ticket-scalping, mascot-racing, dubiously funded, and possibly haunted monuments of America sport*. New York, NY: Liveright Publishing.
- Kwak, D. H., Kwon, Y., & Lim, C. (2015). Licensing a sports brand: Effects of team brand cue, identification, and performance priming on multidimensional values and purchase intentions. *Journal of Product and Brand Management*, 24(3), 198–210. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JPBM-05-2014-0579>.
- Lau, G. T. (2001). Individual and situational factors influencing negative word-of-mouth behaviour. *Canadian Journal of Administration Science*, 18, 163–178. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1936-4490.2001.tb00253.x>.
- Leach, C. W., & Spears, R. (2009). Dejection at in-group defeat and schadenfreude toward second-and third-party out-groups. *Emotion*, 9, 659–665.
- Leach, C. W., Spears, R., Branscombe, N. R., & Doosje, B. (2003). Malicious pleasure: Schadenfreude at the suffering of another group. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 932–943.
- Leach, C. W., van Zomeren, M., Zebel, S., Vliek, M. L. K., Ouwerkerk, J. W., & Spears, R. (2008). Group-level self-definition and self-improvement: A hierarchical (multicomponent) model of in-group identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95, 144–165. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.144>.
- Ledgerwood, A., & Chaiken, S. (2007). Priming us and them: Automatic assimilation and contrast in group attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 940–956. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.93.6.940>.
- Lee, M. (1985). From rivalry to hostility among sport fans. *Quest*, 37(1), 38–49.
- Leetaru, K. (2018, July 19). Is social media becoming to toxic? *Forbes*. Retrieved from: <https://www.forbes.com/sites/kalevleetaru/2018/07/19/is-social-media-becoming-too-toxic/#1d58024d4f0c>.
- Levine, M., Prosser, A., Evans, D., & Reicher, S. (2005). Identity and emergency intervention: How social group membership and inclusiveness of group boundaries shape helping behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 343–353. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271651>.
- Litvin, S. W., Goldsmith, R. E., & Pan, B. (2008). Electronic word-of-mouth in hospitality and tourism management. *Tourism Management*, 29, 458–468. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2007.05.011>.
- Livingston, W. (2015, March 20). Tiger kickoff: The battle line: Manufacturing a rivalry. *Columbian Missourian*. Retrieved from: https://www.columbianmissourian.com/sports/tiger-kickoff-the-battle-line-manufacturing-a-rivalry/article_3d1a156a-c71b-5975-9db4-09a21b225d92.html.

- Maass, A., Salvi, D., Arcuri, L., & Semin, G. (1989). Language use in intergroup contexts: The linguistic intergroup bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 981–993. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-5314.57.6.891>.
- MacDonald, K., Schug, M., Chase, E., & Barth, H. (2013). My people, right or wrong? Minimal group membership disrupts preschoolers' selective trust. *Cognitive Development*, 28, 247–259. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cogdev.2012.11.001>.
- Madrigal, R. (1995). Cognitive and affective determinants of fan satisfaction with sporting event attendance. *Journal of Leisure Research*, 27(3), 205–227.
- Mahony, D. F., & Howard, D. R. (1998). The impact of attitudes on the behavioral intentions of sport spectators. *International Sports Journal*, 2, 96–110.
- Mahony, D. F., & Moorman, A. M. (1999). The impact of fan attitudes on intentions to watch professional basketball teams on television. *Sport Management Review*, 2, 43–66. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523\(99\)70089-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1441-3523(99)70089-6).
- McClung, S., Eveland, V., Sweeney, D., & James, J. D. (2012). Role of the internet site in the promotion management of sports teams and franchise brands. *Journal of Promotion Management*, 18(2), 169–188. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10496491.2012.668429>.
- Moyer, C., Pokryeczynski, J., & Griffin, R. (2015). The relationship of fans' sports-team identification and Facebook usage to purchase of team products. *Journal of Sports Media*, 10(1), 31–49. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jsm.2015.0001>.
- Mudrick, M., Miller, M. J., & Atkin, D. (2016). The influence of social media on fan reactionary behaviors. *Telematics and Informatics*, 33(4). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2016.01.005>.
- Mullin, B., Hardy, S., & Sutton, W. (2014). *Sport marketing* (4th ed.). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Nelson, S. (2014, April 9). Why don't we talk anymore? *Huffington Post*. Retrieved from: https://www.huffpost.com/entry/when-did-texting-replace_b_5105265.
- Nichols, Cobbs, & Raska, D. (2016). Featuring the hometown team in cause-related sports marketing: A cautionary tale for league-wide advertising campaigns. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 25(2), 212–226.
- Noel, J. G., Wann, D. L., & Branscombe, N. R. (1995). Peripheral ingroup membership status and public negativity toward outgroups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(1), 127–137. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.68.1.127>.
- Partridge, J. A., & Wann, D. L. (2015). Exploring the shame coping experiences of youth sport parents. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 38(3), 288–305.

