

30 sept Week 4

## **Entrepreneurship and the desire for growth**

Larry Greiner «evolution & revolution as organization growth»

Greiner's major claims :

entreprise size, age, maturity,

anticipate what' coming next

every organization grow through a series of evolution and revolution phases that are function of the age and the size of the organisation

Managment practices that work well in one phase bring on a crisis in the next missing type of evolution and revolution what they are

Greiner's primary concepts: age of the org, size of the org, stages of reolution, stages of evolution, growth rate of industry, managment style, organisational structure.

The five phases of growth :

- |                  |   |                      |
|------------------|---|----------------------|
| 1) Creativity    | → | crisis of leadership |
| 2) Direction     |   | crisis of autonomy   |
| 3) Delegation    |   | Crisis of control    |
| 4) Coordination  |   | Red-tape crisis      |
| 5) Collaboration |   |                      |

## **Evaluate the supporting evidence :**

Criteria to test the quality of the evidence :

- accuracy
- precision
- sufficiency
- representativeness
- authority
- clarity of expression

## Chapter 3 : Evidence

*Evidence* : any statement that is a response to the question : why is it true ?

- statistics
- details of past events
- anecdotes
- written accounts
- previously established claims
- statement and reasoning that provide support for the claim

→ in the absence of evidence, a claim is only an unsubstantiated (non fondé) opinion.

→ the more contestable is the claim, the more important it is to be bolstered by solid evidence

### **I-) Finding the evidence :**

We must locate the evidence before we can evaluate an argument.

*Argument* : combination of a claim and the evidence for it.

-Cue words + evidence :

Ex : because + evidence, as a result + evidence, in the first place + evidence, for example + evidence, in addition + evidence (...)

Each piece of the evidence has to be explained

### **II-) Quality of the evidence :**

The presence of evidence does not mean the claim is acceptable.

It is rare that we can absolutely be certain about the evidence for any claim.

Our job is to evaluate if the supporting evidence is of high quality and makes the claim highly probable, or whether it is of low quality, making the claim dubious (douteuse).

## **To test the quality of the evidence :**

### **1) Accuracy (exactitude, justesse)**

Accuracy can be impossible to judge without an independent and infallible source of information.

We verify the information by doing research of our own.

Trivial errors (grammar, spelling mistakes...) undermine (ébranle) confidence in the author's reliability and make the argument less persuasive.

## 2) Precision :

A good evidence is precise.

Ex : «the mutual fund did *quite well* last year» → «the mutual fund made 9,2% last year»

«A great deal, many, often, a high probability, few, usually...» = **low precision**

To increase the precision : use numbers, quotations.

## 3) Sufficiency (autosuffisance, independance) :

To be persuasive, an author must present sufficient (suffisante) evidence to support a claim.

When the evidence is not sufficient to support the claim, we say that the author is guilty of the «fallacy of hasty generalization».

*Fallacy* : erroneous, but frequently persuasive way of being led from a reason or circumstance to a conclusion»

If we jump to a conclusion based on insufficient evidence, we are engaging in fallacious thinking.

## 4) Representativeness (représentativité)

Ex : young Canadians are not representative of all Canadian.

The variety in the source of evidence should match the variety in the population relevant to the claim.

The fallacy of hasty generalization is also relevant to unrepresentative evidence. We should not be persuaded by evidence that does not come from a fair sample of information

## 5) Authority

When people have special training and professional credentials, or considerable experience in a particular area, we call them authority and pay close attention to the evidence they provide.

When writers cite business scholars and experienced business people, this lends authority to their argument. This is why, the currency (crédibilité) of the source is important.

Authority is context-dependent.

A legal argument needs authoritative legal sources

Fallacy (fausse idée) of false appeal to authority = error we make when we accept the testimony of someone who has no expertise in the relevant area.

Fallacy of «*argumentum ad populum*» = appeal to the people.

The bandwagon effect : the mere fact that many people accept a belief is not in itself evidence that the belief is correct.

## 6) Clarity of expression :

Use of table, figures, charts, graph : not explicit : common failing.

Data must always be interpreted for the readers. Numbers do not speak for themselves.

1) summarize the table

2)interprets the numbers

+ quotation should also be clearly interpreted when they are offered in evidence.

---

Citing the source of the evidence allows your readers to judge the *authority* and the *accuracy* of the information.

When more than one authority must be cited, the selection of experts must be representative.

Appropriate decisions and clear statements of the significance of the evidence are crucial.