

1	Beyond the Green Label: How Consumers Perceive and Evaluate Sustainable Products
Keywords	Sustainability; Green; Consumer Choices; Information Systems
Goal	Consumers are increasingly confronted with sustainability-related information when making purchasing decisions. Online shops, product websites, social media, and digital marketplaces provide consumers with a growing amount of information about the environmental and social characteristics of products. At the same time, companies increasingly communicate sustainability-related claims to differentiate their products and brands. However, consumers may differ in how they understand sustainability, which sustainability dimensions they consider important, and how they evaluate sustainability claims. In particular, the increasing use of sustainability claims raises the question of how consumers perceive and recognize greenwashing. While existing research has investigated sustainable consumption and greenwashing from different perspectives, less is known about how consumers themselves assess sustainability-related information and which aspects they consider relevant when making sustainable choices. The aim of this bachelor thesis is to explore how consumers perceive and evaluate sustainability in the context of purchasing decisions. In particular, the thesis should investigate which dimensions of sustainability consumers consider important, what motivates them to make sustainable choices, and how they perceive and evaluate sustainability claims and potential greenwashing. In order to gain a deeper understanding of consumers' perspectives, a case study shall be conducted. The case study shall include at least 5 semi-structured interviews with private consumers based on a specified sample. The work should identify relevant perceptions, decision criteria, experiences, and patterns in consumers' sustainable decision-making and structure the findings in a comprehensive way.
Methodology	Case Study – <i>Interviews can be conducted in-person or online (e.g., via Skype, Zoom, etc.)</i>
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Giddens, L., Leidner, D. E., & Williams, C. K. (2026). Facilitating Ethical Consumption Through Reflexive Engagement With Information Systems. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 27(5), 1180–1205. • T: Song, Y. (Amy), Wu, J., Mookherjee, S., & Bose, I. (2026). Advertising green products on brands' official social media accounts or mega-influencer accounts? <i>Information & Management</i>, 63(1), N.PAG-N.PAG. • T: Stieglitz, S., Mirbabaie, M., Deubel, A., Braun, L.-M., & Kissmer, T. (2023). The potential of digital nudging to bridge the gap between environmental attitude and behavior in the usage of smart home applications. <i>International Journal of Information Management</i>, 72, N.PAG-N.PAG. • T: Andraschko, L., Wunderlich, P., Sarker, S., & Veit, D. (2023). Sustainable IS Use: What IS Needed to REDUSE. <i>ICIS 2023 Proceedings</i>. • M: Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive Research: Notes on the Gioia Methodology. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>, 16(1), 15–31. • M: Myers, M. D. (2019). <i>Qualitative Research in Business and Management</i>. London: Sage.

	• M: Urquhart, C., Lehmann, H., & Myers, M. D. (2010). Putting the ‘theory’ back into grounded theory: guidelines for grounded theory studies in information systems. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 20(4), 357–381. • M: Walsham, G. (1995). Interpretive Case Research in IS: Nature and Method. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 4(2), 74–81.
Supervisor	Dr. Christina Wagner

2	From Click to Green Choice: How Digital Information Systems Influence Sustainable Consumption
Keywords	Sustainability, Green, Consumer Choices, Information Systems
Goal	Today, consumers increasingly encounter sustainability-related information when making purchasing decisions. Digital platforms, online shops, recommender systems, mobile applications, and other information systems can influence these decisions by providing sustainability information, personalized recommendations, social comparisons, feedback, or other forms of digital nudging. While prior research has examined how consumers can be encouraged to make more sustainable choices, the literature is spread across Information Systems and neighboring fields such as consumer research, marketing, psychology, and sustainability research. The aim of this master seminar thesis is to conduct a structured literature review bringing together insights from prior research on digital influence and sustainable consumer decision-making. The work should identify and structure the relevant literature streams and provide a comprehensive overview of the types of digital interventions and information systems studied, the theories and concepts applied, the mechanisms through which digital interventions influence consumers, the outcomes investigated, as well as the different contexts in which they are examined. The review may further consider factors such as trust, transparency, perceived credibility, personalization, and greenwashing, and identify opportunities and open questions for future research in Information Systems.
Methodology	Literature Review
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Giddens, L., Leidner, D. E., & Williams, C. K. (2026). Facilitating Ethical Consumption Through Reflexive Engagement With Information Systems. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 27(5), 1180–1205. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.01018 • T: Song, Y. (Amy), Wu, J., Mookherjee, S., & Bose, I. (2026). Advertising green products on brands' official social media accounts or mega-influencer accounts? <i>Information & Management</i>, 63(1), N.PAG-N.PAG. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2025.104259 • T: Stieglitz, S., Mirbabaie, M., Deubel, A., Braun, L.-M., & Kissmer, T. (2023). The potential of digital nudging to bridge the gap between environmental attitude and behavior in the usage of smart home applications. <i>International Journal of Information Management</i>, 72, N.PAG-N.PAG. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijinfomgt.2023.102665 • T: Andraschko, L., Wunderlich, P., Sarker, S., & Veit, D. (2023). Sustainable IS Use: What IS Needed to REDUCE. <i>ICIS 2023 Proceedings</i>. https://aisel.aisnet.org/icis2023/user_behav/user_behav/10 • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and theory symbiosis: An introspective retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(6). https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00501 • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems Research. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i>. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1954824 • M: Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information privacy research: An interdisciplinary review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 980–1016. https://doi.org/10.2307/41409970

