



The Justice of the Grand Slam Tennis Tournaments on the Basis of Draw, Competition Format System and Final Result: a Case Study of the US Open 2017 Men's Singles Tournament

Authors' contribution:

- A) conception and design of the study
- B) acquisition of data
- C) analysis and interpretation of data
- D) manuscript preparation
- E) obtaining funding

Róbert G. Zimányi ^{A-E}, Gábor Géczi ^{A,C,E}

University of Physical Education, Hungary

ABSTRACT

The tennis Grand Slam tournaments play a key role among the major sport events. Sport has also got a social interest to strive for justice. Is the main draw always fair? Is the competition format system right? Overall: can we achieve a just final result? When answering these questions, we need to focus on the telos of the sport event. Present study shows the relating theories of justice and examines them in connection with the US Open: from the evolutionist conception, through Aristotle's excellence-based justice theory, to egalitarianism, meritocracy, equity and it also analyses some issues around positive discrimination. The study examines the justice theories of the US Open 2017 Men's Singles Tournament's with special focus on the draw, the competition format system and the final result. An important point: we can only talk about justice if it is consistent with the telos of the event – this is an exclusion criterion. In addition to the systematic processing of justice theories, the research is based on the International Tennis Federation's (ITF) official documents and on the case study: the official competition regulation and final result of the US Open 2017 Tournament. As an outcome of the research, we can conclude that several theories of justice appear in accordance with the telos of the US Open 2017 Tournament. Each element, namely the draw, the competition format system and the final result can be fair, however, they all depend on the applied theory of justice. Which theories should be applied in certain cases and why? The research also confirms that certain theories of justice do not match the telos of the US Open Grand Slam Tournament. These theories cannot be applied in certain cases. For future search areas we can examine other justice theories, or other related tennis event's justice.

KEYWORDS

telos, justice, US Open, draw, final result

Explanation of topic choice: the US Open

Prelude: the justice related to the competitor's list and the seeds of the US Open 2017 were analyzed in a previous study (Zimányi & Géczi, 2018b). Further considering the question of justice, in the present study it is

extended to the draw, to the competition format system and to the determination of the final result. The starting point is still the competition regulation (rulebook) to which the competitors (and their teams as well as the national tennis federations) have to adapt. The *raison d'être* of justice theories are examined in this respect – which will answer the examined questions.

Today's major sport events, especially the Grand Slam tennis tournaments are given significant attention – since they can be monitored through various media channels (even live stream) worldwide. Tennis events, especially the tennis Grand Slam tournaments (Australian Open, Roland Garros, Wimbledon, US Open) including the US Open, are major sport events. These events are attended by a wide range of people, alongside competent ones, so making the whole range of these events pretty large social ones. In the US Open Men's Singles Tournament (in the following: US Open) anyone can represent himself who is entitled to the participate. The organizers strive every year to manage quality competitions. This study understands quality in a less known and applied way, approaching a new perspective: justice – that Aristotle called the 'supreme virtue' (Aristotle, 2011). We believe that this aspect of justice will also become a quality aspect – not only in the sports, but also in other social subsystems.

For the US Open organizers the issue of the justice is equally important, as in other areas of life. How can be the draw fair? What does fair competition format system mean? Is every final result fair? How to adapt to a straight-line relegation system (main draw), where no mistake can be made¹? The study aims an (among other things) to provide professional answers to these questions. To answer, we collected and examined justice theories. In addition, we analyzed the US Open 2017 Men's Singles Tournament: the official competition regulations, since these terms starts every competition), and on the basis of later achievements and final result.

Introduction: the common telos of the competitive sport and of the US Open

Sport events can be grouped and analyzed differently: according to the analogy of sport clubs, we can distinguish competitive, leisure and corporate sport clubs, sport activities and sport events (Zimányi & Vermes, 2016). The Grand Slam tennis tournaments are definitely considered competitive sport events so we analyze these world events accordingly. It is important to mention that the study focuses on the main draw. We exclusively deal with the examination of the qualification, where it is justified and relevant to the rest of the study, or it needs an explanation.

To determine the telos of the US Open, firstly we need to clarify the essence of the Grand Slam tennis tournaments. In one year, four Grand Slam tennis tournaments are organized and these tournaments give the most world ranking points. One (the last/fourth) Grand Slam tennis tournament is the US Open, where increasing number of events are held year-by-year. This research presents the Men's Singles Tournament in detail (<http://www.atpworldtour.com/en/tournaments/us-open>). If we wish to explore the telos of the US Open, first of all we have to define the term of telos. For the term of telos, we first find it at Aristotle, who claims that we need to find the goal, the essential nature (Aristotle, 2011). Accordingly, what can be the purpose, the essence of the US Open, that is: its telos? Since it is about competition, it is also necessary to comply with the telos of the competitive sport. Meanwhile, we mean the following thesis drop (acceptable to science and to the general public as well): while respecting the normative values of sport² (Simon, Torres & Hager, 2015), to win a competition under 'equal initial conditions'; defeat all opponents and so to be the best. This is the US Open championship title, and if all previous conditions are met, then within the competitive sport, in addition to the telos of Grand Slam, the telos of US Open also prevails. However, are all the wins and US Open championship titles fair and just? Is the draw fair? What do we think: is the competition format system fair? Always and in all circumstances, is a just final result born? The answer is: yes, but only if the prerequisite is met, in this case the

¹ If we loose, we defeat and can not continue the tournament.

² Values not analyzed in this study.

telos of the US Open. However, to better understand the truth, it is also necessary to examine various theories of justice.

