The effects of organizational ambidexterity and justice on organizational learning

Ilkay Erarslan\(^{(a)}\), Erkut Altindag\(^{(b)}\)

\(^{(a,b)}\)Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Beykent University, Istanbul, Turkey

**A R T I C L E   I N F O**

**Article history:**
Received 29 November 2020
Received in rev. form 24 Dec. 2020
Accepted 08 January 2021

**Keywords:**
Organizational Justice, Organizational Learning, Perceived Organizational Support, Ambidexterity

**JEL Classification:**
M10, M11

**A B S T R A C T**

This study examines the relationship between organizational justice and organizational ambidexterity with organizational learning. This paper also evaluates the effect of organizational justice on organizational learning strategies of employees in the cause-effect relationship and measure the effect of perceived organizational support and bi-directionality on organizational learning. 645 family firms operating in Istanbul have been analyzed with Structural Equation Model. Findings demonstrate that organization's ambidexterity ability and the concept of justice in the organization had an indirect and positive effect on the perception of organizational support. This study also highlights that companies using their generic knowledge and skills increase the effectiveness of their innovation activities. The exploratory and developmental capabilities of a company make a significant contribution to the personal development of the employees in the company.
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**Introduction**

The concept of organizational learning, which gained more importance after the 1990s with the adoption of the idea that organizations can learn like people, has taken place among the most investigated topics in the literature. Organizational learning is the process of improving the activities of the organization through better knowledge and understanding. Organizational learning is the conscious use of learning processes at the level of individual, team, and organization with a management approach that predicts the continuous change of the organization in a way that will satisfy the employees of the organization.

Competition, which has increased as a result of globalization, obliges organizations both to use their resources effectively and efficiently and to implement innovation strategies in gaining new skills and new market areas. In today's market environment, competing successfully and creating relevant strategic options are understood to be a challenging task for organizations. Recent studies have defined organizations that can balance these two tasks correctly as “versatile” and “dexterous.” In the global competition, the importance of the management approach that predicts the continuous change of the organization and the learning processes at the organizational level is gradually increasing for organizations to have well-equipped human resources. The exploratory and developmental capabilities of a company have a great contribution to the personal development of the employees of that company, their career planning, taking risks, being proactive and showing high performance within the organization. Since there is no previous study in the literature on the effects of organizational support perception, organizational justice and organizational duality in the implementation of organizational learning strategies, which are of special importance for businesses today, it is considered that it will contribute positively to the literature.

This study's goal is to obtain information about the effect of organizational justice on the organizational learning strategies of employees in enterprises and to investigate the effect of the perceived organizational support in the learning process of employees of family enterprises operating in the service sectors in Istanbul and the ambidexterity of the organization on organizational learning. The answer to the question "Do Organizational Justice and Organizational Ambidexterity Have an Effect on Organizational Learning Through the Perceived Organizational Support?" was sought. Accordingly, it was investigated whether organizational justice and organizational ambidexterity contribute to organizational learning in the enterprises within the scope. Survey work; It was prepared...
with reference to the scales studied in the literature and the sample size was determined as 600. In practice, 645 valid questionnaires were obtained. Application and analysis; Structural Equation Model and SPSS 25.0 and Smart PLS 3 programs were used.

The main hypotheses of the study are determined as follows.

H1: Organizational justice has a positive and indirect effect on organizational learning

H2: Organizational ambidexterity has a direct and positive effect on organizational learning.

H3: Organizational justice and ambidexterity have an indirect effect on organizational learning through the perception of justice.

This study organized as follows: The following section builds on a literature review with theoretical background and empirical studies. The concept of organizational justice, its importance, history, organizational justice theories, and related studies reviewed. The study continues with a research and methodology part. After evaluating the research findings, this study concludes with managerial implications and future research directions.

**Literature Review**

**Theoretical Background and Hypothesis Development**

Organizational justice is defined as the employees’ perception of the degree of justice at which they are treated by the organizational authority (Akram, 2019:2). The concept of justice was first developed in philosophy and then incorporated into the social psychological literature (Chan, 2000: 70). In the literature, it is observed that “adl” in the concept of justice means “justice.” The word “just” is stated as the things that should be done for the order to function correctly (Kucukesmen, 2015: 5). In the Constitution of the Republic of Turkey, the concept of justice is defined as follows, “the main purpose and duties of the state are to try to remove the political, economic, and social obstacles that limit the fundamental rights and freedoms of the person incompatible with the social law state and principles of justice” (Sahin, 2016:120). The concept of organizational justice became conceptual with the theories developed by Homans (1961) and Adams (1963). The fact that organizational justice increases the performance, organizational commitment, and trust of employees has increased the interest in studies on the concept of organizational justice (Efeoglu & İplik, 2011:345).

Organizational justice states that people perceive organizational events as fair (Chih-Yang& Tien-Hui, 2011:657). Organizational justice is defined as the level at which an employee believes that his/her relationships with the organization are fair, equal, and ethical (O’Connor and Crowley-Henry 2019, 908). It has been stated that organizational justice positively affects the work motivation of employees in production departments, which is the subject of a study, and that the good treatment of employees by the enterprise makes employees in the production department happy to continue working in that enterprise (Sutanto et al., 2018: 319).

