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ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE
THEORY DEVELOPMENT

Dan Mahony

Overview
In this chapter, I am going to discuss my interest and work in organisational justice. Although organisational justice has a long history of research in other settings, the first study in sport management was published only about twenty years ago. My initial goal was to extend the theory by applying it to sport, but I also believe some of our findings, including the identification of sub-principles of need, could be applied outside of sport. While I will focus primarily on our efforts to apply this theory in a sport setting, we have recently begun to examine organisational justice in higher education. I will discuss that work and the reason for this change of focus briefly at the end of the chapter.

Before discussing my work with my colleagues, it is important to first provide a general explanation of organisational justice. Organisational justice research examines perceptions of fairness and their impact on the workplace (Greenberg, 1990). These perceptions can be based on a variety of factors and can vary across individuals. In other words, different people can come to different conclusions about whether a particular organisation is acting fairly and the factors they examine in making this determination may be different. While individuals may not agree on what determines fairness, there are some general patterns and this is the focus of organisational justice research. In addition, research has found perceptions of organisational justice impact a number of key organisational variables, including job satisfaction, organisational commitment, organisational citizenship behaviours, trust, turnover intentions and ultimately job performance (e.g., Colquitt et al., 2001; Cropanzano et al., 2001; Fitzgerald, Mahony and Crawford, 2014).

Although the issue of fairness is not new, research on organisational justice did not start until recently. Scholars have identified three major aspects of organisational justice: distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice (Greenberg, 1990). The development of these three areas all pre-dated the work focused on sport and my work that began in the 1990s. Because all of our work in sport used research from other settings, it is important to first discuss this research and the major aspects of organisational justice.
**Distributive justice**

The research on organisational justice began with the focus on the fairness of the distributions. While there was some earlier work (Stouffer et al., 1949), the research on distributive justice increased after the development of Adams’ (1963, 1965) Equity Theory. This theory suggests individuals engage in a comparison of their inputs and outcomes relative to others’ in order to determine if what they received was fair. Adams believed that when the ratios were equal, then individuals perceived the distributions as fair. However, if they perceived the ratios as unfair, individuals would perceive the distributions as unfair and would then do something to restore fairness (e.g., work harder, work less hard, ask for a raise). Overall, the theory suggests individuals believe they should be rewarded based on their contributions to the organisation. This became known as the equity or contribution principle in the literature. The next question was ‘what is considered a valuable contribution to the organisation?’ Tornblom and Jonsson (1985) identified three possible contributions, labelled as sub-principles of equity: productivity, effort and ability. However, as I will discuss later, there are more sub-principles of equity across organisation types and any research on distributive justice should first determine these possible contributions in the setting being examined.

In addition, later research suggested there are other ways resources can be distributive that do not involve examining the contribution of an individual or group. Deutsch (1975) suggested two other possibilities: equality and need. He further argued the use of equality or need instead of equity was often based on the goals of the organisation. For example, organisations are more likely to base distributions on equality when positive relationships among employees and cooperation among employees are important (Deutsch, 1975). Like equity, there were several methods or sub-principles when making distributions based on equality. According to Tornblom and Jonsson (1985), distributions could be made to all groups or individuals equally in a given distribution (equality of treatment), distributions could be equalised over time across more than one distribution (equality of results), or all groups or individuals could have an equal chance to receive a particular resource (equality of opportunity). Need is also used when co-operative relationships and survival of members of the group are important (Deutsch, 1975). Originally, need was considered to be a fairly clear principle with those having fewer resources being seen as having greater needs. However, as will be discussed, the examination of sport distributions suggested need was far more complex and this complexity has also been found in other settings.

**Procedural justice**

While distributions are important, later research focused on procedural justice. Procedural justice examined perceptions of the fairness of the procedures used to make distributions (Greenberg, 1990). Work in this area began with Thibault and Walker (1975), who focused on procedural justice in dispute resolution and found that control within the process of making decisions was important when people were determining if it was fair. Later research in an organisational setting found a number of aspects of the procedures were important when assessing procedural justice, including consistency, suppression of bias, use of accurate information, opportunities to correct for mistakes, and allowing for input when developing the process and making the decisions (Greenberg, 1986; Leventhal, 1980). Although there is sometimes a relationship between perceptions of distributive justice and procedural justice, they are distinct variables and can impact key organisational variables differently. For example, research suggests that distributive justice is a better predictor of satisfaction, while procedural justice is a better predictor of organisational commitment (e.g., Dailey and Kirk, 1992; Folger and Konovsky, 1989; McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992).
Organisational justice theory development