General theories of justice – especially at US Open

What does the notion of justice mean? The answer is: divide the available resources in the right way, that is, as we deserve it (Sandel, 2009). However, the question arises: what do we deserve and why? It is important in the future in terms of interpretation to approach the question from a moral point of view. Here are some of the theories of justice, which can play a role in the US Open. With regards to the scope of the study, not all possible justice theories are analyzed and we are not analyzing it in every detail according to the needs of completeness since the study focuses on justice in the US Open. Thus, after listing the selected theories of justice, the relevant aspects of justice theories have to be analyzed and explained.

Evolutionary justice can be interpreted as the adaptation of the evolutionary theory to justice. Therefore, adaptation to external and internal conditions is of primary importance (Darwin, 2015). In adaptation such as a tennis tournament, at the US Open we have to define the tactics in a way, that we have an influencing role during the match. That is: we can always win over our next opponent. By Aristotle, the justice appears, as a ‘supreme virtue’. The basis of the Aristotelian justice (and discrimination) can be the excellence. By Aristotle, justice can be interpreted as a cardinal virtue: give the people what they deserve, and it can be determined on the basis of excellence – so the ‘others’ will be in the best position as well (Aristotle, 2011). According to egalitarianism, equality must be sought, i.e. ‘everyone is equal’ – no one can be distinguished from anyone else by any criterion. Everyone should be treated equally, according to this theory, ‘everyone deserves the same’. The meritocracy, on the contrary represents an achievements-, and justice-based system. Therefore, on the basis of the achieved results such as the world ranking, it is possible to distinguish individuals and groups. So who perform better and their results are measurably better, or have a better world ranking position), they will give priority and advantages against the others based on this theory of justice (Sandel, 2009).

Positive discrimination can also be a justice aspect. According to this theory, we can positively distinguish someone. But who are the ones to distinguish, and based on what? How can this system be accepted as fair? In addition to the ‘Sandel principles’ (promoting diversity, compensating past sins, and correcting preconceptions; Sandel, 2009) at the area of sports (including tennis competitions), the prioritizing and supporting of ‘home players has been used several times. It can be the basis of the positive discrimination’s justice. The positive discrimination theory, during the US Open competition was applied – we can observe the participation of the competitors (Zimányi & Géczi, 2018b). Also appears positive discrimination in connection with the draw, the competition format system and the final result? It does not belong to the present research project, but we believe it is important to mention it in relation to discrimination, that sport must reject any kind of negative discrimination. In fact: it has to act against it – it is required by the telos of the sport. Therefore, the draw, the competition format system and the final result cannot be treated and influenced based on any negative discrimination criterion.

Previously, several theories of justice have been listed, however, only those theories of justice can be applied, which correspond to the telos of a sport event, in this case, of the US Open. That is, there are some excluding theories which are justified in other areas under this examination. Examples include positive discrimination, which may appear and apply during the competition format system – but no longer in determining the final result (as it is not compatible with the telos).

The goal of the study: justification for the applicability of theories of justice and applied research methodology

Among the above mentioned and briefly explained theories of justice, which one is to follow and why? Which of the theory's application is justified in relation to the determination of the US Open's draw, competition format system and final result? Outdated statement (I am ready to explain why), the question is: which theory (or theories) should we follow? Such a theory of justice must be followed, which also corresponds to the telos of the event, this is an exclusion criterion – so the theories listed above need to be systematized and examined in relation to the draw, to the competition format system and to the final result. To get a complete and realistic picture besides the processing of the theories of justice, we have analyzed the official competition regulations of the US Open, including the number of competitions, we examined the US Open 2017 Men's Singles tournament's draw, competition format system and final result, as a case study. The aim of this study is the presentation of the applicability of the justice theories in sport events, with special regards to the US Open. In the following we describe the results that our research project has got in relation to the US Open's draw, competition format system and final result. Of course, every US Open and every tennis tournament is different, but the US Open is held annually, therefore the interpretation of the theories of justice is true and valid not only for the US Open 2017, but also in general (with minor modifications and variations) for the current Grand Slam tournaments – mainly to the general tendencies of the US Opens. Of course, we are aware of the possible changes that may occur at any time. Our research analyzes the current situation and the US Open 2017 Men's Singles Tournament.

The justice of the draw

Which theory makes the draw fair? The Aristotelian notion of justice and meritocracy are considered together in this case, since they are enforced by the seeds of the US Open: the Aristotelian excellence-based justice (i.e. the one who is more excellent will be seeded) and the merit-based meritocracy referring to the results previously achieved, which also is also shown by the current world rankings. How well do the world rankings show the relative strengths? It is another question, which we do not examine under the present circumstances.

In the draw, the first 32 players in the world ranking will be seeded. The other competitors will be randomly placed to one of the free places in the main draw, a total of 128 competitors can participate (<http://www.itftennis.com/officiating/rulebooks/grand-slams.aspx>). What about the evolutionary conception? This principle, as always, still prevails also due to external conditions. So it is compulsory to adapt, only then can the 'truth' exist, according to this theory. What about the other competitors, like the 33rd position in the world ranking and the followings, who have a worse world ranking position? This is a more populous 'camp' – they are randomly drawn to the main draw. The main board has paired branch up to the finals, only the winner will advance, so only the one can remain, who will be the champion. If they are randomly drawn, then everyone has equal chances, i.e. the system is egalitarian. It can be called a controlled (ludus) alea-type game as well (Caillois, 1961). Only a random draw will decide, how strong matches are formed, who will play with whom (without the 32 seeded players). We cannot know the pairing in advance, but it is also likely that they will not be the same strengths matches (they cannot be because of the human and sport essence either) – even though we mean the same round. But this is not the goal of the draw, the non-seeded will receive the same chance, either has the 33rd or the 92nd position in the world ranking – they are the same at the draw.