	• M: Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 26(2), xiii–xxiii. • M: Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (2013). Using grounded theory as a method for rigorously reviewing literature. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 22(1), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2011.51
Supervisor	Dr. Christina Wagner

3	Going Offline: Why and How People Deliberately Disconnect from Digital Technologies
Keywords	Offline; Digital Detox; Digital Backlash
Goal	Digital technologies have become deeply embedded in everyday life, enabling people to stay constantly connected, informed, and entertained. At the same time, a growing interest in deliberately reducing or avoiding digital technology use can be observed. Practices such as digital detox, social media breaks, or choosing offline alternatives reflect a desire to disconnect from an increasingly digital everyday life. Such deliberate disconnection can take different forms and may be driven by various motivations. People may disconnect temporarily or permanently, restrict specific technologies, or establish boundaries between online and offline activities. The aim of this bachelor thesis is to explore how and why people deliberately reduce, restrict, or avoid digital technologies. A case study including at least 5 semi-structured interviews with private individuals shall be conducted. The work should identify different forms, contexts, and motivations of digital disconnection, explore when and why individuals choose non-digital alternatives, and structure recurring patterns in a comprehensive way.
Methodology	Case Study – <i>Interviews can be conducted in-person or online (e.g., via Skype, Zoom, etc.)</i>
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Maier, C., Laumer, S., Weinert, C., & Weitzel, T. (2015). The effects of technostress and switching stress on discontinued use of social networking services: A study of Facebook use. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 25(3), 275–308. • T: Turel, O. (2015). Quitting the use of a habituated hedonic information system: A theoretical model and empirical examination of Facebook users. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 24(4), 431–446. • T: Maier, C., Laumer, S., Eckhardt, A., & Weitzel, T. (2015). Giving too much social support: Social overload on social networking sites. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 24(5), 447–464. • T: Marx, J., Mirbabaie, M., & Turel, O. (2025). Digital Detox: A theoretical framework and future research directions for Information Systems. <i>Information & Management</i>, 62(1). • M: Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive Research: Notes on the Gioia Methodology. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>, 16(1), 15–31. • M: Myers, M. D. (2019). <i>Qualitative Research in Business and Management</i>. London: Sage. • M: Urquhart, C., Lehmann, H., & Myers, M. D. (2010). Putting the ‘theory’ back into grounded theory: guidelines for grounded theory studies in information systems. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 20(4), 357–381. • M: Walsham, G. (1995). Interpretive Case Research in IS: Nature and Method. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 4(2), 74–81.
Supervisor	Dr. Christina Wagner

