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Most Interesting Idea: Organization’s Size Perception Smelser and John have discussed a number of ideas including the social and economic perspective of organizations. However, the most interesting idea amongst the ones described by the authors is size in reference organizations and organizational change, which forms the fundamental concept of defining the extent to which an organization is small or large. Remarkably, a common believe that most individuals have is the traditional perception of an organization’s size being determined by factors such as the human labor, capacity, resources, wealth or market power (Smelser and John 186). Additionally, size in the context of organizations has effects that directly have an effect on the efficiency and the structure.   
It is captivating that Smelser and John perceive the size of an organization to be affected and determined by various aspects including activities distribution in time and space. The distribution of activities in time and space has a major effect on the organization, which influence the decisions made to achieve the desired outcome. Interestingly, Smelser and John indicate that greater size is associated with greater complexity and formalization; hence, they believe that size carries not only the definition of how large or small an organization is, but also the variations in the organization’s authoritative hierarchy and culture. The authors further outline the cautions necessary in handling effects associated with size including developments such as outsourcing, specializations, and virtual organization. Consequently, it is interesting that the size of an organization is linked to every other aspect of economies of scale and the dissemination of activities in time and space.   
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