That is, there is no advantage to the 'better, the more excellent' (if they are not among the Top32 world ranking positioned players), who did a lot to have a better world ranking position. In the 1st round, the 33rd position can play a match against the 34th position in the world ranking – as well as the 82nd and 90th position of the world ranking in another pair. It is not the same strength, based on world ranking. It only depends on the random draw, while the previous world ranking leaders or champions can meet in the 1st round, or not (if they are not currently seeded, based on their current world ranking position). Therefore, the draw of the non-seeded ones is egalitarian,

because everyone has equal chances – no matter whether they are barely not seeded or they have just qualified to the main draw. From another point of view, it is also egalitarian, that all non-seeded players have a chance (besides the seeded players) to play against a qualifier (Q) or a wild card (WC) player (advance to the next round can exist even then, if somebody's opponent withdraws – but this issue is not under examination in the present study).

Regarding the US Open draw, fairness does not appear among the theories of justice, (such as protected rankings: PR), nor handicap and positive discrimination – if positive discrimination is interpreted according to Sandel (2009). If we do not interpret it in accordance with the 'so called Sandel principles', according to a new type of approach, there may be a kind of positive discrimination at the draw. The one who has a better world ranking position will be seeded, so there is a kind of protection for the draw (i.e. they are positively distinguished), but it is more based on meritocratic and on Aristotelian excellence. It can also be valid for protected rankings (PR) If based on this, someone is included in the Top32 seeded players (the method of calculating the protected ranking is not analyzed by this study). Until the 3rd round the seeded players cannot play with other seeded players, as well as 'the best and the most excellent' seeded players can only play with each other towards the end of the US Open tournament. If the seeded players were perfectly defined by the organizers before the tournament (based on the knowledge and on the world ranking positions), then the lower numbered seeded ones advance to the next rounds. That is to say, the Top32 seeded players will advance to the 3rd round (there are 32 players that can be seeded to this round). To the 4th round the Top16 seeded players, to the quarter-final the Top8 seeded competitors advance. The semi-final is played by the 1-4 seeded players, while the winners of these matches play the 'dream final' between the 1st and 2nd seeded competitors – for the US Open title (http://www.usopen.org/en_US/draws/index.html?promo=subnav). A short thought on what we mean on the above described essence of the human and sport correlation: every person is different, no one can fight, compete and perform twice in the same way. The performance depends on the daily form and concentration – as well as from the own and the opponent's momentary performance. How much can someone give out from yourself, how much does the opponent let him prevail. The sport is characterized by "results-turning" and uncertain final result – which can be surprising, since (not always the favorite one wins). If we accept this principle, then match-pairs of the same strength will never take place – neither among the same opponents, if they meet again later and struggle against each other in other tournament. Who can deliver a maximum performance in a situation? Psychology and the science of the combat sports explore this question, however the present study does not focus on this in the present circumstances.

Let's look at the draw details. As described, seeded players can play with other seeded players earliest in the 3rd round: the 1st seeded player is placed on the top branch, the 2nd to the bottom branch, the furthers possible from each other'. The 3rd and 4th seeded players are picked for the top and bottom branches – initially equal opportunities, 50% chance on which branch to go; i.e. the system is egalitarian. The same applies to the 5-8th, the 9-16th, and the 17-32nd seeded players, the difference is the wider seeding pile. What about the other competitors? The 'remaining' (128-32=) 96 competitors (world ranking positioner, qualifier, protected ranking and wild card holder, lucky loser: LL) random without constraints, but regulated alea-type distribution (Caillois, 1961). So through egalitarianism, only a random draw will decide how strong and challenging struggles are formed. Of course, they cannot be the same strength pairings – but it is not the aim of the draw. The following 1st round pairs may also occur:

- 1st seeded versus 33rd in the world ranking,
- 32nd seeded versus 33rd in the world ranking,
- Wild card³ (WC) player versus lucky loser⁴ (LL),

³ US Open organizers can give wild cards to players who do not have the right world ranking position for the main draw (this decision is based on the positive discrimination).

⁴ Who started the competition in the qualification, but he lost in the qualification final – but somebody's (who could play

- Lucky loser (LL) versus lucky loser (LL),
- Qualifier (Q) versus Qualifier (Q),
- Qualifier (Q) versus lucky loser (LL).

It is interesting in the latter case, that this match, played a few days before the qualifying final match, can be repeated on the main draw. It is possible that they played against each other in the final qualifying round. The winner will be placed on the main draw, while a loser, through a withdraw of another player, who would have been entitled to the main draw – as a best ranked runner-up qualification finalist, may be on the main draw as well⁵. They were drawn again together according to the applied egalitarian principle – in relation to the draw. Both of them met the evolutionary principle (one acquired this in his own right, the other got it through an ‘external factor’ not just on his own, by withdraw). They also correspond to meritocracy as well as Aristotelian excellence-based discrimination, based on the world ranking position and on the qualifying results. The repeated main draw match can be anticipated but we do not know the final result, it may be the opposite result. Therefore, the one who won the qualification final match; his opponent (lucky loser on the main draw) may defeat him on the rematch (on the main draw, for example in the 1st round). Based on the evolutionary theory of justice, the more adaptable player wins. The principle of the meritocracy can also be observed: who reached better results, as the Aristotle's excellence: the one who is more excellent, can defeat his opponent (it could be different in the qualification as on the main draw).