4	Opting Out of Digital? A Review of Digital Disconnection in an Always-Online World
Keywords	Offline; Digital Detox; Digital Backlash
Goal	Digital technologies have become deeply embedded in everyday life, enabling people to stay constantly connected, informed, and entertained. At the same time, a growing interest in deliberately reducing or avoiding digital technology use can be observed. Concepts such as digital detox, digital disconnection, technology non-use, or digital minimalism describe different ways in which individuals seek to limit their engagement with digital technologies. Research on this phenomenon spans different technologies, contexts, and disciplines and considers different forms of disconnection, ranging from temporary breaks and selective restrictions to more permanent technology abandonment. However, a comprehensive understanding of when, why, and in which areas individuals deliberately disconnect from digital technologies is still emerging. The aim of this bachelor thesis is to conduct a structured literature review on deliberate digital disconnection and technology non-use. The work should identify and structure relevant literature streams, examine different forms, contexts, and motivations of digital disconnection, and synthesize what is known about when and why individuals reduce or avoid digital technology use. Based on the findings, the thesis should develop a comprehensive overview of the phenomenon and identify opportunities for future research.
Methodology	Literature Review
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Maier, C., Laumer, S., Weinert, C., & Weitzel, T. (2015). The effects of technostress and switching stress on discontinued use of social networking services: A study of Facebook use. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 25(3), 275–308. • T: Turel, O. (2015). Quitting the use of a habituated hedonic information system: A theoretical model and empirical examination of Facebook users. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 24(4), 431–446. • T: Maier, C., Laumer, S., Eckhardt, A., & Weitzel, T. (2015). Giving too much social support: Social overload on social networking sites. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 24(5), 447–464. • T: Marx, J., Mirbabaie, M., & Turel, O. (2025). Digital Detox: A theoretical framework and future research directions for Information Systems. <i>Information & Management</i>, 62(1). • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and theory symbiosis: An introspective retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(6). • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems Research. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i>. • M: Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information privacy research: An interdisciplinary review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 980–1016. • M: Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the past to prepare for the future: Writing a literature review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 26(2), xiii–xxiii. • M: Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (2013). Using grounded theory as a method for rigorously reviewing literature. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 22(1), 45–55.
Supervisor	Dr. Christina Wagner

5	Bad Prompting Or Hallucinating AI. Accountability In Times Of Cognitive Computing.
Keywords	Accountability, Information Systems Research, Literature Review
Goal	Humans increasingly outsource their decision-making to information technology (IT) and rely on the IT to decide in their best interest. The question, who is held accountable for the consequences of such decisions is frequently discussed. However, accountability perceptions exceed the mere understanding about who did something wrong. Whilst accountability discussions focus majorly on legal considerations, insights on perceived accountability and its psychological consequences remain fragmented and need synthesizing. With the recent advent of autonomous and interactive IT -applications, including machine learning and artificial intelligence, this topic increased in relevancy for academia, practice and the general public. This thesis includes a systematic literature review on accountability in information systems literature. The specific focus on the context of this thesis remains on interactive IT, including applications of machine learning and artificial intelligence.
Methodology	Literature Review
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Baird, A., & Maruping, L. M. (2021). The Next Generation of Research on Is Use: A Theoretical Framework of Delegation to and from Agentic Is Artifacts. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 45(1), 315–341. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2021/15882 • T: Berente, N., Gu, B., Recker, J., & Santhanam, R. (2021). Managing artificial intelligence. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 45(3), 1433–1450. • T: Carter, M., & Grover, V. (2015). Me, My Self, And I (T). <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 39(4), 931–958. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2015/39.4.9 • T: Schuetz, S., & Venkatesh, V. (2020). The rise of human machines: How cognitive computing systems challenge assumptions of user-system interaction. <i>Journal of the Association of Information Systems</i>, 21(2), 460–482. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00608 • T: Stout, N., Dennis, A., & Wells, T. (2014). The Buck Stops There: The Impact of Perceived Accountability and Control on the Intention to Delegate to Software Agents. <i>AIS Transactions on Human-Computer Interaction</i>, 6(1), 1–15. • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(06), 552–567. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00501 • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems Research. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i>. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1954824 • M: Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information Privacy Research: An Interdisciplinary Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 989–1016. https://doi.org/10.2307/41409970 • M: Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 26(2), 13–23. https://doi.org/10.2307/4132319 • M: Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (2013). Using grounded theory as a method for rigorously reviewing literature. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 22(1), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2011.51
Supervisor	Dr. Bruckner Moritz