Interactional justice

The third aspect of organisational justice to be examined was interactional justice. Interactional justice focuses on the perceptions of fairness based on the interpersonal treatment received by the employee and the methods used for communicating throughout the decision-making process (Bies and Moag, 1986). Bies and Moag suggested there were a number of factors that impacted employees’ perceptions of interactional justice, including truthfulness, justifications used for decisions, respect from management and avoiding inappropriate comments. While there has been some disagreement about whether interactional justice is distinct from distributive justice and procedural justice, an overall assessment of the research in this area suggests that it is distinct (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2001; Colquitt et al., 2001). Greenberg (1993) suggested that interactional justice should actually be split into two dimensions: interpersonal justice and informational justice. While there is some support for Greenberg’s (1993) model (Colquitt et al., 2001), it is not yet widely accepted or used (Bies, 2005).

Process

My interest in organisational justice in sport began when I was a doctoral student in sport management at Ohio State University in 1992. Dr Mary Hums was a presenter in one of our graduate classes and she discussed her dissertation, which was the first attempt at examining organisational justice in a sport management setting. I found the theory, as well as her study, very interesting. However, my primary research focus was on sport consumer behaviour, so I did not explore organisational justice further until a year and half later. In the spring of 1994, I was preparing for my comprehensive exams and Dr Packinathian Chellardurai gave me two options for his question. One of those options was to focus on expanding the application of organisational justice in sport management. Because I was already interested in organisational justice, this was the more appealing option. When preparing for this question, I spent a considerable amount of time examining the literature and developing a number of future research questions. By the time I completed my comprehensive exam, I decided to utilise what I had done with this exam question and develop another line of research after completing my dissertation.

Reason for interest

I believe my interest in organisational justice as a theoretical framework was closely tied to my experience and interest in serving in leadership roles. I have been in leadership roles for most of my life, starting with serving as class president when I was eleven years old. I learned early on that I could accomplish very little on my own and in order to be successful, it was important to have others actively engaged. This perspective has only increased as I have managed larger and more complex operations. Over time, I have come to realise that my role is largely about managing morale and keeping people motivated towards achieving the organisation’s goals. Because organisational justice impacts a number of key organisational variables, including job satisfaction, organisational commitment, organisational citizenship behaviours, trust, turnover intentions and ultimately job performance (e.g., Colquitt et al., 2001, Cropanzano et al., 2001; Fitzgerald et al., 2014), it has always been clear to me that understanding organisational justice perceptions and their impact is important to those in leadership roles.

Moreover, the organisational justice framework has always made intuitive sense to me. I believe organisations send messages about what is important by how they distribute resources. So, these distributions are not only important because of their direct impact on employees (e.g., increase in salary), but also because the distributions let people know about the organisation’s
priorities. In addition, I believe the procedures and the interactions have an important impact and have found this to be the case in my various leadership roles. However, prior researchers have also suggested that organisational setting is important and has an impact on what is perceived as being fair (Deutsch, 1975), so one cannot assume perceptions are consistent across settings. I have certainly found this to be the case in my own experiences. For example, the expectation of faculty regarding their level of involvement in the process of making salary distribution decisions of colleagues is considerably different from the expectations among my fellow employees when I worked for the accounting firm of Peat Marwick Main. Faculty members expect to be involved, and sometimes very involved, while the accountants did not expect to be involved at all in the decisions regarding the compensation of other accountants at the same level. Therefore, I saw value in examining organisational justice in sport organisations, and primarily in intercollegiate athletics. More recently, I have begun to examine higher education for similar reasons.

**Early organisational justice research in sport management**

My research really built from the research project Dr Hums presented to our class in 1992. Hums and Chelladurai (1994) focused on intercollegiate athletics and examined the distribution of a variety of resources (facilities, support services and money) and differences based on gender, NCAA division and position (e.g., coach, administrator). They also began the process of revising the distribution principles for college athletics by defining productivity as wins and adding spectator appeal as a new principle. Hums and Chelladurai found that while there were some group differences, the respondents in all groups consistently indicated a preference for equality of treatment, need and equality of results over the other principles.