- Phillips-Melancon, J., & Dalakas, V. (2014). Brand rivalry and consumers' schadenfreude: The case of Apple. *Services Marketing Quarterly*, 35, 173–186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15332969.2014.885370>.
- Raney, A. A., & Kinally, W. (2009). Examining perceived violence in and enjoyment of televised rivalry sports contests. *Mass Communication and Society*, 12(3), 311–331.
- Rocha, V. (2015, May 7). Bryan Stow attacker will serve another three years in prison. *Los Angeles Times*. Retrieved from: <http://www.latimes.com/local/lanow/la-me-ln-stow-attacker-letter-20150507-story.html#>.
- Rubin, M., & Hewstone, M. (1998). Social identity theory's self-esteem hypothesis: A review and some suggestions for clarification. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 2, 40–62.
- Sanford, K., & Scott, F. (2016). Assessing the intensity of sport rivalries using data from secondary market transactions. *Journal of Sports Economics*, 17(2), 159–174. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1527002514527112>.
- Sherif, M. (1966). *In common predicament*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Co.
- Sherif, M., Harvey, O. J., White, B. J., Hood, W. R., & Sherif, C. W. (1961). *Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The Robber's cave experiment*. Norman, OK: The University of Oklahoma.
- Simerman, J. (2012, October 2). Alabama fan aggress to 11th-hour plea in LSU assault case. *The Times-Picayune*. Retrieved from: https://www.nola.com/crime/index.ssf/2012/10/alabama_fan_agrees_to_11th_hou.html.
- Smith, D. L. (2011). *Less than human*. New York: St. Marten's.
- Smith, R. A., & Schwartz, N. (2003). Language, social comparison, and college football: Is your school less similar to the rival school than the rival school is to your school? *Communication Monographs*, 70, 351–360. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0363775032000179142>.
- Snyder, C. R., & Fromkin, H. L. (1980). *Uniqueness: The human pursuit of difference*. New York: Plenum.
- Snyder, C. R., Lassegard, M., & Ford, C. E. (1986). Distancing after group success and failure: Basking in reflected glory and cutting off reflected failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(2), 382–388. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.51.382>.
- Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behavior. *Social Science Information*, 13(2), 65–93. <https://doi.org/10.1177/053901847401300204>.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press Inc.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). *Human groups and social categories: Studies in social psychology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 33–48). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Inc.

- Toma, J. D. (2003). *Football U. Spectator sports in the life of the American University*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.
- Tucker, R. (2017). *Sluggfest: Inside the epic 50-year battle between Marvel and DC*. New York, NY: De Capo Press.
- Turner, J. C. (1975). Social comparison and social *identity*: Some prospects for intergroup behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 5, 5–34. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420050102>.
- Tyler, B. D., & Cobbs, J. B. (2015). Rival conceptions of rivalry: Why some competitions mean more than others. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 15(2), 227–248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2015.1010558>.
- Tyler, B. D., & Cobbs, J. (2017). All rivals are not equal: Clarifying misrepresentations and discerning three core properties of rivalry. *Journal of Sport Management*, 31(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1123/jsm.2015-0371>.
- Tyler, B. D., Morehead, C. A., Cobbs, J., & DeSchriver, D. (2017). What is rivalry? Old and new approaches to specifying rivalry in demand estimations of spectator sports. *Sport Marketing Quarterly*, 26(4), 204–222.
- UEFA charges PSG, Red Star Belgrade for fan violence at game. 2018. *USA Today*. Retrieved from: <https://www.usatoday.com/story/sports/soccer/2018/10/04/uefa-charges-psg-red-star-belgrade-for-fan-violence-at-game/38042669/>.
- Vanman, E. J. (2016). The role of empathy in intergroup relations. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 11, 59–63. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copysc.2016.06.007>.
- Vohs, K. D., & Heatherton, T. F. (2001). Self-esteem and threats to self: Implications for self-construal and interpersonal perceptions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 81(6), 1103–1118. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.6.1103>.
- Wann, D. L. (1995). Preliminary validation of the sport fan motivation scale. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, 19, 377–396. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019372395019004004>.
- Wann, D. L. (2006a). Understanding the positive social psychological benefits of sport identification: The team identification-social psychological health model. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 10(4), 272–296. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.10.4.272>.
- Wann, D. L. (2006b). Understanding the positive social psychological benefits of sport identification: The team identification-social psychological health model. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 10, 272–296. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1089-2699.10.4.272>.
- Wann, D. L., Brame, E., Clarkson, M., Brooks, D., & Waddill, P. J. (2008). College student attendance at sporting events and the relationship between sport team identification and social psychological health. *Journal of Intercollegiate Sports*, 1, 242–254.