**Organizational Justice Theories**

Greenberg (1987) classified organizational justice in four dimensions as reactive-proactive and process-content dimensions in his article entitled “A Taxonomy of Organizational Justice Theories.” In this classification, the Equity Theory of Adams (1965) was classified as the reactive-content theory, the Procedural Justice theory of Leventhal (1976) was classified as the proactive-content theory, the procedural (operative) justice theory of Thibaut and Walker (1975) was classified as the reactive-process theory, and the distribution preference theory of Levanthal, Karuza, and Fry (1980) was classified as the proactive-process theory (Greenberg, 1987: 10).

Organizational justice theorists have developed many theories to explain why people attach so much importance to justice in the organizations and groups they belong to. The first theory (Thibaut&Walker, 1975; Tyler, 1987) states that people have an instrumental reason for justice. Justice can reduce uncertainty and help them achieve the desired results in the long term. The second theory emphasizes the associative reasons that may cause people to care about justice. The relational model explains that people closely monitor how fair they are treated in the groups they belong to (Cugueró-Escofet& Fortin, 2014:441-442).

The “Distributive Justice Theory” of Homans (1961), the “Equity Theory” of Adams (1965), Walster and Berscheid's (1973) "Equity Theory,” and Crosby's (1976) "Relative Deprivation Theory” are included in the reactive content theory (Icerli, 2010:71). Adams established the concept of organizational justice by presenting the workplace equity theory. The Equality Theory was taken from social change theory (Baoosh&Memarzadeh, 2019:3). Adams hypothesized that individuals achieve a sense of equity or justice through the comparison of ratio inputs (contributions) and outputs (rewards) (Tsai, 2012: 29). It is observed that imbalanced and inconsistent situations create contradictions in the individual, create discomfort in his/her mind and push him/her to seek physical/psychological compensation (Kılıç, 2016: 198). The Equity Theory of Walster and Berscheid examined the responses of employees to reward and punishment systems. According to this theory, organization members accept the equal distribution of rewards in reward practices within the organization. While groups punish members who do not treat other members equally, they reward members who treat equally (Icerli, 2010:72-73). According to the Status Value Theory, the response of the employee due to the idea of inequality in the practices of the organization is related to the comparison made for his/her professional group or a professional group. Jasso's Theory of Distributive Justice defined justice “in terms of the comparison employees make between their actual share of benefits and their beliefs about what a fair share will be” (Greenberg, 1987: 12). In the Relative Deprivation Theory
of Crosby (1976), organization employees are not satisfied with the attitudes and behaviors of the organization and perceive that they are not treated equally. Employees experience deprivation when they feel a contradiction between the results they think they deserve and the reality (Icetli, 2010:73-74). The Distribution Theory of Deutsch is related to the fair distribution of the economic and social conditions provided by the organization for its employees (Kucukesmen, 2015: 21).

In proactive theories, Leventhal stated that the organization applies different norms for employees in distribution decisions and reward distribution decisions are applied accordingly by developing the "Procedural Justice Model" (Ari et al., 2017: 44). The reactive process theory investigates the responses to the procedures used to make decisions (Ackerman, 2001: 7). The reactive process theory states that employees are more satisfied with practices that provide control to employees in situations related to the processes of the organization and that they perceive the decisions that occur after these practices as fair (Aliyeva, 2013: 14). In contrast to reactive process theories, which focus on the procedures used to resolve disagreements that occur, proactive process theories deal with "distribution procedures" (Ari et al., 2017: 44).

Researchers have conceptualized distributive, procedural, and interactional justice within organizational justice (Cheung, 2013: 552). At the beginning of the conceptualization of organizational justice, theorists focused on distributive justice, defined by Greenberg (1990) as "the judgment of the individual." The foundation of this theory is based on the equity theory of Adams (1963, 1965) (Tsai, 2012: 29). The Distributive Justice Theory states that employees expect earnings in proportion to their investments and that when these expectations are met, they will have the perception that justice is realized (Tekeli, 2016: 22). Procedural justice is related to the fairness of the decision-making process that determines the outputs in an organization (Ertas, 2014: 471). Procedural justice affects the organizational commitment of individuals (Chih-Yang, 2011: 658-659). The structure of interactional justice was first introduced by Bies and Moag (1986). Based on the study conducted on interpersonal assessment expectations during recruitment, the researchers identified four criteria for interactional justice. They stated these as justification (explaining the basis of decisions), truthfulness (a non-deceptive authority figure), respect (being polite rather than impolite), and propriety (avoiding false statements or biased opinions) (Colquitt, 2001: 390). Interactional justice means that the treatment of an employee in the entry into force or disclosure of formal procedures is fair (Niehoff & Moorman, 1993: 534). Interactional justice has an interpersonal component promoted by dignified and respectful treatment, and an information component encouraged by adequate and honest disclosure (Yang, 2011: 658).