6	Shifting From Deterministic Technology To Cognitive Computing. Understanding The Social Aspect Human-Technology Interactions With Seemingly Intelligent Software Applications.
Keywords	Information Technology, Artificial Intelligence, Human-Technology Interaction, Literature Review
Goal	Identities shape our perceptions of self and how we perceive and shape the world around us. Identities define our self-confidence, our interactions with others and how we approach everyday tasks. Since information technology (IT) is inevitably intertwined with our everyday lives, IT has also become part of our self-conception, forming what is known as IT identity. IT identity is defined as “who we are in relation to IT” by Carter and Grover (2015). Since the inception of the theory, research has been continuously elaborating on how interactions with technology change as a result of increasing social characteristics that define technology. Yet theorizing is predominantly based on traditional IT that includes one-way interactions. Since the inception of interactive IT applications, including large language models, the social component of human-technology interactions is increasingly important to understand. This thesis aims to synthesize existing knowledge on the social aspect of human-technology interactions.
Methodology	Literature Review
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Carter, M., & Grover, V. (2015). Me, My Self, And I (T). <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 39(4), 931–958. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2015/39.4.9 • T: Carter, M., Petter, S., Grover, V., & Thatcher, J. B. (2020a). Information Technology Identity: A Key Determinant of IT Feature and Exploratory Usage. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 44(3), 983–1021. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2020/14607 • T: Carter, M., Reibenspiess, V., Li, Y., & Grover, V. (2022). IT Use and Identity: A Review and a Research Agenda. <i>Foundations and Trends in Information Systems</i>, 6(1), 1–93. https://doi.org/10.1561/29000000027 • T: Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity Theory and Social Identity Theory. <i>Social Psychology Quarterly</i>, 63(3), 224–237. https://doi.org/10.2307/2695870 • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(06), 552–567. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00501 • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems Research. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i>. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1954824 • M: Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information Privacy Research: An Interdisciplinary Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 989–1016. https://doi.org/10.2307/41409970 • M: Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 26(2), 13–23. https://doi.org/10.2307/4132319 • M: Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (2013). Using grounded theory as a method for rigorously reviewing literature. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 22(1), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2011.51
Supervisor	Dr. Bruckner Moritz

7	Literacy and Machine Learning. How Intelligent Information Aggregation Changes our Information Literacy. - A Systematic Literature Review
Keywords	Literacy, Machine Learning, Artificial Intelligence, Literature Review
Goal	Seemingly intelligent applications of machine learning algorithms, like for example natural language processing (i.e., ChatGPT), simplify information sourcing, aggregation and understanding. It naturally affects our literacy if information can be sourced anywhere, anytime, and we do not need to rely on our own reasoning anymore. However, critical thinking and sourcing of information from primary sources are important literacy skills for a reliable understanding of diverse contexts. This thesis is expected to elucidate effects of machine learning applications on literacy of humans. Effects, consequences and future research avenues should be critically discussed, based on a systematic literature review.
Methodology	Literature Review
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Behrens, S. J. (1994). A conceptual analysis and historical overview of information literacy. <i>College and Research Libraries</i>, 55(4), Article 4. Scopus. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl_55_04_309 • T: Belkin, N. J., & Croft, W. B. (1992). Information filtering and information retrieval: Two sides of the same coin? <i>Communications of the ACM</i>, 35(12), Article 12. https://doi.org/10.1145/138859.138861 • T: Demetis, D., & Lee, A. (2018). When Humans Using the IT Artifact Becomes IT Using the Human Artifact. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(10), 929–952. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00514 • T: Mackey, T. P., & Jacobson, T. E. (2011). Reframing Information Literacy as a Metaliteracy. <i>College & Research Libraries</i>, 72(1), Article 1. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl-76r1 • T: Malhotra, N. K., Jain, A. K., & Lagakos, S. W. (1982). The Information Overload Controversy: An Alternative Viewpoint. <i>Journal of Marketing</i>, 46(2), 27–37. • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(06), 552–567. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00501 • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems Research. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i>. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1954824 • M: Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information Privacy Research: An Interdisciplinary Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 989–1016. https://doi.org/10.2307/41409970 • M: Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 26(2), 13–23. https://doi.org/10.2307/4132319 • M: Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (2013). Using grounded theory as a method for rigorously reviewing literature. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 22(1), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2011.51
Supervisor	Dr. Bruckner Moritz