- 1st seeded versus a protected ranking (PR) player (even former number 1 in the world ranking),
- former number 1s against each other, etc.

We can see that it is a coincidence who are drawn together (unequivocal: before the qualification criteria must be met), so who should defeat whom. No one knows in advance against which opponent to prepare, whom to adapt to, and thus no one can actually influence the ‘uncertain final result’, against whom to achieve a better results, and against whom to be ‘more excellent’.

The ‘complete’ egalitarianism of the draw (without the seeded competitors) is valid until the 3rd round. From the 4th round on, seeded players can also play against other seeded players. Which seeded players will play against the other one (if they are not defeated in this tournament phase)? It partly remains random, but not exclusively. Evolutionary adaptation can be observed, as the Aristotle's excellence and the meritocracy – because we have to defeat our opponents, if we wish to reach the next tournament round. Accordingly, the seeded players are distinguished (per pots): seeded 1-2, seeded 2-4, seeded 5-8, seeded, 9-16, and seeded 17-32. The better the world ranking position is, the lower seeding number – the pots-members cannot meet and cannot play with each other before a certain tournament round (we do not analyze this issue in detail in this study case).

Furthermore, during the research we determine: the theory of the positive discrimination does not exist at the draw (<http://www.itftennis.com/officiating/rulebooks/grand-slams.aspx>).

The justice of the competition format system

An also highly relevant question is the justice of the competition format system as well, because besides the competitor's list, the seedings and the draw, this determines largely the final result. This is one of the last steps

in the main draw) withdraw, he can be on the main draw, as a best ranked (world ranking) among losers of the qualification final. In this case not only in their own hands is the fate, but evolutionary adaptation can be observed (to the competition regulation), like the meritocracy, and as well as the Aristotelian excellence-based theory of justice (reached the qualification final).

⁵ In advance we do not know, how many withdraws will be, in the Roland Garros 2018 tournament 8 lucky losers (LL) could play in the main draw. It should not be based on such a number of withdraws (<http://www.nemzetisport.hu/tenisz/roland-garros-11-kor-mar-jatszom-a-centeren-rohannia-kellett-dimitrov-ellenfelenek-2637937>).

that affects the final result. Is a just and fair final result possible to achieve? Under the competition format system, we mean the previously announced competition regulation (the rules), the tournament and daily schedules, and the advances' justice (in accordance with the terms and conditions of the competition). Of course, the telos must also be fulfilled: i.e. all the basic conditions must be ensured; the telos of the sport, the tennis, the Grand Slam, and the US Open must be met. This is an exclusion criteria, without this we cannot talk about a fair competition format system. Similarly prevailed the telos at the draw, therefore it corresponded to the goal and to the essence of the sport, of tennis, of the Grand Slam and of the US Open as well (which also contains the mission and the vision). How did the competition format system of the US Open 2017 Men's Singles Tournament look like (www.atpworldtour.com/en/tournaments/us-open)?

According to the evolutionary justice, the primary goal is the adapting to the competition format system. The ones who best adapts (this is an internal factor, unlike the random draw), can prevail the most. Firstly, it is necessary to adapt to the external factors, and to the opponents. What about the Aristotelian theory of justice? Does excellence play a significant role? The answer is yes. Those competitors advance who provide superior (i.e. 'more excellent') performance in current matches. It is possible: the same performance would not be enough against another competitor – here we refer to the evolutionary perception, for adaptation. Accordingly, we have to adapt to the opponent, if 'weaker performance' is enough, somebody do not have to perform better than what is enough – a competition can keep for a long time, we can spare our power if we would like to win the competition, the title. The main point and the essence of the evolutionary approach is the optimal adaptation – therefore the best adaptable competitor wins. During the US Open and its competition format system, it is not allowed to make any mistake: with one defeat the competition is over, in the current year we knock out and then after there is no fairness and anything else for compensation (with the exception of a previously analyzed example of some qualifying losers who became lucky losers in the main draw). Namely, the competitors have to defeat the next opponent in compliance with the rules. The main point is not to earn more total points against the current opponent, but rather to decide who collects them in the most efficient way, according to the rules, i.e. who will win the current match and goes through to the next round. At the US Open 2017 Women's Singles tournament, the Latvian Sevastova (LAT) collected more total points, than her opponent Stephens (USA) – however at the end, Stephens triumphed and went through to the next round. According to the US Open competition regulation, at the singles tournaments – women have to win 2 sets, men have to win 3 sets (not in a row). Therefore, Stephens could better adapt to (the external) circumstances and to the internal conditions, i.e. to the competition regulation and to the (current) opponent, by which she could defeat her opponent. Each opponent is different; it is different to play with a seeded player, than a qualifier (who was playing four times in a row). At the US Open Men's Singles Tournament, Carreno-Busta (ESP) reached the quarter-final this way, but afterwards a 'higher seedings number' competitor was followed – whom he defeated and went through to the semi-final, where he lost and was knocked out against Anderson (RSA), who later lost in the final, against Nadal (ESP) (www.atpworldtour.com/en/tournaments/us-open).