According to Greenberg (1993), interpersonal justice is the courtesy, value, and respect degree that the management shows to employees, which is determinant in ensuring the achievements and execution of the processes of an organization (Akyol, 2018: 10). The informational justice theory is designed to encourage individuals to express their opinions and suggestions, to give employees the opportunity to express themselves through bottom-up information sharing practices, thereby creating a perception of procedural justice among themselves (Tremblay & Landreville, 2015: 349-350). The open data movement is largely a movement that reflects the deeper libertarian ethics of the information technology sector, and especially the open-source subculture (Johnson, 2014: 264). Shapiro and Brett (2005) stated that giving an opportunity to the voices of employees improves procedural justice in two important processes: a feeling of being carefully listened to and being genuinely respected, and the perception that it has an impact on decision-making (Shapiro & Brett, 2005: 159).

Organizational Ambidexterity

The term ambidexterity was first used by Robert Duncan (1976), who defined the balance that organizations must achieve in order to succeed. Duncan suggested that an organization "should be strategically sensitive to significant changes and also be concerned with conducting its activities in the most efficient way" (Vario, 2017: 32). March (1991) stated that the developing and exploratory strategies for which organizations allocate their resources are two fundamentally different learning activities. According to March, knowledge contributes to competitive advantage in situations involving competition (March, 1991: 72-74). The studies conducted state that organizations have innovative and exploratory features and have the ability to use these features in all their resources. These organizations, defined as ambidextrous organizations, implement innovative strategies in order to gain new skills and new markets with their ability to use their resources efficiently under global competitive conditions (Findikli, 2014: 155). Previous studies such as the studies conducted by Hannan & Freeman (1977), McGill, Slocum, & Lei (1992), Miller & Friesen (1986) claimed that organizational practices addressing development and exploratory research at the same time could be impossible to implement (Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2008: 376-377). Tushman and O'Reilly (1996) stated that versatile organizations were needed to overcome the success paradox (Tushman & O'Reilly, 1996: 24). Organizational ambidexterity is explained as a dynamic capability that emphasizes the role of management in the adaptation, integration, and restructuring of an organization's skills and resources to this change to adapt to the continuously changing environment (Úbeda-García et al., 2019: 1). For a company to become successful in the long run, both adaption and mastering for adaptation are required, which is called ambidexterity (Birkinshaw, 2004: 47). It is stated that the senior management in organizations should facilitate the activation of strategic processes to learn which autonomous initiatives have adaptable value for the organization and deserve to be a part of the organization's strategy (Burgelman, 1991: 256). According to the study, it is stated that new skills should be revealed in autonomous processes other than the existing strategies (Tunc, 2015: 66).

Organizational Ambidexterity Typologies

Management expects employees to be able to perform multiple tasks and to think in a versatile way (Acaray, 2018: 220). Birkinshaw and Gibson (2004) defined the important characteristics of versatile employees by explaining organizational ambidexterity in terms of structure and context in their study (Birkinshaw & Gibson, 2004: 49-50). Structural ambidexterity involves separating development
and exploratory activities into different units of the organization, such as separate departments, divisions, and teams. The task of senior managers is to ensure that the development and exploratory activity results of each unit are integrated to create value (McCarthy & Gordon, 2011: 241). Contextual ambidexterity is the creation of a set of processes or systems that enable and encourage managers to make their own decisions on issues related to the organization's adjustment and adaptation (Clercq et al., 2014: 193). Ambidexterity is defined as being sufficiently adaptable to the business demands of the organization and changes that may occur in the environment (O'Reilly et al., 2013: 328-329). The organization should establish different units and research and development activities in order to harmonize its current products and services in its market activities (Kececi, 2015: 52).

Şimşek et al. (2009) defined dimensions as harmonic, periodic, departmental and mutual ambidexterity. Harmonic ambidexterity is defined as the joint performance of development and exploratory activities in the business unit of the organization (Wang & Rafiq, 2014: 60). In periodic ambidexterity, it is used alternately between long development activity periods and short exploratory activities of organizations (Simsek et al., 2009: 882). Departmental ambidexterity requires units to consider the organization's vision, even if they have their own strategies and systems (Tunc, 2015: 81). The studies conducted state that reciprocal ambidexterity occurs in reciprocal relationships between enterprises. It is indicated that there is a high level of reciprocal ambidexterity between enterprises in cooperation related to innovation (Tiwana, 2008: 267).

Dimensions of Organizational Ambidexterity

Although the studies conducted demonstrate that organizations face difficulties in both discovering and developing, the current literature and management practices provide recommendations on how organizations can manage both discovery and development (Mom et al., 2007: 910). The development activity is defined as the repetition or improvement activities of the existing products that aim to improve the existing product market areas of the organization (Tran, 2013: 18). In the studies conducted, it is stated that the development activity has a direct effect and relationship on the performance of the organization and partially mediates the relationship between exploratory activities and performance (Zabiegalski, 2015:27). The exploratory activity refers to concepts such as research, change, experimentation, and discovery (Raisch & Birkinshaw, 2008: 376-377). Experimentality is at the forefront in exploratory activities, and it applies learning processes experimentally (Tunc, 2015: 84). The researchers have implicitly or explicitly stated that development and discovery require information processes. The development activity involves the use of open knowledge bases, and improvements can be made in the existing markets by internalizing and combining them (Lubatkin et al., 2006: 648).

