Reviewer Evaluation [Round 1] – Journal of Critical Incidents Vol. 7

Critical Incident Title: Age Discrimination at Texas Roadhouse, Inc.

Reviewer #: 401

| CRITICAL INCIDENT | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Yes | No | Comments | | |
| Blind Memorandum addressing feedback from Annual Meeting is provided. | **X** |  |  | | |
| Describes a provocative/interesting situation | **X** |  |  | | |
| Focal point is a single decision point OR single descriptive event. | **X** |  |  | | |
| Hook is effective for catching the reader’s interest. |  | **X** | Although referencing line dancing does offer some appeal, the opening paragraph could go much further in capturing reader interest. The author(s) should consider also referencing the conflict that Texas Roadhouse was encountering. | | |
| Introductory paragraph states the issue to be solved or analyzed. |  | **X** | See comment above. | | |
| Incident is timely – focuses on a current issue. | **X** |  |  | | |
| Incident is discipline relevant – focuses on an issue or event common to many organizations. | **X** |  |  | | |
| Contains information students will need to make an informed decision or analyze the situation. | **X** |  | On first read, I thought the answer to this aspect of the review was “No,” because the reader does not have information to understand the basis on which how Texas Roadhouse was defending itself.  Asking the students to identify possibilities as to why Texas Roadhouse had been hiring young employees for the front of house positions, however, seems appropriate (TN Discussion Question #4). It still doesn’t inform the student of Texas Roadhouse’s actual reason(s) for the practice, but it does allow students to evaluate multiple possibilities in light of legal requirements. | | |
| If you mark NO to the above, is there additional CI information identified as companion readings/industry notes OR information presented in the teaching note that would enhance the story contained in the CI? |  |  | N/A | | |
| Fosters student’s use of their knowledge and skill. | **X** |  |  | | |
| Figures and tables are relevant to the CI. |  |  | N/A | | |
| Figures and tables are clearly referenced in the body of the CI. |  |  | N/A | | |
| CI flows well and is easy to read. | **X** |  |  | | |
| CI information accurately reflects a real situation. | **X** |  |  | | |
| CI meets 3 page limitation | **X** |  | Blank page after P. 3 should be deleted. | | |
| Free of grammar, punctuation, & spelling errors. |  |  | One instance of a typographical error on P. 1. The term “discriminatingthe” not only should be corrected to be more than one word, but the sentence indicates that additional words might also have been intended. | | |
| Written in past tense | **X** |  |  | | |
| OVERALL ASSESSMENT | | | | | |
| For each item, place a check mark in the appropriate column. For both ‘minor’ and ‘major’ revisions, provide specific recommendations that must be met in order for you to recommend publication. | | | No additional revisions are needed before a publication decision can be made. | Minor revisions are needed before acceptance decision can be made | Major revisions are needed before publication decision can be made. |
| Critical Incident: | | |  | **X** |  |
| Comments:  Interesting approach. To evaluate the evidence for/against Texas Roadhouse, the reader needs to understand the evidence supporting each side. Don’t have info on what Texas Roadhouse is basing its defense. In light of the 2% of front of house employees being 40+ the reader would want to know the basis on which Texas Roadhouse is arguing that it is not being discriminatory. In reading the ci, my first thoughts were that perhaps there is an aspect of what Texas Roadhouse’s target market desired that made age an important distinction when choosing to patronize the restaurant. Would it matter, for example, if it is helpful for Texas Roadhouse in appealing to its target market (and, therefore, its business) if Renee is young? If so, why is it important? Also, if so, then would that even matter for Texas Roadhouse’s defense – especially in light of the fact that customer preference is not accepted as a BFOQ as the tn states? Not providing this information and asking students to consider multiple possibilities (per the tn) offers both advantages (evaluating multiple possibilities) and disadvantages (an inability to evaluate the actual reason for the hiring decisions based solely on the info in the ci).  Biggest concern centers on the introductory paragraph. The paragraph does not identify the primary issue of the ci. Nor does it capture the reader’s attention as fully as it could be at least hinting at the conflict that had arisen.  One other concern and it is not a particularly critical one. As an introductory character “Renee” is irrelevant to the remainder of the ci. The author(s) could enhance her applicability to the rest of the ci by describing her age (and possibly her appearance). Is Renee in her twenties? Or is she actually in her forties and able to perform her job well?  Overall, a very interesting and well written ci! | | | | | |