- Wann, D. L., & Branscombe, N. R. (1990). Die-hard and fair-weather fans: Effects of identification of BIRGing and CORGing tendencies. *Journal of Sport and Social Issues, 14*, 103–117. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019372359001400203>.
- Wann, D. L., Carlson, J. D., Schrader, M. P. (1999). The impact of team identification on the hostile and instrumental verbal aggression of sport spectators. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 14*(2), 279–286.
- Wann, D. L., Fahl, C. L., Erdmann, J. B., & Littleton, J. D. (1999). Relationship between identification with the role of sport fan and trait aggression. *Perceptual and Motor Skills, 88*, 1296–1298. <https://doi.org/10.2466/PMS.88.3.1296-1298>.
- Wann, D. L., Havard, C. T., Grieve, F. G., Lanter, J. R., Partridge, J. A., & Zapalac, R. K. (2016). Investigating sport rivals: Number, evaluations, and relationship with team identification. *Journal of Fandom Studies, 4*.
- Wann, D. L., Haynes, G., McLean, B., & Pullen, P. (2003). Sport team identification and willingness to consider anonymous acts of hostile aggression. *Aggressive Behavior, 29*, 406–413. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.10046>.
- Wann, D. L., Melnick, M. J., Russell, G. W., & Pease, D. G. (2001). *Sport fans: The psychology and social impact of spectators*. New York, NY: Routledge Press.
- Wann, D. L., Peterson, R. R., Cothran, C., & Dykes, M. (1999). Sport fan aggression and anonymity: The importance of team identification. *Social Behavior and Personality, 27*(6), 567–602. <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.1999.27.6.597>.
- Wann, D. L., & Waddill, P. J. (2013). Predicting sport fans' willingness to consider anonymous acts of aggression: Importance of team identification and fan dysfunction. In C. Mohiyeddini (Ed.), *Contemporary topics and trends in the psychology of sports*. Nova: Hauppauge, NY.
- Wann, D. L., Waddill, P. J., Bono, D., Scheuchner, H., & Ruga, K. (2017). Sport spectator verbal aggression: The impact of team identification and fan dysfunction on fans' abuse of opponents and officials. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 25*(4).
- Wenger, J. L., & Brown, R. O. (2014). Sport fans: Evaluating the consistency between implicit and explicit attitudes toward favorite and rival teams. *Psychological Reports: Mental & Physical Health, 114*, 572–584.
- Westen, D., Blagov, P. S., Harenski, K., Kilts, C., & Hamann, S. (2006). Neural bases of motivated reasoning: An fMRI study of emotional constraints on partisan political judgement in the 2004 U.S. Presidential Election. *Journal of Cognitive Neuroscience, 18*(11), 1947–1958.
- Zillmann, D., Bryant, J., & Sapolsky, B. (1989). Enjoyment from sports spectatorship. In J. Goldstein (Ed.), *Sports, games, and play: Social and psychological viewpoints* (2nd ed., pp. 241–278). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

- Zillmann, D., & Cantor, J. R. (1976). A disposition theory of humor and mirth. In T. Chapman & H. Foot (Eds.), *Humor and laughter: Theory, research, and application* (pp. 93–115). London: Wiley.
- Zimbardo, P. (2008). *The Lucifer effect: Understanding how good people turn bad*. New York: Random House.