Perceived Organizational Support

Perceived organizational support is defined as the beliefs of employees about how much the organization attaches importance to employee welfare and how much it values their contributions (Paulin, 2014: 24). An increasing number of studies have shown that perceived organizational support is positively associated with organizational citizenship behavior (Demir, 2015: 134). In the early 1950s, researchers suggested that employees create global perceptions of support and that these perceptions are associated with various positive business outcomes (Croppanzano, 1997: 161). The organizational support theory is the recognition of employees' achievements by the employer and considering their work, efforts, and thoughts important in line with the value they bring (Boyaci, 2017: 5). According to the organizational support theory, it creates a general perception of the extent to which the organization evaluates the contributions of its employees and to what extent it is concerned with the welfare of employees. Therefore, experiencing the perceived organizational support expresses the belief that employees are on their side of the organization. Perceived organizational support is mainly based on employees' experiences within the organization, such as favorable work conditions, perceived manager support, and the experience of justice (Ott et al., 2019: 113).

Perceived organizational support theories are discussed in three sections, such as organizational support theory, social change theory, and reciprocity (reciprocal relationship) theory. The organizational support theory is the theoretical framework that takes into account the development, nature, and outputs of perceived organizational support. The organizational support theory, developed from the social change theory, is based on the idea that the good treatment provided by an organization will keep employees loyal to the organization, and they will try to help the organization achieve its goals (Arboleda, 2010: 9-10). The social change theory states that the employees of the organization establish social relationships due to the expectation of reward (respect, honor, friendship, being paid attention to, etc.). Importance is attached to positions in the social relationships established by employees (Engin, 2015: 18). According to the reciprocity (reciprocal relationship) theory, individuals interact with society throughout their lives. The concept of reciprocity, which exists wherever an individual exists, also exists within the organization where the individual is present (Boyaci, 2017: 4).

Organizational Learning

Learning is important for organizations to adapt to innovations and changes experienced (Kacmaz, 2015: 34). Kurt and March (1963) introduced the concept of organizational learning for the first time. They stated that the efforts of organizations to respond to changes in the external environment in order to match the objectives of the organization with new conditions led to finding procedures that would help the organization achieve them more effectively (Saadat, 2016: 221). Organizational learning is the sharing of knowledge and experiences by employees of the organization and the application of the organization's process of obtaining, using, and disseminating information within the organization (Sekerli, 2014: 15). Chandler (1962), Duncan (1974), Jelinek (1979), Miles and Snow (1978), Miller and Friesen (1980), Shrivastava (1981) are the researchers who formed the basis of the first attempts to define,
develop, and differentiate organizational learning and its components. Theorists have called learning new insights or knowledge, new structures, new systems, actions, or a combination of all of these. These theories have defined learning as adaptation and change (Fiol & Lyles, 1991: 803). Argyris and Schön (1978) examined the organizational learning cycle in three parts as single-loop, double-loop, and secondary (learning to learn) learning (Mert, 2017: 105). While explaining the difference between single-loop and double-loop learning, Argyris stated that single-loop learning was the process of uncovering the cause of errors and correcting these errors and caused organizations to continue their current policies and goals and achieve success. In double-loop learning, errors are detected and corrected, and organizational rules, policies, and goals that cause the error are also changed (Ayden & Dusukcn, 2002: 124). In secondary learning (learning to learn), employees focus on the process and develop new strategies by focusing on the factors that affect, inhibit, or facilitate the learning process (Tolgay, 2010: 29-30).

Factors affecting learning are discussed in two parts as environmental (external) and internal factors. Environmental factors are addressed as macro environment, industrial environment, and firm-specific environment (Dimovski, 1994: 56-57). In the classification of Emery and Trist (1965), the environment is divided into sections. The first one, placid, randomized environments have randomly distributed and disconnected elements, there are no behavioral patterns and learning conditions. Turbulent environments require more control capacity than they normally have, so organizations in turbulent and disorganized environments fluctuate with their environment, virtually unable to learn and control their development (Hedberg, 1981: 13). The time for an organization to change and the transformation of environmental conditions mature when previous organizational strategies are brought to their previous form (Lam & Pang, 2002: 85). Chandler (1962), Katz-Kahn (1966), Thompson (1967) argued that the ultimate criterion of organizational performance was long-term survival and growth. Organizational performance affects the organization's ability to learn and adapt to a changing environment (Fiol & Lyles, 1985: 803-804). In internal factors, the development and permanence of organizational learning are provided by the organization's strategy, vision, culture, structure, and organizational clarity. Thanks to the adoption of the common vision by employees, employees willingly learn in line with the goals of the organization (Tolgay, 2010: 41-43). Many researchers have stated that learning is the most appropriate approach in the business field because it leads to high performance (López-Martínez, 2019: 33). Continuous development in a learning culture is stated as a natural by-product of people's commitment and empowerment (DellaNeve, 2007: 49).

