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**Network Organizations and the Environmental Process**

Network organizations have long been discussed in the business and the economic community. Because both large and small firms cannot operate in socially unstructured contexts, network organizations are a viable concept. Instead, they are entangled in the web of social networks (Ahmady, Mehrpour & Nikooravesh, 2016). Different forms of networks and their effects on organizations have been discovered since the development and realization of empirical data. Network organizations need to be flexible and adjust to changing environmental factors. Such organizations must also consider areas for adaptation and the length of time changes take to occur in a particular company. This discussion aims to assess various network organization types and their effects on environmental processes.

**Types of Network Organizations**

Network organizations are systems that monitor commercial organizations' commitment to sustainable initiatives like environmental protection and, as a result, the link between environmental protection policies and procedures (Gray & Gray, 2017). Additionally, the term "network organizations" describes the setting in which people coordinate and plan their efforts to accomplish shared goals. They are characterized by their goals, methods, and structural components. Network companies include potential intangible and specialist assets in their structure under common control, which is vital to keep in mind. They also strongly emphasize shared ownership, which facilitates the effective, adaptable, and efficient integration of intercommunication and support. Network organizations may be considered a hybrid between a business and a market, as well as between market disaggregation and vertical integration (Scott & Davis, 2017). Various network architectures are used today, each different and distinguished by internal, dynamic, and stable labels. Organizations use internal network structures because it is believed that exposing internal units to a competitive market can stay inventive and attract market and entrepreneurial benefits without having to outsource money or resources. Dynamic network architectures use intensive outsourcing budgets to sustain operations (Gray & Gray, 2017).

A dynamic network requires potential partners and the autonomous organization working inside the value chain to form temporary relationships. This network is visible in the short-cycle product-displaying fashion sector. For instance, a well-known clothing manufacturer consults with all its experts to create a new range of apparel. However, the expert is not obligated to work on the next season's clothesline. Stable networks use outsourcing to provide value chain flexibility. Big firms play a crucial role in creating market-based relationships for investors identified within the network when it is sturdy, even if those investors or partners continue to work for other companies outside the network (Scott & Davis, 2017). This maintains partners' marketability, particularly for small businesses. For instance, Nike Company channels much of its resources on marketing and research while simultaneously allowing other firms to continue with manufacturing. Nike permits these businesses to work with rival brands. Compared to dynamic and internal networks, these networks are thought to be long-lasting and highly stable.

Organizational networks may be categorized into three analytical levels: ego network, overall network, and network positions. The ego network is the most basic yet crucial in identifying relationships, variety, and expertise. Direct communication between the organization and other organizations is its primary objective. The overall network is more extensive and includes all participants in a particular network. They gauge network density and establish whether it is centralized or decentralized. Depending on how central they are, these organizations are categorized as flat, hierarchical, matrix, or siloed. At the organizational network level, the network position aims to identify the place of players. Networks may be quantified using distance, centrality, structural, and clustering holes in addition to the analytical levels, indicating the network's coherence. Institutionalists and ecologists contest the assumption made by analysts of contingency and transaction costs that firms may alter their essential structural elements. These two groups contend that because institutions are rigid entities with little ability to adjust, it is simple to do so. It is thought difficult, unusual, and hazardous to an organization's survival to change its network. Ecologists consider the organization's creation, change, and demise the most dependent informative variable (Scott & Davis, 2017). The amount of time and attention paid to current external situations varies. All network levels can incorporate evolutionary models. However, several research has focused primarily on the population level.

All organizations that divide into their general forms make up organizational populations. The evolutionary principle model's primary goal is to explain the organization's variety. Because organizations evolve through time, they change their characteristics, contributing to some manifestations of diversity (Carroll & Hannan, 2018). Organizations are selected differently as networks evolve based on how well they fit the organizational structures and environmental factors. The evolutionary analysis uses a variety of procedures. This comprises the development of diversity, the choice of forms, and their distribution and maintenance. Organizations are developed by several processes, some of which may be intentional or spontaneous. Differentiated selection is used to ensure their survival after that. Lastly, duplication or replication is used to keep the organizations alive. The ecological model is firmly built on an open idea that gives the environment's importance much weight. This is due to the natural system approach and the fact that the final result is ineffective.

**Impact of Network Organizations**

Being a part of organizational networks has many effects, especially when it comes to the environmental process. This involves technological breakthroughs and ecological processes. Organizations functioning inside a network have a better opportunity to share scarce resources. These resources might include the development of brand-new organizations and financial assistance through access to cash necessary for managing the organization. By doing this, the company would be shielded from relying on banks that charge exorbitant interest rates for capital. In turn, this would result in lower transaction costs and lower production.

**Creation of New Organizations**

The connection between entrepreneurship and creating a new organization is among its most essential aspects. Early in the 20th century, many people had trouble starting new businesses or organizations. Starting a new business necessitates purchasing property, making plans, employing personnel, or purchasing equipment. The characteristics and inclinations of entrepreneurs were emphasized in the development of organizations. They evaluated elements including taking risks and the urge for success (Sanchez-Bueno & Suarez-Gonzalez, 2010). The importance of the founder's context and the relational network has received increased attention in research from sociologists and economics. Their investigation showed no equal playing field when starting an organization. Additionally, there are significant variations in structural possibilities and people's abilities to take advantage of them. Resources, networks, and expertise are three factors impacting new organizations (Sanchez-Bueno & Suarez-Gonzalez, 2010). Networks come in many forms; however, diversifying one network is crucial to improve access to information. However, knowledge is a social and personal element influenced by a person's IQ, work history, and educational opportunities. An organization's structure is crucial because it affects decision-making, coordination, communication, management, specialization, knowledge transfer, and sharing. There are many false beginnings and dead ends in starting new organizations (Scott & Davis, 2017). In addition, setbacks typically happen frequently. It is significant to highlight that several organizations take advantage of and profit from the creative efforts of early movers.