Based on the present research, we determine: the competition format system follows the egalitarian theory of justice, that everyone is equal. We mean the following: the daily schedules ensure the (nearly) same rest time for the competitors, who are in the same branch and perhaps will play against each other – so the rest time difference is not a decisive factor, it is rather the struggle and the performance during a match. Of course, some match time can be dragged, it may be disadvantageous due to fatigue, who won later. At the end of a match day, the court schedule is prepared the same way, according to predefined and communicated conditions for everyone. What are these predefined, communicated and declared conditions and rules, which apply equally to all competitors? The research has revealed that the principle of equality corresponds to the daily schedule per branch. Those competitors play the same day, who won in the previous round and will play against each other in the next round (except for weather conditions, as an external condition: which can move a match to the next day). Can the competition format system be fully equal? The answer is: no. One of the main reason is that the matches are not played for time, but for points – thus besides the winner, we do not know the match time, they

are uncertain. In fact, match time can be very different, therefore the rest time is scarcely the same – if they start and finish a match at the same time (if they play in the same court, it is already impossible). However, the competitor's list and the draw are accessible and available to everyone, so in this approach equality exists. Competitors know the branch in advance, it can be counted who will or can play against whom in which round, etc. Equality can be observed from another side as well: everyone has to win the same number of matches for the victory, for the championship title (irrespective of seedings and world ranking positions). It is another question: because of the seedings and the current performance of the opponent, some competitor had "easier" way to reach the next round – but it depends on the random draw. It is not entirely accurate, that every competitor had to win a same number of matches, because the one in the qualification who qualified to the main draw had to win (before the main draw) 3 more matches – as a lucky loser (LL) it was enough to win 2 matches (but had to play 3 matches). Thus, due to the more matches for the qualifiers (Q), a disadvantage can be observed. However, the handicap system is not applied by the organizers, i.e. the disadvantages are not balanced, since would not be compatible with the telos of the competitive sport, such as the telos of the US Open. Therefore, there is no equality in all aspects regarding the number of matches (www.atpworldtour.com/en/tournaments/us-open).

We can also find the theory of meritocracy (in this case including the Aristotelian excellence) during the analysis of the competition format system: the competitors have got the court schedules (including the order of matches and the daypart: morning, afternoon or night session⁶) based on merit and excellence. Briefly mention (but not analyzed in detail): utilitarian perception (as a possible theory of justice) appear (Zimányi & Géczi, 2018a). A possible aspect by the organizers, is to generate economic benefits, we mean the broadcasting royalties, the seeded players, and players. The demand for watching matches is higher in case of players of better world ranking positions. According to utilitarianism, during the live broadcasting of their matches, more advertising can be sold at higher prices. There is a mix of competitive sport and show-business: approaching the end of the US Open, the 'road to the final', it is expected that the matches are played by players of better world ranking positions, to whom (understandably) more people are attracted. This is a factor that increases the viewership, thus also the economic benefits – preliminary research: on-site and the TV-viewers, which players' matches are demanded the most, define the advertising fees (Sterbenz & Géczi, 2016). This principle is favored by utilitarianism, therefore achieving the highest profit (Mill, 1979). However, this is just a secondary involvement in sport – the real value should not be forgotten, keep the telos and the value of the competitive sport, of the tennis, including the Grand Slam and the US Open. In order to achieve this, all basic conditions must be ensured, this is still an exclusion criterion.

At his issue, positive discrimination may be associated with meritocracy and with the Aristotelian excellence: i.e. at the court schedule the 'more excellent' and the competitor who achieved the better results are positively differentiated – evening matches not expected to have sunshine, the temperature is expected to be more pleasant, etc. Even so we cannot talk about consider positive discrimination as a classic 'Sandel principles', because in this case it should have fulfilled one of the following principles: promoting diversity, compensating past sins, and correcting preconceptions (Sandel, 2009). None of the above listed principles appeared. However, if we supplement the classic 'Sandel principles' and focus on the 'home players' (Zimányi & Géczi, 2018b), we can also consider it as an example of positive discrimination. Because the matches of these players (especially if they are randomly drawn against each other) are placed to the higher capacity tennis court (www.atpworldtour.com/en/tournaments/us-open) – many home fans can see their matches, which has an identity-enhancing role as well (Földesiné, Gál & Dóczi, 2010).

During the competition format system, the schedule can vary flexibly – therefore the 'main matches'⁷ are not just determined meaning which seeded players are struggling against each other, but also the current form and

⁶ At night session matches we can see economic interests in order to achieve a 'sold-out ticker' matches.

⁷ What we mean under 'main matches': the night session matches as well as so struggles followed by special attention –

performance can be crucial. For example, if it is a previously hopeless predetermined player, who is interested in approaching the final of the US Open – it awakes the attention of viewers and other competent people, so can get the chance to prove himself in a ‘main match’.

The justice of the final result

The final result depends on the competitors and on their competent team as well as on the external conditions. The goal of the tennis competitors is: reaching always better results. Many tournament rounds complete, go through on the way to the final in the knock-out system. But it cannot succeed for everyone – in fact: there can be only one winner, so the organizers have to provide its value, to which the justice of the final result is a precondition. Of course, the telos must also be fulfilled at this issue, i.e. all the basic conditions must be ensured to prevail the telos of the sport, of the competitive tennis, including the Grand Slam and the US Open. This remains an exclusionary criterion – without this we cannot consider it as a just and fair final result. Similarly, the telos at the draw and at the competition format system prevailed, as the research confirmed: both cases corresponded to the essence of the US Open. In connection with the theories of justice, there are common features. As we can see it by considering the competition regulation: a player can only be a champion, if he/she is unbeaten, therefore wins all his/her matches (<http://www.itftennis.com/officiating/rulebooks/grand-slams.aspx>).