These results surprised me. As a former athletic department employee and a scholar who had examined resource distribution in intercollegiate athletics, at least at a cursory level, this seemed completely inconsistent with what I had observed. While it is hard to examine facility and support service distributions, the distribution of financial resources is easier. So, I decided to examine the actual distribution of resources in intercollegiate athletics as a next step in this line of research (Mahony and Pastore, 1998). Fortunately, the NCAA has been collecting data from institutions about revenues and expenses, as well as number of sports and participation opportunities by gender, since the 1970s.

While there had been a shift in resources and opportunities that favour women during the twenty-year period we examined, this shift appeared to be more related to legislation (e.g., Title IX, Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1988) than a belief that distributions based on equality or need were most fair (Mahony and Pastore, 1998). In fact, during the period between the *Grove City v. Bell* (1984) and the Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1988, when Title IX’s implications for intercollegiate athletics was essentially removed, resource shifts to women’s sports stopped. This shift began again only after the Civil Rights Restoration Act re-established Title IX’s impact on intercollegiate athletics. In addition, the shift to women’s sports appeared to have no impact on the revenue-generating sports of football and men’s basketball, which continued to be the largest growth area in the budget, and had a much greater impact on men’s non-revenue sports (Mahony and Pastore, 1998). This clearly indicated an emphasis on the importance of spectator appeal in distributing resources, as opposed to equality or need.

**Attempts to understand inconsistencies**

The inconsistency between the findings of Hums and Chelladurai (1994) and my first organisational justice study (Mahony and Pastore, 1998) led to our next research project. We
did several things in the next study to see if we could better understand the inconsistency in the results (Mahony, Hums and Riemer, 2002). First, we decided to focus on only the distributions of money. This is the resource for which we could clearly see the difference between the two studies, so it made sense to focus on it. Second, we decided to focus on only those in the decision-making positions regarding financial resource distributions. We surveyed athletic directors and athletic board chairs, because athletic boards ultimately approve budgets. Third, we added several principles. Revenue production was added as a sub-principle of equity. While spectator appeal and revenue production are closely related, we thought the term revenue production would elicit a different reaction among respondents. The principle of equal percentages (i.e., all receive the same percentage increase or decrease) was added based on feedback from respondents in the prior study. We also believed there may be more to the principle of need than simply the concept that those who have less need more. Therefore, we had three need sub-principles – need to survive (women’s sport), need to survive (men’s non-revenue sport) and need to be successful. Fourth, we asked about the likelihood of each principle being used. We believed this might be the most important question because it is possible one may believe a particular principle is most fair (e.g., equality, need), but feel compelled to make distributions based on another principle (e.g., revenue production). This could alone explain the differences in the results in the prior studies. All of these changes were examples of theory building in an effort to better understand the operations of intercollegiate athletics.

Although we made these changes from the Hums and Chelladurai (1994) study, the results did not differ considerably (Mahony et al., 2002). In this study, the need sub-principles were considered to be the most fair and only equality of treatment was also considered to be fair (i.e., past the mid-point on the seven-point scale). Moreover, respondents indicated the three need sub-principles were also more likely to be used. In fact, the respondents indicated strong consistency between what they perceived as being fair and what was likely to be used. On one level this made sense. Our respondents were the decision-makers, so there should be consistency between what they perceive as being fair and what is actually done in the organisation. On the other hand, the findings still suggested a conflict with the findings in Mahony and Pastore (1998). In particular, the support for need to survive (men’s non-revenue sports) was in direct conflict with the actual decisions that were being made.

Because we believed understanding the need principle was important, we added a few open-ended questions at the end of the survey used for the Mahony et al. (2002) study. The analysis of these questions led to the Mahony, Hums and Riemer (2005) study, which I believe may have been a more important contribution to theory development and the organisational justice literature. The questions simply asked what men’s and women’s sports were perceived as having the greatest need and why. At both the NCAA Division I-A (FBS) and Division III levels, the sport with the greatest need was football. This suggested at least some consistency between the strong support for need in Mahony et al. (2002) and Hums and Chelladurai (1994) and the actual distributions examined in Mahony and Pastore (1998).