**Technological Developments**

Every time technology evolves, network organizations may avoid having to invest a significant amount of money in new technology. This is typical, especially for small businesses with limited resources and competing in a competitive, dynamic market. In locations where they share a network with larger companies, start-ups and small businesses can survive. Some hypotheses contend that the development of new technology led to the emergence of new organizations, industries, and people (Haapakorpi & Alasoini, 2018). The current partners' competence was bolstered and undermined by two different technology advancements (Stavropoulos, Wall & Xu, 2018), and creating new groups was more often associated with destructive advances.

**Organizational Populations**

Groups of populations that are related are sometimes referred to as organizational populations. Higher education institutions and media are two good examples. According to organizational ecologists, genetic systems were the foundation for early organizational forms. They also suggested that it should be characterized as an organizational action plan for converting inputs into outputs, with a typical organizational structure serving as the essential characteristic of the population (Carroll & Hannan, 2018). Numerous techniques have emerged from in-depth research on the problem of identifying organizational populations. First, one may classify institutions of higher learning, medical facilities, and commercial companies using the native system. The evolution of organizational structures throughout time will affect another process. Organizational forms are imprinted by their inertia. Additionally, they will likely keep the trait they gained upon emerging. Organizations founded during a specific period frequently share similar structural characteristics. Organizations were set up in the early 20th century according to their functions. Most firms started focusing on diversification strategies, resulting in a rise in administrative choices. The functional units included finance, engineering, manufacturing, sales, and marketing.

**Ecological Systems**

The ecological process necessitates knowledge and information resources and helps businesses or organizations within a network. In this situation, networks are crucial conduits for disseminating both old and new knowledge. Companies operating inside a network could access data and expertise that would otherwise be unavailable to them if they were not a part of the network. Access to information enables businesses to adapt to environmental changes, such as changing consumer needs (Gibson, Hardy & Buckley, 2014). Two different organizational survival strategies are described in detail by ecologists. The specialized strategy has a limited ability to tolerate environmental variation. The generalist strategy requires the capacity to procreate and flourish in various environmental circumstances. Organizations can handle adverse ecological changes. These two factors interact with one another and contribute to the development of favorable conditions for the existence of organizations. However, organizations may suffer when they are in-network. Organizational networks may provide partners with numerous options, but they may also restrict them. For instance, the partners may be prevented from joining other networks that would be more advantageous by being trapped within one. The output and contribution to the industry will be impacted, as well as organizational performance inside the network. Partners of the organization may potentially provide private information to competitors. This prevents them from gaining a long-lasting edge in the cutthroat market. Additionally, network involvement may encourage well-established companies to adhere to standards below standard norms and ideals. By undermining the organization's structure, these values and norms may adversely affect the organization's performance.

**Biblical Integration**

Organizations are dynamic and continually adapt to gain momentum in their environments. An organization's operations must alter to accommodate environmental change. Changes to processes, policies, culture, technology, strategy, or organizational structure may be part of the modification or change (Kitsios, Kamariotou & Talias, 2020). King Solomon's construction of God's temple is a great biblical illustration of network organization. Numerous people collaborated on this project to achieve the same goal. If people and organizations work together, they can accomplish their goals. 1 Corinthians 12:4–7 (King James Bible) “There are different kinds of gifts, but the same Spirit distributes them. There are different kinds of service, but the same Lord. There are different kinds of working, but it is the same God at work in all of them and everyone. Now to each one, the manifestation of the Spirit is given for the common good”. This emphasizes our interdependence, togetherness, and contributions as we each exercise the many callings and gifts that God has given us. Furthermore, all organizations are open system forms since they would not consider the safety of the surrounding environment if they were not. It is also critical to remember that individuals inside an organization impact the environment and the business. The conduct at work is shaped in part by social norms. Members are informed of the social standards through processes and guidelines that must be followed. Social standards from the natural, rational, or open system exist in every organization (Scott & Davis, 2017). Businesses should put their efforts into producing materials that will help their customers, shareholders, partners in the industry, and staff members. In Genesis 2:15 (King James Bible), Moses emphasizes the call for human beings to work and safeguard the earth. In Leviticus 25:14 (King James Bible), “when we make a sale or buy from our neighbor, you shall not wrong one another.” This means that building customer confidence and fair dealings will lead to the growth of organizations.

**Conclusion**

As was covered in this discussion, there are several forms of network organization. Depending on the organization, these networks could be advantageous or harmful. Additionally, networks influence an organization's productivity and contribution. Due to the rising negative consequences of modernization on people's health, organizations and businesses must concentrate on protecting society and the environment. Additionally, companies must abide by all laws and rules about environmental preservation. An ecological protection culture should be promoted through institutions. This may be done by implementing internal legislation that guarantees environmental conservation. These measures must benefit sustainability, safeguarding people from dangers, notwithstanding the implications for environmental protection.
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