Knowledge distribution has three effects for organizational learning: firstly, it increases the speed of organizational learning through message routing and message summarization. Secondly, it increases the learning of individuals, organizational units, and the organization as a whole due to a large number of information resources. Finally, it increases the amount of organizational information when the organization does not know what kind of information it actually has until different pieces of information are collected in "central storage" (Dimovski, 1994: 19). Interpretation has been defined as "the process during which information becomes meaningful". It is stated that more learning occurs when the units in the organization understand the nature of the various comments held by other units (Karahan & Yılmaz, 2010: 156). Variables affecting the continuing effectiveness of organizational memory are information distribution and organizational interpretation of information, norms and methods for storing information, methods of the stored information. Institutional information about how to do work is stored in the form of standard operating procedures and routines (Huber 1991, 105). Briefly, In the light of the literature section, the hypothesis are developed below:

\[ H_1: \text{Organizational justice has a positive and indirect effect on organizational learning.} \]
\[ H_2: \text{Organizational ambidexterity has a direct and positive effect on organizational learning.} \]
\[ H_3: \text{Organizational justice and ambidexterity have an indirect effect on organizational learning through the perception of justice} \]

**Research and Methodology**

**Data**

Within the scope of the study, as a result of detailed investigations in the literature, it is observed that a lot of studies have been conducted on organizational justice, the perception of organizational justice, organizational ambidexterity, and organizational learning. The scales that could be valid and were thought to yield the best results among the research scales on this subject were included in the study. The scales of the factors related to our research scope in the scales of the studies in the current and international literature used in various studies were brought together in a comprehensive survey form. Thus, a research scale suitable for evaluating the effect of organizational justice on the organizational learning strategies of employees in enterprises in the cause-effect relationship and the effects of the perceived organizational support in the learning process and the ambidexterity of the organization on organizational learning was created. The content of the questions was not changed or reduced in any way for the questions in the survey form not to lose their original meaning and due to the success of their previous use. The research scale was first pre-tested and evaluated on the employees of 44 different enterprises. The original scale form was shaped within a fluent structure that employees could easily understand and fill out. For organizational justice, which is the first independent variable in the survey form, which includes demographic data and dependent and independent variables explained in detail based on the literature, the study of Wasti (?) entitled "The Concept of Organizational Justice and Reliability and Validity Analysis of the Translation of the Scale in Turkish" was utilized, and it contains 18 variables. The second independent variable, organizational ambidexterity, has two dimensions and contains 12 variables. For ambidexterity, the work of Lubatkin, Simsek, Ling and Veiga (2006) entitled "Ambidexterity and Performance in Small-to Medium-Sized Firms: The Pivotal Role of Top Management Team Behavioral
Integration” was used. Perceived organizational support, which is the mediator variable, has one dimension and includes 16 variables. For perceived organizational support, questions of the 16-question summary survey in the work of Eisenberg (1986) entitled “Perceived organizational support. Journal of Applied Psychology” were used. The organizational learning scale, which is the dependent variable, has one dimension and includes 16 variables. The PhD. thesis of Kacman (2015) was used for the organizational learning scale.

Surveys were delivered to enterprises in the service sector and the answers to the survey were collected online. To obtain quick feedback from enterprises, questionnaires were prepared online, and delivery in the email environment was provided. Six hundred questionnaires were targeted as a sample, and it was decided that the collected 645 samples were sufficient.

Sampling as it is not possible to reach all main mass units. The sample size was calculated as follows (Albayrak, 2019: 47):

\[
p: \text{Percentage of employees in relevant companies} \\
q: (1-p) \\
Z: \text{normal value at 95% confidence level (± 1.96)} \\
e: \text{Tolerance level (± 0.05)} \\
n = p \times q \times (Z / e)^2
\]

The value that gives the maximum variance when p and q values in the main mass are unknown 0.5 is used.

\[
n = 0.5 \times 0.5 \times (1.96 / 0.05)^2 = 384
\]

Trust generally accepted by researchers in social sciences. Due to the 95% of the range, the Z value was taken as 1.96 and thus The minimum sample size was calculated above. Incidental to sample units, The convenience sampling method is one of the non-sampling methods. There is some descriptive information in our survey study, which includes the demographic characteristics of the participants. Firstly, 108 people representing about 16.7% of the respondents are business owners/partners, 122 people representing about 18.9% are senior managers, 133 people representing about 20.6% are middle-level managers, and 282 people representing 43.7% are officers/personnel. Although it is observed that the majority of the respondents are officers/personnel, it is thought that the answers given were more conscious and reflected the company information correctly since mid-level and senior managers and business owners or partners also filled out the questionnaire. It is observed that 95 people with 14.7% of the employees who answered the questionnaire have received high school education. It is observed that 140 people with 21.1% are college graduates. It is found that university graduates constitute the most crowded group with 250 people and 38.8%. There are 136 people at a rate of 21.1% with a postgraduate diploma. The number of participants who have received doctorate education is 24 people at a rate of 3.7%. It is observed that the education level of the respondents is high. The rate of university graduate participants is very high. This reinforces the fact that this study conducted at the academic level was easily understood by the participants and they gave objective answers. Furthermore, it was observed that the education level of the enterprise employees was high.