More importantly, we identified three sub-principles of need. The first, need due to lack of resources, was aligned with the traditional definition of need in the literature (i.e., those with less need more). However, the second two sub-principles, need due to high costs and need to be competitively successful, were additions to the literature. These principles explain how participants could perceive football as having the greatest needs. The sport has higher costs for several reasons (e.g., more players, high equipment costs) and could be perceived as needing to spend more because competing institutions are also spending more on football.

Moreover, while our focus was on developing sub-principles of need for the college athletics setting, the three sub-principles identified could be useful in studying other organisational types.
One could imagine why leaders in a wide variety of organisations may make allocation decisions based on the naturally higher costs associated with activities in some areas of their organisations or on the need to be successful in competing with rival organisations. For example, higher education academic leaders often allocate more resources to those departments with higher costs associated with the work of faculty in the area (e.g., lab space, equipment) and pay different salaries to faculty in departments in which the salaries at competing organisations are higher (e.g., law, medicine, business). Therefore, I believe we expanded the organisational justice literature beyond sport in this particular study.

As a follow-up to this study, we examined the fairness of three sub-principles of need developed in Mahony et al. (2005), as well as the most popular sub-principles of equality (e.g., equality of treatment) and equity (e.g., revenue production) (Patrick, Mahony and Petrosko, 2008). In this study, we also changed the scenarios. In the prior studies, the reasons for distributions and budget reductions were related to a neutral source (e.g., increased donations and bad economy; Hums and Chelladurai, 1994; Mahony et al., 2002). We believed it was possible that one of the reasons there was less support for revenue production and spectator appeal was that the change in funding was not related to the activities of the sports producing more revenue. Therefore, we added scenarios in which the changes were described as being directly related to the success or failures of these sports. We again focused on those in higher administration positions (i.e., athletic directors and senior women’s administrators) at Division I and III institutions.

The results indicated that need due to lack of resources was viewed positively across scenarios, divisions and genders, so we again found support for a principle that did not appear to be used frequently, particularly at the Division I level. There were the predicted differences based on gender, with women preferring equality and men preferring revenue production, and on division, with Division I perceiving revenue production and need to be competitively successful as more fair. However, while there were also some differences across scenarios, the general preference across groups and scenarios for need due to lack of resources was consistent.

While these studies were informative, we consistently found some inconsistencies between what was actually done and the responses regarding fairness and likelihood of use. We decided to conduct a study examining the perspectives of college students (Mahony, Riemer, Breeding and Hums, 2006). There were several reasons for this study. We questioned the honesty of the responses in the previous studies and believed participants were simply providing the socially appropriate responses as opposed to what they truly believed. We thought students might be more honest when answering the questions. We also focused on those who would be future leaders in sport organisations (i.e., sport management students) and those who were impacted by the distribution decisions (i.e., student athletes). We divided them into five groups: (a) male non-athletes, (b) male revenue sport athletes, (c) male non-revenue sport athletes, (d) female non-athletes, and (e) female athletes. In addition, we were interested in examining if the results would be different in a for-profit sport organisation, so we examined their perceptions of distributive justice principles for a sporting goods company (i.e., New Balance).

In many ways, the results were similar to those we had found in the earlier studies with coaches and administrators. The students preferred equality of treatment and need over all of the other principles and this was consistent for all five groups. There were some group differences, but in contrast to prior research in organisational justice they were not simply gender differences. Male revenue sport athletes and male non-athletes tended to prefer equity or contribution more, while male non-revenue athletes and women athletes tended to prefer equality more. The responses appear to be based on self-interest. Male revenue sport athletes would
benefit if revenue production and spectator appeal were used, while the other athletes would do better under a system that focuses on equality. Moreover, in the sporting goods scenarios, which eliminated any self-interest, there were no significant differences between the groups. Therefore, self-interest did appear to impact responses.

We believe this finding could have important implications for organisational justice literature in general. When prior research found women tended to prefer equality and men preferred equity (e.g., Hums and Chelladurai, 1994; Major, Bylsma and Cozzarelli, 1989), the explanation provided was that women tend to be more compassionate and are more concerned with looking out for the best interests of all, while men are more competitive. However, the results in Mahony et al. (2006) suggest another possibility. The preference by women for equality in distributions may be because they perceive the equity based systems to be biased against them and the only way to get a ‘fair’ share is through a system that has no subjectivity (i.e., equality of treatment). While more research is still needed to determine the impact of gender and self-interest on perceptions of fairness of distributive justice principles, this study suggests such research is warranted.