Here we can observe the evolutionist conceptual justice, since it must adapt to the circumstances, i.e. to the competition regulation: to reach the champion title, all opponents must be defeated (not every player must be defeated, because the player does not play everyone with everyone according to the competition regulation here is a knock-out system). The one who can best adapt to the external and internal circumstances, deserves (mostly) the victory. In every match, he/she needs to adapt better to the opponent, rather than vice versa. A competitor must perform in a way which is enough to the win against the current opponent. Although it is true: everyone performs as much as his/her opponent lets him to do that. If he can adapt better to the opponent's style, play and performance – thereby from the adaptive role can be an influencing role, which leads to victory.

This concept is meritocratic as well, because the achieved result makes someone the champion (so if he triumphed over every opponent). Only the performance on the tennis court counts – controlled (*ludus*) agon-type game (Cailliois, 1961), which can determine the above examined schedule and order of play. We are not discussing the qualification, but the qualified (Q, LL) players to the main draw are discussed. Meritocracy can also be observed in their case, they could play in the main draw based on their achievements (wins in the qualification) – at the lucky losers (LL), better world ranking position are also needed to have a chance to be in the main draw. At the US Open 2017 Men's Singles Tournament, two of them happened with two withdrawals from the main draw, so Mayer (ARG) and Lacko (SVK) could be a lucky loser (LL) and compete in the main draw. Lacko was beaten in the 1st round, counter to Mayer, who triumphed 2 wins in a way, that in the 1st round he could beat the 26th seeded competitor: Gasquet (FRA). Based on the reached results and on the merit (as the meritocracy) the opportunity to compete in the main draw as a lucky loser (LL) was just and fair (http://www.usopen.org/en_US/draws/index.html?promo=subnav).

Based on the reached results, we can describe a formula about the justice of the final result:

$\text{meritocracy}_{\text{main draw}} > \text{meritocracy}_{\text{qualifier (Q)}} > \text{meritocracy}_{\text{lucky loser (LL)}} > \text{meritocracy}_{\text{qualification competitor}}$

Explaining: each competitor with his previous achieved results, they are rightly listed on the main draw (world ranking position), while some competitor qualified (Q) to the main draw by winning, the ‘third group’ is the lucky losers (LL), who won 2 matches in the qualification but lost in the qualification final, even so they could compete in the main draw, because they had better world ranking position and somebody withdrew. Besides the

according to the organizers.

lucky losers (LL), the qualifying participants are mentioned, even if they have not reached the main draw, they have a 'prestigious' ranking of the world ranking list – which enabled them to 'at least' qualify for the qualification (these positions are worst, than who are in the main draw and had the highest world ranking positions).

The above described model is the same as Aristotle's (notion of) excellence and as the evolutionary adaptation. Therefore, these terms could also be used in the formula, instead of 'meritocracy'.

Aristotle's theory of justice also appears here: we have to distinguish and make a decision, which should be based on the excellence. This is somewhat different from the comparison with meritocracy. The latter refers to the achieved results on the tennis court, while excellence can be interpreted in several ways. If a competitor is 'more excellent' (based on the world ranking position), it does not mean that s/he can always win. In the view of this interpretation, in this case does the excellence apply to the world ranking position, or was he able to make a 'more excellent' performance? Does the practice follow theory? Has the 'more excellent' (better) world ranking position been confirmed? Therefore, that player wins the tournament title, who is the 'most excellent' in certain circumstances – this competitor deserves the most the victory. The final result is determined by the number of advances, therefore the number of wins, US Open does not have 'consolations draw' (http://www.usopen.org/en_US/draws/index.html?promo=subnav). Competitors cannot make a mistake, i.e. after one defeat the tournament ends, as opposed to tournaments with group rounds or round robin (at consolation draw, after one defeat we can continue the tournament, but we do not have any chance to reach the title). If somebody wants to be a champion (in our examined case: US Open champion), s/he must win all of his/her matches. If s/he fails, then the final or the 'nearest round' to the final can be the aspiration level besides to the future development.

With regards to the final result, the idea of egalitarianism does not match the telos of the competitive sport (including the US Open). The idea, that everyone starts on equal terms, can be welcome, although this is not necessarily so: not the same access exists for all to the 'tennis resources' around the world. Therefore, based on the principle of 'everyone's equal', it is not possible to make and determine the final result at the competitive sport. On the basis of something 'positive', we have to distinguish the winner: this 'positive' can be the above mentioned excellence or meritocracy. Consequently, during the final result not everyone will be equal – they can only be equal, if they achieve the same results (however, it depends on the performance and at the competitive tennis cannot be a draw final result). Positive discrimination should not appear either, because of the performance-based competitive sport, final result can only born by the merits, results, and optimal adaptation. Nobody can be in a better position at the final result, just to promote the diversity, or because someone is 'home player'. The results have to be achieved at the competition or tournament (in our case on the tennis court) and not at the 'green table'. Handicap does not meet the telos of the competitive sport – i.e. it is not possible to accept a fair final result in the competition, if one of the opponents is deliberately disadvantaged (without any reason). For example, could the final result be fair if one of the opponents (due to previous injury) had to win just one set? Or if a match does not start from 0:0, nevertheless would get advantage one of the 'disadvantaged' players (for example because of weaker and worse world ranking position)? Positive acceptance of these issues and questions of course, does not correspond to the telos of the competitive sport. As we can see, besides egalitarianism and positive discrimination, handicap cannot be interpreted either: therefore these theories of justice cannot play a significant role at the final result of a competitive sport event – so neither at the end result of the US Open (as the research confirms, these theories of justice did not play a role in the US Open 2017 Men's Singles).