When the gender of the employees who responded to the survey was examined, it was found that 285 of them were female at a rate close to 44.2%, and 360 were male at a rate close to 55.8%. It is observed that mostly male employees work in family enterprises in the service sector, and the majority of those filling out the questionnaire were male employees. This can be interpreted as the fact that male employees take more place in the business life in Turkey.

**Study Design**

As seen in the study design in Figure 1, the independent variables of the study design were determined to be organizational justice and organizational ambidexterity. Perceived organizational support was studied as a mediator variable.

![Figure 1: Model of the study](image-url)
Reliability and Validity Analysis

Validity shows the accuracy degree of the measurement. It indicates the actual difference in the scale scores of the research measurements. Content validity is when an expert on the subject audits and evaluates the scales. Predictive validity is when the measurement made on a subject includes the prediction made on another subject in the future. Concurrent validity is the use of different ratings on the same research subject in the same study. Construct validity shows whether the scale has a theoretical structure compatible with the characteristics of the study (Polat, 2019: 67-68).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>AVE-Average Variance Explained</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>Common Factor Variance</th>
<th>Redundancy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.738</td>
<td>0.394</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Justice</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.685</td>
<td>0.285</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambidexterity</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>0.743</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>0.782</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>0.390</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the general index values of all dimensions are examined, it is observed that the explained variance takes values between 0.285 and 0.448. Likewise, the composite reliability values vary between 0.592 and 0.796. In Cronbach's alpha values, the perception of justice has a value of 0.685, which is relatively lower compared to other variables. The justice variable took a value of 0.738, the ambidexterity variable took a value of 0.743, and finally, the organizational learning variable took a value of 0.756. As is known, if it is desired to increase the reliability of the survey, the α value obtained for individual questions is reviewed, as stated before. The reliability of the survey is increased by removing the question that reduces the α value, the total α value obtained.

Cronbach's alpha (α) coefficient is formulated as follows:

\[ \alpha = \frac{K}{K - 1} \left( 1 - \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{K} \sigma_{Y_i}^2}{\sigma_x^2} \right) \]

K indicates the number of items, \( \sigma_x^2 \) indicates the variance of the total test score, and \( \sigma_{Y_i}^2 \) indicates the variance of the i(th) item in the total sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>0.738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Justice</td>
<td>0.685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambidexterity</td>
<td>0.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>0.756</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When the reliability coefficients were examined, Cronbach's alpha values, which are the most used ratio in the field of Social Sciences, were analyzed. Reliability values vary between 0.685 and 0.756. The threshold value of 0.600 is also used by many researchers for this analysis, the base value of which is determined to be 0.700 in various sources. It is observed that the scale average exceeds 0.700 in any case, and as a result of these analyses, the factor analysis and structural equation model were passed to without any doubt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fit Indices</th>
<th>Value of Fit Indices</th>
<th>Acceptable Fit</th>
<th>Good Fit</th>
<th>Status of Fit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X2 /df</td>
<td>1.128</td>
<td>( \leq 5 )</td>
<td>( \leq 2 )</td>
<td>Good Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMSEA</td>
<td>0.055</td>
<td>( \leq 0.08 )</td>
<td>( \leq 0.05 )</td>
<td>Acceptable Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparative Fit Index (CFI)</td>
<td>0.875</td>
<td>( \leq 0.90 )</td>
<td>( \geq 0.95 )</td>
<td>Acceptable Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardized RMR</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>( \leq 0.08 )</td>
<td>( \leq 0.05 )</td>
<td>Acceptable Fit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goodness of Fit Index (GFI)</td>
<td>0.882</td>
<td>( \leq 0.90 )</td>
<td>( \geq 0.95 )</td>
<td>Acceptable Fit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Guneri & Arslan (2018).

The fit index values obtained as a result of the confirmatory factor analysis performed to test the suitability of the scale items to employees are presented in Table 3.
Table 4: Correlation Table (Latent Variable Correlations)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice (1)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Justice (2)</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambidexterity (3)</td>
<td>0.857</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning (4)</td>
<td>0.811</td>
<td>0.691</td>
<td>0.876</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first detail that draws attention when examining the correlation table is that all variables are highly correlated with each other. As is known, mutual interaction is at the forefront in correlation analysis rather than cause and effect relationship. To give an example from the table, the correlation coefficient of 0.811 between organizational justice and organizational learning shows the rate at which these two variables affect each other. When organizational justice changes by 1 unit, learning increases by 0.81 units in the positive direction.

