



Issues in Informing Science + Information Technology

*An Official Publication
of the Informing Science Institute
InformingScience.org*

IISIT.org

Volume 22, 2025

Editor in Chief:

Eli Cohen, Informing Science Institute (USA)

Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology (IISIT) is a peer-reviewed journal that publishes selected high-quality articles from the Informing Science and Information Technology Education (IⁿSITE) conferences.

All conference manuscripts have been submitted and reviewed electronically using the same review system as our Journals. We provide our published authors with both a quality print publication and widespread readership. This approach ensures that published works are read and cited by the widest possible audience.

(CC BY-NC 4.0) The articles in this journal are licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/). When you copy and redistribute this paper in full or in part, you need to provide proper attribution to it to ensure that others can later locate this work (and to ensure that others do not accuse you of plagiarism). You may (and we encourage you to) adapt, remix, transform, and build upon the material for any non-commercial purposes. This license does not permit you to use this material for commercial purposes.

Online ISSN: 1547-5867

Published by the Informing Science Institute
131 Brookhill Ct., Santa Rosa, California USA
phone: +1-707-537-2211
<http://informingscience.org>

The Journal of Issues in Informing Science and Information Technology

Volume 22, 2025 Table of Contents

	ARTICLE #
Systematic Literature Review of the Development of Data Science Applications in Healthcare Anshuman Rangaraj, Theodore Langdon, Hazem Said	001
The Predominant Ethical Issues Around Deep Fake Technology and Fake News on Social Media Singarila Somanje, John Mangundu	002
Predictive Modeling for Identity Theft Detection: A Design Science Approach Using Machine Learning and Historical Data Charles Mitchell Jr., Samuel Sambasivam	003
Leveraging Technology-Driven Nudging for Decision-Making in Criminal Justice - Expert Perspectives Hansinie Madushika Jayathilake, Amir Reza Asadi, Taiwo Peter Akinremi, Joel Kwesi Appiah, Opetunde Ibitoye, Hazem Said	004
Peer Assessment of In-Class Presentations: A Cross-Cultural Comparison of American and Chinese Students in Information Systems Courses Sung J Shim	005
Designing and Validating a Comprehensive Institution-Wide DEI Needs Assessment Nicole Buzzetto-Hollywood, Katherine Quinn	006
Interventions and Iterations to Fortify Small Business Resilience Krishnakumar Nair	007
Factors Influencing Online Identity Falsification Among Israeli Students in the Wake of the COVID-19 Pandemic Maor Weinberger, Dan Bouhnik	008
Preparing for the Future: An Initial Examination of Generative AI's Integration into Unified Communications Through the Lens of Microsoft Copilot in Teams Joy Fluker, Meg Murray, Jayant Gupta	009
Bridging the Generative AI Literacy Gap: A Guide to Introducing Prompt Engineering in University Courses Meg Coffin Murray	010
Embedding Inquiry-Based Learning in a Large Database Course via Paired Assessment Mali Senapathi	011
Exploring Data Mesh Adoption in Large Organizations Robert Winter, Tobias Hackl	012

<u>Applying Competencies Across Disciplines to Enhance Computational Thinking and Professional Performance</u>	
Imani Akin, Matasha MurrellJones, Ramona Burress	013
<u>Advancing Federated Machine Learning for Privacy-Preserving Financial Models: Performance Comparison with Standard Machine Learning on Financial Data</u>	
Samuel Sambasivam	014
<u>Expanding Access and Impact: Culturally Responsive Practices for Hispanic Graduate Students in Virtual Academic Spaces</u>	
Jeffery Chernosky	015
<u>AI Assistance Variants in Software Development Cycles</u>	
Micheal Callahan, Joseph Claus, Emmy Voita, Christine Bakke	015

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.