

Information to Authors of IJCIR

Submitting Articles to IJCIR

The International Journal of Computing and ICT Research (IJCIR) follows the Association of Computing Machinery (ACM) publication guidelines. This means, therefore, that much of what follows in these author guidelines is taken from the ACM Author Instructions (www.acm.org). The IJCIR is electronically produced, so it is imperative that all manuscripts be prepared in electronic formats. The instructions contained herein are meant to make the process of manuscript preparation as straightforward as possible.

Submission of manuscripts in MS Word is preferred, please see the template¹ below.

Copyrights

To ensure a smooth production process, don't forget to include the **Signed Copyright Form** when you transmit your final manuscript to IJCIR. For completeness, please make sure that your manuscript has the following components:

1. MS Word source file for processing
2. Printable PDF and/or PostScript file for copyediting
3. Illustrations in any of the following electronics formats: eps, tif, gif, or jpeg

ACM - Computing Classification System (CCS)

An important aspect of preparing your paper for publication by IJCIR is to provide the proper indexing and retrieval information from the ACM Computing Classification System (CCS). Please prepare the categories and general terms for your paper because you are the expert on the contents of your paper. The ACM -CCS

¹ The journal has adopted the ACM Publication Style and this template is the same as that used by the ACM.

involves a four-level tree that has three coded levels and an uncoded level of subject descriptors (usually appearing at the fourth level). This tree comprises the categories and subject descriptors. It is important that there'll be ONLY one Primary level! If you are not yet familiar with this scheme, we suggest that you take a look at

http://www.acm.org/class/how_to_use.html

This is important to us and your readers because accurate categorization provides the reader with quick content reference, facilitating the search for related literature, as well as searches for your work.

ACM In-Text Citation Style

The in-text citation style is as follows: For parenthetical citations we enclose the last name of the first author and year of publication, thus: [Burando 2007]; when there are two authors, both last names and the year of publication are included [Burando and Lee 2007]; when there are more than two authors, we cite the last name of the first author followed by an "et al." [Burando et al. 2007]; when a number of authors are cited parenthetically we list the last name and year, or two last names and year, or the last name of the first author followed by "et al." and year of publication. All parenthetical citations are enclosed in square brackets and separated by semi-colons, thus: [Burando 2007; Burando and Lee 2007; Burando et al. 2007]. When a citation is part of a sentence, the name of the author is NOT enclosed in brackets, but the year is: "So we see that Burando et al. [2007]..."

Special Note About Reference Format

Because manuscript references take a lot of time during the copyediting process, it is important that authors strictly adhere to the reference format.

Below and in the template is the correct reference format for the IJCIR publication.

Please note:

- First of all, all entries are presented in alphabetical order.
- Secondly, all occurrences of names of authors and/or editors should be set in Caps and Small Caps.

For journal:

ABDELBAR, A.M., AND HEDETNIEMI, S.M. 1998. Approximating MAPs for belief networks in NP-hard and other theorems. *Artificial Intelligence* 102, 21-38.

For book:

GINSBERG, M. 1987. *Readings in Nonmonotonic Reasoning*. Morgan Kaufmann, Los Altos, CA.

For article in a book of collection:

GREINER, R. 1999. Explanation-based learning. In *The Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science*, R. WILSON AND F. KEIL, Eds. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 301-303.

For Conference Proceedings:

MAREK, W., AND TRUSZCZYNSKI, M. 1989. Relating autoepistemic and default logics. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*, Toronto, Canada, May 1989, H. BRACHMAN AND R. REITER, Eds. Morgan Kaufmann, San Mateo, CA, 276-288.

Author Template

This Is the Title of the Paper

AUTHOR 1

Affiliation 1

and

AUTHOR 2 AND AUTHOR 3

Affiliation 2

This research investigates the role of interface manipulation style on reflective cognition and concept learning through comparison of the effectiveness of three versions of a software application for learning two-dimensional transformation geometry. The three versions, respectively, utilize a Direct Object Manipulation (DOM) interface - in which the user manipulates the visual representation of objects being transformed; a Direct Concept Manipulation (DCM) interface - in which the user manipulates the visual representation of the transformation being applied to the object; and a Reflective Direct Concept Manipulation (RDCM) interface - in which the DCM approach is extended with scaffolding.