Table 5: R-Square Value Table (R-Square)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>R-Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Justice</td>
<td>0.599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambidexterity</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning</td>
<td>0.782</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, 78.2% of the changes in organizational learning, which is the pure dependent variable, are explained by the independent variables of the study. In summary, a change of 100 units in the independent variables increases organizational learning by 0.782. Furthermore, 59.9% of the changes in the Perception of Justice scale included in the study as a mediator variable are explained by the variables of Organizational Justice and Ambidexterity.

Table 6: Table of Beta Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Composite Reliability</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice (1)</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Justice (2)</td>
<td>0.693</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambidexterity (3)</td>
<td>0.733</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning (4)</td>
<td>0.592</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 presents the path model values in which the effects on a total of three variables within the scope of the analysis are observed. When the Perception of Justice on its own is considered as a dependent variable in the first place, it is observed that Justice and Ambidexterity have an effect by taking beta values of 0.467 and 0.335, respectively. Likewise, upon examining the effects on organizational learning, which is the pure dependent variable in the model, these independent variables affect as beta values of 0.228 and 0.680, respectively. Composite reliability values are included in the table as additional information.

Factor and Path Analysis

Path analysis is an extension of the regression model. In a path analysis model in the correlation matrix, two or more daily models are compared. The path of the model is indicated by a square and an arrow indicating causality. The regression weight is determined by the model. Then the fit statistics are calculated to see the fit of the model. When the path analysis model is examined, it is observed that the Justice Phenomenon (0.206) and Ambidexterity (0.664) capabilities are effective in Organizational Learning.

Table 7: Path Model-Beta Values Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Justice (1)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Justice (2)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambidexterity (3)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning (4)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The effects of these two variables on learning is explained at a rate of 78.2%. However, the perception of justice within the organization does not have any significant effect on the dependent variable of the study, Organizational Learning, in other words, the cause-effect relationship. It is thought that this is due to the fact that the "perception of justice" remains in the background, especially in enterprises where the perception of justice has strong effects on continuity and job satisfaction in the workplace.

**Findings**

**Mediator Variable Effect**

The mediator variable is the variable that provides the cause-effect relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable. The regulatory variable is the variable that affects dependent and independent variables together, and it does not contribute to the cause-effect relationship. The mediator variable provides the interaction between these two variables and provides the flow of cause-effect relationship (Yener, 2014: 101-102). The analysis of the conditions proposed by Baron and Kenny (1986) was tested with different models to test the mediating role of ethical leadership in the relationship between psychological contract violation and organizational justice. A variable act as a mediator variable if the following conditions are met.

(a) The levels of change in the independent variables should be significantly explained by the changes in the assumed mediator variable.

(b) The changes in the mediator variable should be significantly explained by the changes in the dependent variable.

(c) When states a and b are controlled and the direct effect of the independent variable is zero, the previous significant relationship between the dependent and independent variables will no longer be significant.

**Table 8: Mediator Variable Effect**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediator Effect</th>
<th>Organizational Learning</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Ambidexterity</th>
<th>Perceived Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mediator Effect 1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OO_-_Organizational Learning</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adaletA_-_Justice</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.507</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambidexterity-Çiftyönlülük</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.473</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>support_one-Perceived Support</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-0.037</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As can be seen from the table, when the effect of the variables of Justice and Ambidexterity on the support factor is examined, it is observed that the effect levels in the previous tables did not become zero but changed. This can be interpreted as the fact that the mediator variable element partially exists. The most significant constraint of the study is that the analyses previously performed at the primary level were carried out at this stage at the secondary level. Although performing analyses at the secondary level is not a technical error, the results were not significant in the evaluation made over sub-factors due to the complex structure of the model. This situation draws attention as a constraint.

As a result of the analyses, when examining whether the effect of the independent variable (perceived organizational support) on the dependent variable (organizational learning) has completely disappeared in order to reveal whether there is a mediating effect, if the relationship continues to be significant even though the effect decreases, the "partial mediation effect" can be mentioned. Accordingly, it is observed that in the enterprises considered, treating employees equally and feeling that employees are treated fairly affect organizational learning thanks to its positive effects, despite its indirect effect on organizational learning. It is the mediating effect of perceived organizational support that causes the decrease. Therefore, the results reveal the partial mediation effect.

Within the analysis results, the results of the model hypotheses were evaluated as follows:

**Table 9: Hypothesis Results**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: Organizational justice has a positive and indirect effect on organizational learning:</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: Organizational ambidexterity has a direct and positive effect on organizational learning:</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: Organizational justice and ambidexterity have an indirect effect on organizational learning through the perception of justice:</td>
<td>Partially Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions**

The most important contribution of this study to the management literature is to conclude that these concepts are related to organizational learning by empirically proving the positive relationship between organizational justice and organizational
ambidexterity, perceived organizational support and organizational learning. Examining the relationships between organizational justice, organizational ambidexterity, perceived organizational support, and organizational learning in enterprises operating in different industrial sectors may yield useful results. Relationships of organizational memory, leadership, organizational culture, etc., not included in this study, may also be studied for future research.