**Extensions and applications**

After these studies, I continued to be involved in research on organisational justice in intercollegiate athletics (Andrew et al., 2009; Kim et al., 2008) and applications of organisational justice in other sport settings (Dittmore et al., 2009). However, my interest in examining organisational justice in sport organisations began to decline and the new studies were student initiated. Frankly, I was continually frustrated by the clear differences between the realities we observed (Mahony and Pastore, 1998) and the respondents’ indication of what they perceived as fair and what their athletic departments would be likely to do. Despite these frustrations, I do think some of our findings added to the literature in sport and beyond. As previously discussed, I think the development of different sub-principles for need has wide applications (Mahony et al., 2005). I also believe the findings in Mahony et al. (2006) related to gender and self-interest have the potential to change a widely accepted theory regarding gender differences related to fairness perceptions. Overall, I believe this line of research has made a contribution to the literature and I have seen others expand the work and believe there is still potential to do more.

In fact, the inconsistencies raise many questions that could be examined. While this would go beyond research on organisational justice, I suspect there may be something within the culture of intercollegiate athletics that has impacted the responses in this line of research. There appears to be a strong need within this culture to ‘stick to the story’. The ‘story’ impacting this line of research is that athletic departments are not businesses and are not about generating revenue, and their main goal is to treat all student athletes equally and provide them what they need to have a great experience. Regardless of which group we asked or how we changed the scenarios or options, all groups kept to this story. In his book, former NCAA executive director Walter Byers (1995) discussed the related attempt to create and then maintain the myth of amateurism and the student-athlete over many years. More recently, those involved with intercollegiate athletics have continued this approach and frequently discuss the collegiate model in contrast to the professional model. The fact that this ‘story’ is being challenged at the time this is being written in 2014, by the O’Bannon case and Northwestern football players’ attempt to unionize, will likely strengthen the need to be consistent when stakeholders describe the goals and practices of intercollegiate athletics. I believe examining the culture of intercollegiate athletics and the consistency of beliefs within this culture, and perhaps comparing it with different cultures across organisational types, would be an interesting direction for research.
Transitioning to examinations of higher education

Regardless, my curiosity about distributive justice has been moving in a new direction. By 2004, I was a full-time higher education administrator and became more interested in organisational justice in this setting. This interest increased when I moved in to the role of dean and was responsible for making distribution decisions on a daily basis. I saw clear applications for organisational justice in the higher education setting and thought research would be valuable to the literature and to my daily work. In addition, I believed the responses would be very different from what we found in intercollegiate athletics. While consistency of thought and group mentality is valued in intercollegiate athletics, I find the opposite to be true in the academic world. Faculty members frequently and openly question decisions of administrators as well as the direction of the university and higher education in general. Moreover, even mid-level administrators openly disagree with the upper administration. In my experiences, consistency of thought is simply not valued in this setting.

We began this line of research by ascertaining the key contributions in this setting. Because contributions and their importance vary across organisational types, this appeared to be a logical first step. The study involved interviewing several deans and identified five possible contributions or sub-principles of equity: (a) quantity and quality of research publications, (b) external research funding, (c) quality of teaching, (d) impact on students and (e) quality service (Bradley Hnat, Mahony, Fitzgerald and Crawford, 2015).

As a follow-up to this study, we surveyed university administrators (deans and department chairs). In the first study from this dataset, we were interested in examining the perceptions of fairness of various distributive justice principles and the likelihood they would be used (Fitzgerald, Mahony, Crawford and Bradley Hnat, 2014). This was similar to the study we did with administrators in intercollegiate athletics (Mahony et al., 2002). We had two scenarios – one involved distributing resources to faculty and the other involved distributing resources to academic programmes. When examining the distributive justice principles, we used the principles identified in Bradley Hnat et al. (2015) and added two other equity principles in the academic programme scenario based on a review of the literature (i.e., enrolment growth, student credit hours produced). We used only equality of treatment to assess equality because it is the equality sub-principles that received the strongest support in prior research (Patrick et al., 2008). We also used all three need sub-principles identified in Mahony et al. (2005). This gave us an opportunity to examine if these need sub-principles could be used in another setting.