Measurability is important for the final result and as the tennis 'is played for points' (for example not for time), so without any subjective considerations (contrary to the judges scoring), the outcome of a match, and the final result can be determined, therefore the champion title of the US Open as well. The goal is always the same: achieve better results and more victories in the knock-out system (in the optimal case: from the top 128 main

draw competitors only we stay at the end – the first step is to reach the main draw). However, we know: in competitive sports, where ‘living organisms’, individuals, teams struggle with each other, the ‘transitivity principle’ does not apply: for example if the 14th seeded competitor defeats the 19th seeded one, and this 19th seeded competitor defeats the 30th seeded one, it does not necessarily result in, that the 14th seeded competitor can always and under all circumstances defeats the 30th seeded competitor. In one match, anyone can be beaten – evolutionary adaptation and action effectiveness are needed to win (this study does not deal with the latter issue).

Conclusions: justice exists at the draw, at the competition format system, and at the final result

In conclusion, evolutionary adaptation is always present – it cannot be otherwise, because most of the factors are external conditions, which cannot be changed (or at most only in the long term). The starting point for all sport events is the official competition regulation – defined by the organizers: this is the ‘alpha’. This must be met in all circumstances. Firstly we need to adapt to this, so it should be made accessible (the competition regulation) to everyone. Here only egalitarianism can be accepted on the basis of the telos, since we do not rule out anybody from the tournament. The telos of the competitive sport is, that the best players can take part in the competition, its starting point: get the original (unmodified) information about the competition for everyone. However, all the information may reach the affected people (competitors, his teams, national federations) but cannot qualify for himself with his performance to the main draw or to the qualification (based on meritocracy and Aristotelian excellence or positive discrimination, as received a wild card). Another question (the study does not examine in present circumstances): indeed, all competitors and all national federations get the information about the conditions, the competition regulation? So these bits of information will be reached? Or what about those players who are playing world-class, but they do not have an appropriate world ranking position to compete in a main draw (or in the qualification) and neither do they receive a wild card (WC)?

In the present case study we can conclude, that more theories of justice can appear. Therefore, truth exists – the question is: which justice theory want to explain in certain cases? Which is the most appropriate, and why? More theories of justice appear; the draw, the competition format system and the final result cannot be just meritocratic, Aristotelian excellence-based or egalitarian. Regarding the draw, excellence-based discrimination and meritocracy exist – in line with world ranking positions (based on these, the seeded competitors are also determined). At the draw, above all in the case of the non-seeded competitors, the principle of equality exists: a random draw decides which branch to go in the main draw. Furthermore, in relation to the draw, the principle of the positive discrimination (wild cards) and fairness (protected rankings) do not correspond to the telos. That is: if at the draw being brought favorable position for a home competitor (to give him a wild card), then we cannot talk about truth, i.e. we cannot apply these theories. During the research, we observed at the competition format system the principle of equality as far as possible: providing the same rest time for competitors on the same branch. However, positive discrimination (home competitors matches on higher capacity tennis courts), meritocracy and the Aristotelian excellence-based distinction (seeded competitors matches on higher capacity tennis courts as well) were represented (the mentioned utilitarianism can also be observed in this case). When determining the final result, we can see, that the key-question is the evolutionary adaptation, i.e. the better and more efficient compliance with the competition regulation: therefore, how can we defeat one after the other opponents. The final result was also just and fair according to the meritocracy and Aristotelian excellence-based theories: that one won and advanced, who achieved better results, and were more excellent in current matches (which did not depend on the world ranking positions). In the tournament (in our case on the tennis court) correspond to the telos only the performance counts. We have to defeat the current opponent, so the system is meritocratic, ‘evolution-adaptive’, and Aristotelian excellence-based distinctive. At the final result, the principle of equality does not correspond to the telos; therefore it would not be fair to determine the final result. Besides the equality, the positive discrimination cannot be accepted for the final result – it is not compatible with the

telos. Nobody can achieve better result just because we apply the ‘Sandel principles’ (Sandel, 2009) – or supplementing them: we give advantages to the home competitors.

As we found out during the research, none of the examined and accepted theories of justice contradict to the telos of competitive sports, including the telos and the competition regulation of the US Open: a defeat is not allowed during the tournament. With one defeat we cannot continue the competition only the winner goes through to the next round (except for the previously described lucky losers’ case – however, it cannot be based on this because it depends on external conditions). At examining some items, we found such theories of justice which are excluded (exclusion criterion). So they do not conform to the telos of competitive sports and of the US Open: such as the positive discrimination of the draw, or the egalitarianism and the final result determining. At the competition format system, all in the study examined theories of justice are ‘telos-compatible’. Therefore, these theories considered just and fair, and they are also applicable.

Conclusion: to the US Open’s rules and the competition regulation must be adapted in all circumstances, this is a criteria – applying to the draw, the competition format system and the calculation and determination of the final result as well. As for exclusion criterion: it must be fulfilled to the (current determined) telos, in order to achieve quality and justness of the (sport) event – which applies together and also separately to the draw, the competition format system and to the determining of the final result.

Future research areas

In relation to justice, countless more questions may arise in the world of tennis. The problem still remains: which justice theory is accepted and why do we follow it? Further theories of justice can be investigated, for example Rawls's theory of justice (Rawls, 1971): can we make a just and fair decision about the draw, the competition format system and about the final result behind the ‘veil of ignorance’? We can also analyze in detail libertarianism (Friedman, 1962), utilitarianism (Mill, 1979) and Kant’s morality and motivation (Sandel, 2009) in the context of justice and sport events, too.