When the hypotheses for the research results were evaluated in general, the causality relationships of two independent variables, a mediator variable, and a dependent variable in the research model were examined through the structural equation model. In the model in which perceived organizational support was examined as a mediator variable, it was observed that it had no effect on the dependent variable, organizational learning. Furthermore, the organization's ambidexterity capability and the concept of justice in the organization have a direct and positive effect on the perceived organizational support. As an additional finding, organizational justice affects organizational learning at a low level (b=0.206). Perhaps the most striking finding of the study is that it has been proven that organizational ambidexterity capability affects organizational learning strongly (b=0.665) and positively. It has been especially supported by the results of this study that companies use their knowledge and skills to increase the effectiveness of their innovation activities. The exploratory and development capabilities of a company make a significant contribution to the personal development of the employees of that company, their career planning, taking risks, being proactive, and exhibiting high performance within the organization. According to the research findings, the organizational justice variable had an effect on the perception of justice, but the effect of the perception of justice on organizational learning was not determined. The impact of organizational justice on organizational learning is limited.

The difficulty of the competitive conditions brought about by globalization is gradually increasing. Especially organizational managers can be successful in global competition by using their human resources, information and technologies more efficiently, developing new skills, expanding their markets or gaining new markets. Since development and exploratory activities in an organization are related to organizational learning, the fact that enterprises attach the necessary importance to learning activities and include these activities in their strategic planning may contribute to the competitive advantage of knowledge. Thus, productivity may increase in terms of organizational performance. In the literature review in the second section of our study, it is observed that organizational ambidexterity studies focus on performance. Organizations may need to achieve organizational ambidexterity to improve their performance. This is thought to be one of the reasons why the findings in our study are higher compared to other scales. Ambidexterity is an important element for organizations to gain a competitive advantage and survive for a long time. If the exploratory and development skills of individuals in senior management are compatible, they will enable the organization to develop new global strategies. Innovation should be included in the management structure of the organization as a management activity. A new structure should be created regarding the development of ambidexterity capabilities in organizations, and their job descriptions should be determined. The common characteristics of organizations with the ambidexterity capability are their high performance, high sales capabilities, profitability in exploratory and development activities, and improving their learning capacity.

Organizations face an increasingly global, complex, and changing environment. Knowledge should be considered as a key strategic resource to compete effectively. The COVID-19 pandemic period, which we experience nowadays and which has become a common problem of the whole world, shows that unexpected situations bring about financial risks and economic problems for organizations. It is observed that organizations depend on their ability to be ambidextrous with strong technical infrastructures, innovative, high innovation capability, following technology, and having digital potential in order to be able to hold on to markets where competition is gradually increasing, adapt to technological change quickly, and direct organizational design to new digital markets. In order for an organization to adapt to change, it may be necessary to implement organizational learning processes in their strategic structures and to quickly adapt their employees to this change with exploratory and development activities.

Recommendations for future academic studies are presented below:

(i) Although the relationship between organizational justice and organizational learning is not a subject that has been studied much in the literature, when evaluated separately, it is observed that the subjects of organizational justice, organizational ambidexterity, perception of organizational justice, and organizational learning are included with different variables in the literature. There is a need to investigate the effects of organizational justice and the perception of organizational justice on organizational learning in different sectors. It can be investigated empirically how organizational justice affects organizational learning activities. Organizational justice dimensions can be addressed by limiting the research, especially for those working in the industrial sector.

Furthermore, it can be mentioned that in a workplace environment where organizational justice is provided, it will be more adaptively open to a more goal-oriented development process such as organizational learning.

(ii) Since organizational learning takes an important place for the strategic goals of an organization, an investigation of the role of the manager with the justice aspect in strategic management and organizational learning studies will contribute to the literature.

(iii) Examining the relationship between organizational justice and organizational learning, which cannot be found directly in this study, through different mediator variables in future studies may yield a meaningful result.

The main limitation of this study is that the study was conducted within the framework of the data obtained from Istanbul. It is thought that studies to be carried out in wider areas will reveal the relationships between the variables more clearly. Another limitation of the study is that family enterprises were addressed as the scope of the study. In future studies, enterprises can be limited on a
regional and sectoral basis. Sectors can be divided into public and private institutions, and a sample can be selected for the relationship between organizational justice and organizational learning. Detailed research can be conducted in limited sectors where technology is intense. An investigation of the effects of organizational justice and organizational ambidexterity on organizational learning in technology-intensive sectors, the mediator effects of perceived organizational support is important to verify the results of this thesis. Comprehensive scales in the literature for the scales used in the research model were included in the study. A summary (shortened) scale in the literature was used for the perceived organizational support dimension addressed in the study as the mediator variable. Researchers who want to conduct a similar study in the future may be suggested to use the non-summary scale for the perceived organizational support dimension.
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