We found academic administrators generally believed that compensating faculty members and allocating resources to departments based on the quality of teaching and impact on students was most fair (Fitzgerald et al., 2014). While there were some differences across institution types (i.e., research universities vs. other institutions), these principles were consistently at the top of the list. However, they believed factors such as research productivity, funding secured and need to be competitively successful were more likely to be used. Need due to high costs, enrollment growth and student credit hours produced were also perceived as fair in the academic programme scenario. The results also indicated that equal distributions and distributions based on need due to less resources were not perceived as fair or likely to be used.

These results were interesting in a couple of ways. First, the responses were very different from what occurred in the intercollegiate athletic studies. In this case, the principles perceived as fair and those identified as most likely to be used were the opposite (i.e., not equality and need due to less resources). Second, there were large differences between what was perceived as being fair and likely to be used. This was not the case in the intercollegiate athletics studies (Mahony et al., 2002). Moreover, the administrators being surveyed appear to be in
decision-making positions, but still did not believe resources would be distributed the way they thought was most fair. This may support my earlier suggestion that the culture in these two organisations is very different.

**Future directions**

The initial findings in higher education have encouraged us to explore this further. We are currently working on two additional papers from the survey of administrators exploring the impact of organisational justice on organisational commitment, job satisfaction and turnover intentions. We have also begun to collect data from faculty using a similar survey and will likely explore other higher education stakeholders in the future. As a former dean of an education college, I have also become interested in exploring organisational justice in K-12 education settings. Again, this has largely been ignored and the rapid changes in teacher evaluation and compensation plans make this an ideal time for such research. I have also discussed the possibility of exploring the interaction between organisational justice and social justice in various education settings. Overall, while I have moved this line of research away from sport, my interest in organisational justice remains and I am excited about all of the future possibilities.

**Note**

1 This chapter is a reflection on Mahony *et al.* (2010) and the work related to it.
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Applying organisational justice theory

Jeremy S. Jordan

The substantial body of work examining organisational justice in sport organisations by Mahony and his various co-authors has had a significant impact on my research and the advancement of organisational justice research in sport management. Research by Mahony and Pastore (1998), along with Hums and Chelladurai (1994), is generally considered some of the first in sport management and was foundational for subsequent work by other scholars in the field.

Similar to the evolution of organisational justice research outside of sport management, Mahony’s initial focus was on the dimension of distributive justice, the perceived fairness of resource allocations. His work was based on that of Adams (1965), Homans (1961) and Greenberg (1990), among others, and focused on how and why resources were allocated in intercollegiate athletics. This line of research examined the distribution principles of equity, equality and need and the relative fairness of each method when allocating resources. To understand the impact of each distribution process, Mahony and colleagues sampled coaches, athletic administrators, athletic board chairs and sport management students throughout a variety of studies (see Mahony, Hums, Andrew and Dittmore, 2010). In addition to understanding the allocation principles of distributive justice that were deemed most fair by each of these groups, Mahony et al. (2002; 2005; 2006) deconstructed the principle of need by identifying sub-principles of need that seemed to be operating in intercollegiate athletics (2005). This work, along with that of Hums and Chelladurai (1994), did much to advance understanding of distributive justice in sport management and also contributed to the broader examination of organisational justice in non-sport settings.

The work by Mahony and colleagues has informed my research on organisational justice and that of many other scholars in sport management who have worked to expand not only understanding of distributive justice but also the other dimensions of justice. The thorough examination of how distributive justice operates in sport organisations undertaken by Mahony has allowed other researchers, including me, to build upon his work by examining how procedural, interactional and informational justice interact with distributive justice and the influence these interactions have on organisational relevant attitudes and behaviours. Additionally, review of work completed by Mahony and his co-authors provides an example of a systematic line of research that tests theory by building upon previous findings to develop appropriate hypotheses moving forward. The development of a systematic line of enquiry is critical to extending understanding of theory in a coherent and organised manner. Sport management as a discipline continues to mature, based on the development of systematic lines of enquiry such as that initiated by Mahony and colleagues.

Finally, Mahony et al. (2010) provided a comprehensive overview of organisational justice research in sport management and synthesised findings from various studies into an organised review. This study represented a first attempt to consolidate the work done by multiple scholars into a single narrative that identified what is known and what type of research needs to be done in order to move this line of enquiry forward. This study will benefit current and future sport management scholars by identifying lines of research necessary to advance what we know about organisational justice in sport management.
Note

1 Jeremy S. Jordan is with the School of Tourism and Hospitality Management at Temple University.
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