| TEACHING NOTE | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Criteria | Yes | No | | Comments | | |
| Critical Incident Overview identifying the salient points of the CI. | **X** |  | |  | | |
| Critical Incident overview identifies courses in which the CI could be used. | **X** |  | |  | | |
| Critical Incident overview states whether the CI is decision or descriptive. |  |  | | Overview does indirectly identify the incident as a descriptive ci: “The incident can be used as an application of the process of …”  It does not, however, directly state the incident as descriptive. | | |
| List of learning objectives [what the student will be able to do] NOT teaching objectives. | **X** |  | |  | | |
| Learning objectives are appropriate for the focus of the CI (e.g. are there higher order Bloom’s Taxonomy verbs?).  **If not, suggestions for improvement?** |  |  | | Three of the four learning objectives are higher order verbs within Bloom’s Taxonomy. The third learning objective, however, simply asks students to “consider” certain claims: “LO3: Consider competing claims of groups having a stake in the outcome of this conflict.”  The one Discussion Question that addresses this learning objective (DQ6) goes beyond simply asking students to consider something. It actually asks students to make a thoughtful evaluation. This learning objective, therefore, could easily be modified to ask the students to do more than just consider, but actually to evaluate these claims. | | |
| Statement on whether or not the CI is disguised. If the later, states how. |  | **X** | | CI does not appear to be disguised in any way. No such statement, however, confirms that. | | |
| Overview of extent of the fieldwork conducted [if applicable] |  |  | | N/A | | |
| List of questions for students to answer. | **X** |  | |  | | |
| Questions are appropriately rigorous for the stated learning objectives. | **X** |  | |  | | |
| Restatement of each question with answer. | **X** |  | |  | | |
| Answers provide a substantial response, including use of applicable theories, formulas, laws, etc. [A non-expert could use the answers to assess the students’ response] | **X** |  | |  | | |
| Developing responses to the questions will help students understand and/or apply concepts, theories, and techniques appropriate to the courses identified. | **X** |  | |  | | |
| General Discussion section [Is optional – contains class activities, class discussion points, etc.] | **X** |  | |  | | |
| Epilogue | **X** |  | | Epilogue should identify what happened with the specific charges against Texas Roadhouse. Did the parties reach a settlement? If so, what were the details of the settlement? Was there any type of hearing? If so, how was it resolved? | | |
| Additional Pedagogical Materials provided. If, yes, they are relevant to the desired learning. | **X** |  | |  | | |
| References are provided. | **X** |  | |  | | |
| OVERALL ASSESSMENT | | | | | | |
| For each item, place a check mark in the appropriate column. For both ‘minor’ and ‘major’ revisions, provide specific recommendations that must be met in order for you to recommend publication. | | | No additional revisions are needed before a publication decision can be made. | | Minor revisions are needed before acceptance decision can be made | Major revisions are needed before publication decision can be made. |
| Teaching Note: | | |  | | **X** |  |
| Comments:  The response to Discussion Question #1 (DQ1) references a specific definition of discrimination without directly identifying that definition. (P. TN-3: “By this definition, discriminating against a qualified young person on the basis of age is harmful to the organization as well as being unfair to the applicant”). The statement appears to refer to the ADEA’s definition (per the requirements of the question itself). A component of the purpose of the ADEA’s definition is identified in the subsequent paragraph, but the specific definition itself had not yet been provided. The author(s) should either directly provided at this point – or make reference to the definition as it appears at the end of the tn..  A couple of editorial revisions:  P. 1: Extra space between “role” and “of” : “the role of government agencies like the EEOC”  P. 5: Extra period at the end of the first sentence.  Well done! | | | | | | |
| Should this Critical Incident with its Teaching Note be considered for the Best Critical Incident Award? \_X\_ YES \_\_ NO | | | | | | |