Categories and Subject Descriptors: G.4 [**Mathematics of Computing**]: Mathematical Software - *User Interfaces*; H5.2 [**Information Interfaces and Presentation**]: User Interfaces - *User-centered design; Interaction styles; Theory and methods*; K.3 [**Computing Milieux**]: Computers and Education

General Terms: Design, Experimentation, Human Factors

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Human-computer interaction, direct manipulation, reflection, education, learning, cognition, learnware, transformation geometry, problem solving

1. INTRODUCTION

A great deal of interface design research has been devoted to determining mechanisms for making productivity tools (e.g., word processors and drawing tools) easy to use and intuitive so that users can perform a given task more smoothly and efficiently.

Hutchins et al. [1986] outline different aspects of "directness." They state:

The Gulf of Execution is bridged by making the commands and mechanisms of the system match the thoughts and goals of the user as much as possible. The Gulf of Evaluation is bridged by making the output displays present a good Conceptual Model of the system that is readily perceived, interpreted, and evaluated.

The research presented in this paper addresses the following questions arising in the preceding discussion:

1. Is a shift from DOM to DCM conducive to effective learning?
2. Does DCM afford more reflective cognition and conscious processing of concepts?

This research was supported by the Funding Agency.

Authors' addresses: Author 1, Department of ..., The University of ..., State Zip Code; Author 2, Department of ..., The University of ..., State Zip Code; Author 3, Department of ..., The University of ..., State Zip Code.

Permission to make digital/hard copy of part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that the copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage, the copyright notice,

the title of the publication, and its date of appear, and notice is given that copying is by permission of the ACM, Inc. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers, or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

© 2001 ACM 1073-0516/01/0300-0034 \$5.00

3. How can the interface support reflective cognition, and are there scaffolding strategies that would support and enhance the DCM metaphor?

2. PRIMARY HEAD

2.1 Secondary Head

In the DOM version, the user manipulates the geometric shapes directly. Buttons on the side allow users to select drag, clockwise rotate, counter-clockwise rotate, horizontal flip, or vertical flip mode (see Figure 5).

Fig. 5. Figure caption is set underneath the illustration.

2.1.1 Tertiary Head. This can be illustrated by the following equation:

$$T_{\text{Attempt}}(m) = T_{\text{Overread}}(m) + R(m) \cdot T_{\text{Input}}(m)$$

(2)

Table II shows mean pretest scores were at about the same level for all the groups. However, the results show large gains for the RDCM treatment group.

Table II. Table Head Sits on Top of the Table

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many thanks to my former colleagues at the University of Illinois who developed the earlier prototypes of the system described here.

REFERENCES <<ENTRIES ARE ALPHABETICAL BY LAST NAME OF PRIMARY AU>>

<<For Journal:>>

ABDELBAR, A.M., AND HEDETNIEMI, S.M. 1998. Approximating MAPs for belief networks in NP-hard and other theorems. *Artificial Intelligence* 102, 21-38.

<<For Book:>>

GINSBERG, M. 1987. *Readings in Nonmonotonic Reasoning*. Morgan Kaufmann, Los Altos, CA.

<<For article in a book of collection:>>

GREINER, R. 1999. Explanation-based learning. In *The Encyclopedia of Cognitive Science*, R. WILSON AND F. KEIL, Eds. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 301-303.

<<For Conference Proceedings:>>

MAREK, W., AND TRUSZCZYNSKI, M. 1989. Relating autoepistemic and default logics. In *Proceedings of the 1st International Conference on Principles of Knowledge Representation and Reasoning*, Toronto, Canada, May 1989, H. BRACHMAN AND R. REITER, Eds. Morgan Kaufmann, San Mateo, CA, 276-288.

Received August 2000; revised March 2001; accepted May 2001.