Confirmed by practical examples, we can analyze other sport events and competitions’ justice of the draw, the competition format system and the final result. What are the differences, against such a competition, where can not a straight line knock-out system be used? Other final result would be born if there were group matches? I.e. there was a chance to make a mistake and one or more defeats can suffer to reach the championship title. In the same way, can we view the final result as just and fair? What is the difference between the basis of justice, the system format of round-robin tournament and main draw tournament? Another question is: what is the justice-based difference at the US Open 2017 Women's Singles tournament in the issue of the draw, the competition format system and of the final result? Or what about the justice and fairness of doubles? How can participating the doubles (men’s women’s, mix) and how to determine their rankings? How can we seed the pairs? How to draw them? Does the doubles’ competition format system consider the singles matches? Are the final results of the doubles considered just and fair? Are the two best doubles-players always winning? Therefore: raise the best doubles-players the trophy at the end of the tournament?

REFERENCES

- Aristotle. (2011). *Nicomachean Ethics*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Bentham, J. (1996). *Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*. University Press, Oxford.
- Caillois, R. (1961). *Man, Play and Games*. New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Culley, P. & Pascoe, J. (2009). *Sports Facilities and Technologies*. Routledge.
- Darwin, C. (2015). *A fajok eredete [The Origin of Species]*. Budapest: Typotex.
- Földesiné Szabó, Gy., Gál, A. & Dóczi, T. (2010). *Sportszociológia [Sport Sociology]*. Budapest: Semmelweis Egyetem Testnevelési és Sporttudományi Kar.

- Friedman, M. (1962). *Capitalism and Freedom*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- MacIntyre, A. (2007). *After virtue (3rd ed.)*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Masterman, G. (2014). *Strategic sports event management*. 3rd edition. Routledge.
- Mill, J.S. (1989). *On Liberty*. Cambridge: University Press.
- Mill, J.S. (1979). *Utilitarianism*. George Sher, ed. Hackett Publishing.
- Rawls, J. (1971). *A Theory of Justice*. Mass. Cambridge: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.
- Sandel, M.J. (2009). *Justice. What's the Right Things to Do?* New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.
- Simon, R.L., Torres, C.R., & Hager, P.F (2015). *Fair play the ethics of sport (4th ed.)*. Colorado: Westview Press.
- Sterbenz, T. & Géczi, G. (2016). *Sportmenedzsment [Sport Management]*. Budapest: Testnevelési Egyetem.
- Warburton, N. (2012). *A Little History of Philosophy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Zimányi, R. (2016). Sportolók és sportegyesületek közötti minőségi szerződéskötések és átigazolások [Quality contracts and transfers between athletes and sport clubs]. In G. Keresztes (Ed.), *Tavaszi Szél 2016 [Spring Wind 2016. Tanulmánykötet]*. IV. kötet: Pszichológia- és neveléstudomány, sporttudomány, szociológia- és multidiszciplináris társadalomtudomány, történelem- és politikatudomány [Book of studies. IV. volumes: Psychology and Pedagogy, Sport Science, Sociology, multidisciplinary Social Science, History Science and Political Science] (pp. 211-219).
- Zimányi, R.G. & Géczi, G. (2018a). Justice at Sport Clubs According to the Theory of Utilitarianism and Libertarianism. *Physical Culture and Sport. Studies and Research*, 77(1), 55-60.
- Zimányi, R.G. & Géczi, G. (2018b). A Grand Slam tenisztornák igazságossága a versenyzők és a kiemelések aspektusi alapján – A 2017-es US Open férfi egyéni bajnokságának esettanulmánya [The justice of The Grand Slam Tennis Tournaments on the basis of competitors and seeding – case study of the US Open 2017 Men's Singles Tournament]. *Magyar Sporttudományi Szemle*, 19, 4(76), 60-67.
- Zimányi, R. & Vermes, K. (2016). Happy Sport Clubs. In A. Gál, J. Kosiewicz & T. Sterbenz (Eds.), *Sport and Social Sciences with Reflection on Practice* (pp. 117-128). Warsaw: AWF-ISSSS.

Web pages

- ATP, retrieved 17 November 2017 from: <http://www.atpworldtour.com/en/rankings/rankings-faq>
- ATP, retrieved 15 November 2017 from: <http://www.atpworldtour.com/en/tournaments/us-open/560/overview?detailTab=seeds>
- ITF, retrieved 14 November 2017 from: <http://www.itftennis.com/media/220770/220770.pdf>
- ITF, retrieved 14 November 2017 from: <http://www.itftennis.com/officiating/rulebooks/grand-slams.aspx>
- Nemzeti Sport (NSO), retrieved 5 June 2018 from: <http://www.nemzetisport.hu/tenisz/roland-garros-11-kor-mar-jatszom-a-centeren-rohannia-kellett-dimitrov-ellenfelenek-2637937> = National Sport.hu/tennis/roland garros at 11 am has been playing on center court dimitrov's opponents had to rush
- US Open, retrieved 16 November 2017 from: http://www.usopen.org/en_US/draws/index.html?promo=subnav

AUTHOR'S ADDRESS:

Róbert G. Zimányi
University of Physical Education
1112 Budapest, Rózsabarrack u. 14
Budapest, Hungary
E-mail: zimanyi.robert@evopro-sc.com

Received: 7 March 2019; Accepted: 17 April 2019