

The Journal of
Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology
Volume 11, 2014

Table of Contents

Campus Event App - New Exploration for Mobile Augmented Reality Joseph T. Chao, Lei Pan, and Kevin R. Parker	1-11
Learning and Assessment Practices of Doctoral Studies of Developing and Developed Countries: A Case Study of Doctoral Studies in Bangladesh Ahabab Chowdhury	13-30
Warranty of Misinforming: An Overview Dimitar Christozov, Stefanka Chukova, and Plamen Mateev	31-46
Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Systems – Is Botswana Winning? A Question on Culture Effects Oduronke Temitope Eyitayo	47-55
To Social Login or not Login? Exploring Factors Affecting the Decision Ruti Gafni and Dudu Nissim	57-72
Software Development Using C++: Beauty-and-the-Beast Kirby McMaster, Samuel Sambasivam, and Stuart Wolthuis	73-84
Unraveling the Digital Literacy Paradox: How Higher Education Fails at the Fourth Literacy Meg Coffin Murray and Jorge Pérez	85-100
Critical Design Factors of Developing a High-quality Educational Website: Perspectives of Pre-service Teachers Wing-Shui Ng	101-113
The Use of Mobile Phones by South African University Students David North, Kevin Johnston, and Jacques Ophoff	115-138
An Overview of Information Tools and Technologies for Competitive Intelligence Building: Theoretical Approach Celina M. Olszak	139-153
Effectiveness of Combining Algorithm and Program Animation: A Case Study with Data Structure Course Waleed Ibrahim Osman and Mudawi M. Elmusharaf	155-168
Analysis of Student Attitudes towards E-learning: The Case of Engineering Students in Libya Amal Rhema and Iwona Miliszewska	169-190
Making the Case for BYOD Instruction in Teacher Education Nancy Burns-Sardone	191-201
Analyzing Computer Programming Job Trend Using Web Data Mining David Smith and Azad Ali	203-214

A Collaborative Framework for a Cross-Institutional Assessment to Shape Future IT Professionals
Anne Venables, Grace Tan, and Sunam Pradhan 215-223

Course Quality Starts with Knowing Its C-Index
Neville I. Williams 225-237

Review Process

All papers were reviewed blindly (that is, with author and affiliation information removed) by between 6 and 10 external reviewers. The reviewers did not know the identity of the authors nor the authors of the reviewers. Reviewers were matched to papers using a formula to minimize the psychological distance between reviewers’ stated expertise and interest and the topics covered in the paper. In cases where this formula did not provide at least 6 reviewers, reviewers were randomly assigned to papers. No reviewer was required to review more than 3 papers.

Reviewers were instructed to mentor the authors by providing feedback on how to improve the submission. They were further required to recommend whether or not the paper should be accepted using a six-point scale (from “reject” to “must accept”).

The authors of all papers, whether accepted or not, were provided with the reviewers’ feedback, as part of our process of mentoring authors. Authors of accepted papers were required to revise their submissions in light of the issues raised in the reviews.

We believe that the papers in this journal represent a great contribution to science.