

The Journal of  
**Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology**

**Volume 19, 2022**

**Table of Contents**

Digital Literacy in the Core: The Emerging Higher Education Landscape <b>Meg Murray, Jorge Pérez, Joy Fluker</b> .....	1-13
A Classification Schema for Designing Augmented Reality Experiences <b>Shaun Bangay, Sophie McKenzie</b> .....	15-40
Retail Quest: Student Perceptions of a Virtual Field Trip App <b>Mary Lebens</b> .....	41-59
Impact of Gender on Perceived Work Climate in Business Information Systems <b>Georg Disterer</b> .....	61-69
The Tutor’s Role in the Online Training of Preservice Teachers: Tutor and Tutee Perspectives <b>Gila Cohen Zilka</b> .....	71-95
Modern Transdisciplinarity: Results of the Development of the Prime Cause and Initial Ideas <b>Vladimir S. Mokiy, Tatiana A. Lukyanova</b> .....	97-120
“I Do Better, Feel Less Stress and Am Happier” – A Humanist and Affective Perspective on Student Engagement in an Online Class <b>Geraldine Torrisi-Steele</b> .....	121-133
Using Teach Back Tutorials to Overcome Pandemic Learning Gaps <b>Steven Sherman, Benjamin Larson, Jeffrey Bohler, E. Fran Smith</b> .....	135-148

## *Review Process*

Except where otherwise noted, all papers were reviewed using a process commonly known as double-blind (that is, with author and affiliation information) 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 submission's 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.