

Academic BRASS

Published by the
BRASS Business Reference in Academic Libraries Committee

Vol 9 (1), Spring 2014

Desirae Zingarelli-Sweet
Business Librarian
James Madison University

Peer Reference for an Upper-Level Undergraduate Business Course

Peer reference models have been in use in academic libraries since at least the 1970s, but they enjoyed more widespread acceptance throughout the 1990s and 2000s, in conjunction with the rise of information or learning commons and related service models (Bodermer, 2014, p.165). The use of student workers to provide basic reference services across college and university libraries continues to increase (Gremmels, 2013, p.234-5), and there are several existing examples of efficacious peer reference models utilizing undergraduate student workers (Bodermer, 2014; Faix et al., 2010). Nevertheless, there seems to be significant untapped potential for peer reference support to business students across a variety of institutions. What follows is a discussion of one such sustainable reference service, utilizing one student worker at a time.

As a new professional and liaison to the 3,500-student College of Business at James Madison University in the fall of 2013, I was lucky enough to step into a situation in which an agreement had been struck for the first time between the library and the College of Business. The two units were to split the cost of paying a library student worker to assist with a large course required of all business majors. With funding secured and a great deal of freedom in hiring, training, and deploying this student worker, I found this very small-scale peer reference program sustainable and well-worth the time invested in its development and supervision for both me and, anecdotally, for the business students served.

In either the fall or spring semester of their junior year, undergraduate business majors at James Madison University are required to enroll concurrently in four integrated courses. In addition to individual assignments and examinations in each area, these courses culminate in the completion of a robust written business plan and presentation. At present, over six hundred students finish this suite of courses every year. Historically, library instruction efforts for the university's College of Business have focused on reaching students in this set of courses because it explicitly requires secondary research and is required by all declared business majors, regardless of concentration.

The maxim that peer collaboration enhances student learning has been well assimilated into most undergraduate business programs (Colby et al., 2011, p. 90-92), and my local context is no exception. The constellation of courses in question rely upon student groups of five or more to complete the business plan, among other activities.

Moreover, the instructional faculty routinely make use of undergraduate teaching assistants to support learning in these content-heavy courses.

The library's peer reference student worker position fits into the same category as this teaching assistant— what Falchikov (2001) names “cross-level peer tutoring involving one institution” in her typology of peer tutoring (p.9, 36-46). That is to say, both set-ups make use of existing differences in student preparedness or expertise. Successful completion of the courses in question (or their equivalent) is a requirement listed in the peer research coach's job description and a condition of employment. Previous experience teaching, tutoring, coaching others was also given preference in the hiring process.

Once the student had been interviewed and selected, the student read and signed a ten-point position description as well as a negotiated statement of learning outcomes for the year in order to clarify the expectations and communicate the value placed on the student worker's growth throughout the employment period. This COB 300 peer research coach was prepared for and expected to answer course-related business reference questions of moderate complexity— those in the 3-4 range of the 6-point READ scale (see Gerlich, n.d.). Formal training included selected readings from Celia Ross's *Making Sense of Business Reference* and several similar guides, a reading on working with teams of students, review of the library guide for the course and other commonly used resources, practice questions, and (ideally) observation of in-class library instruction for the courses in question. Ongoing guidance was provided during a weekly, in-person meeting and as needed.

Based on anecdotal evidence, having increased options for course-specific research help benefited the target students in three notable ways. First, the peer research coach extends the hours during which specialized business research assistance is available to include Sundays and weekday nights, both in-person and through the university library's chat system. This provided a cost-effective means of lightening the business librarian's workload by triaging reference questions from this cohort of 600-plus per term. Second, the predictable benefits of peer tutoring for both tutors and tutees— including increased cognitive apprehension, academic skills development, and learner engagement and motivation— are well-documented (Bodermer, 2014, p. 162-165; Owen, 2011, p. 55-58; Falchikov, 2001, p. 67-83). Positive student feedback and some groups' repeat consultations with the peer research coach helped substantiate these presumed gains.

Third, the peer research coach's existence provided students a choice in course-specific research help. Having two options for research consultations allowed students some ability to choose an avenue that better suited their learning styles and personalities, as indicated by some students' gravitation toward the student assistant or myself in spite of hours of availability. Furthermore, in a university and a discipline that continue to struggle with sexism and other unsavory gender dynamics (Anderson, 2014; Chugh, Milkman, & Akinola, 2014; Sandler, 2008; Whitmire, 2008), I have to wonder whether the marked predominance of female students who sought me out for research help versus those that visited the male peer research coach(es) bore a significance.

There is clear room for improvement in service assessment (beyond simple tallying of service hours and reference interactions) and promotion to the target student population. In the future, I also hope to coordinate better with the recently piloted, general peer reference service within the university libraries, particularly in student worker training. From my current vantage point, however, the benefits of this course-specific, peer research coach far outweigh the cost of time and resources. I highly

encourage others— especially solo business librarians— to explore peer tutoring for undergraduate business research.

Works Cited

- Anderson, N. (2014, June 19). In TV reports, former JMU student says assailants were given light punishment. *The Washington Post*. Retrieved from <http://www.washingtonpost.com/>
- Bodermer, B. (2014). They CAN and they SHOULD: Undergraduates providing peer reference and instruction. *College & Research Libraries*, 55(2), 162-178.
- Chugh, D., Milkman, K. L., & Akinola, M. (2014, May 11). Professors are prejudiced, too. *The New York Times* (Washington ed.), p. SR14.
- Colby, A., et al. (2011). *Rethinking undergraduate business education: Liberal learning for the profession*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Faix, A., et al. (2010). Peer reference redefined: New uses for undergraduate students. *Reference Services Review*, 38(1), 90-107. Retrieved from Library, Information Science & Technology Abstracts.
- Falchikov, N. (2001). *Learning together: Peer tutoring in higher education*. New York: Routledge Falmer.
- Gerlich, B. K. (n.d.). The READ scale. Retrieved from <http://readscale.org/read-scale.html>
- Gremmels, G. (2013). Staffing trends in college and university libraries. *Reference Services Review*, 41(2), 233-252.
- Owen, J. E. (2011). Peer educators in classroom settings: Effective academic partners. In *New Directions for Student Services*, 133, 55-64. Retrieved from Wiley Online Library.
- Sandler, B. R. (2008, September 5). Gender vs. brains [Letter to the editor]. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 55(2), p. A79. Retrieved from LexisNexis Academic.
- Whitmire, R. (2008, July 25). A tough time to be a girl: Gender imbalance on campuses. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, 54(46), p. A23. Retrieved from MasterFILE + Premier.