8	Cognitive Atrophy, Adoption To New Technology Or A Global Pandemic?
Keywords	Cognitive Atrophy, Human-Computer Interaction, Information Systems Research, Literature Review
Goal	Information technology (IT) is always available and in use through smartphones, PC's and tablets. Other technology, like TV's, cooking devices and smart home applications are getting increasingly smart and take over decisions for humans. Studies show that extensive use of IT reduces cognitive abilities to take decisions independent of IT. Examples have been studied in the context of GPS navigation software like for example Google Maps. Individuals who extensively rely on suggestions to navigate by Google Maps show decreased skills to navigate on their own. A phenomenon called cognitive atrophy, meaning the degeneration of the mental capability of taking decisions in the absence of IT. Since this increasing reliance includes the risk of cognitive atrophy for everyone, this topic is highly relevant for academia, managers and the general public. This thesis aims at conducting a systematic literature on what is known about cognitive atrophy in the context of IT use.
Methodology	Literature Review
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Carr, N. (2020). <i>The Shallows: What the Internet Is Doing to Our Brains</i>. W. W. Norton & Company. • T: Dahmani, L., & Bohbot, V. D. (2020). Habitual use of GPS negatively impacts spatial memory during self-guided navigation. <i>Scientific Reports</i>, 10(1), 6310. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-020-62877-0 • T: Schuetz, S., & Venkatesh, V. (2020). The rise of human machines: How cognitive computing systems challenge assumptions of user-system interaction. <i>Journal of the Association of Information Systems</i>, 21(2), 460–482. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00608 • T: Sparrow, B., Liu, J., & Wegner, D. M. (2011). Google Effects on Memory: Cognitive Consequences of Having Information at Our Fingertips. <i>Science</i>, 333(6043), 776–778. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1207745 • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(06), 552–567. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00501 • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems Research. <i>SSRN Electronic Journal</i>. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.1954824 • M: Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information Privacy Research: An Interdisciplinary Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 989–1016. https://doi.org/10.2307/41409970 • M: Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 26(2), 13–23. https://doi.org/10.2307/4132319 • M: Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. P. M. (2013). Using grounded theory as a method for rigorously reviewing literature. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 22(1), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2011.51
Supervisor	Dr. Bruckner Moritz

9	The Fairness of AI-Based Decision-Making – A Literature Review
Keywords	Artificial Intelligence, Fairness, Algorithmic Fairness, Human-AI Collaboration, AI Governance, Decision Making, Algorithmic Bias
Goal	The growing prevalence of artificial intelligence (AI) systems in organizational decision-making processes raises concerns about fairness and equity. The reason is the emergence of algorithmic bias as decisions based on AI models can reproduce or amplify biases present in historical training data and lead to unfair outcomes. Although various mitigating approaches have been developed, their practical implementation remains challenging. The aim of this bachelor thesis is to conduct a systematic literature review of existing research in the field of information systems (IS) on fairness in AI-based decision-making. The thesis will examine how fairness is conceptualized and evaluated, how algorithmic bias emerges, and which technical, organizational, and human factors influence the fairness of outcomes.
Methodology	Literature Review
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Rai, A., Tian, J., & Xue, L. (2026). FAIR: A Design Theory for Artificial Intelligence Fairness. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 50(3), 817–850. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2026/17971 • T: Dolata, M., Feuerriegel, S., & Schwabe, G. (2022). A Sociotechnical View of Algorithmic Fairness. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 32(4), 754–818. https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12370 • T: Ochmann, J., Michels, L., Tiefenbeck, V., Maier, C., & Laumer, S. (2024). Perceived Algorithmic Fairness: An Empirical Study of Transparency and Anthropomorphism in Algorithmic Recruiting. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 34(2), 384–414. https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12482 • T: Arhin, K., Hickman, L., & Kuruzovich, J. (2026). A Layered Needs-Affordances-Features Approach to Advancing Artificial Intelligence Fairness in Hiring Systems. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 27(4), 846–876. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00993 • T: Veale, M., & Binns, R. (2017). Fairer Machine Learning in the Real World: Mitigating Discrimination without Collecting Sensitive Data. <i>Big Data & Society</i>, 4(2). https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951717743530 • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(6). • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems research. <i>Working Papers on Information System</i>, 10, 1–5. • M: Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information Privacy Research: An Interdisciplinary Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 980–1016. • M: Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 26(2), xiii–xxiii. • M: Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. P. (2013). Using Grounded Theory as a Method for Rigorously Reviewing Literature. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 22(1), 45–55.
Supervisor	Dr. Yulia Tseytlin

10	The Effects of Generative AI on Human Creativity – A Literature Review
Keywords	Artificial Intelligence, Generative AI, Creativity, Innovation, Human-AI Collaboration, Co-Creative Process
Goal	Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) is establishing itself as an important tool for driving innovation. But under what conditions does AI assistance enhance or constrain creative performance? Ample research on human–AI collaboration examines how the technology influences the various stages of creative work, from idea generation to development to implementation. The aim of this bachelor thesis is to conduct a systematic literature review of existing information systems (IS) research on the impact of GenAI assistance on the creative process. The thesis will examine factors explaining the technology's effects on human creativity, such as the type of AI assistance, the stage of the creative process, and the user's level of expertise. It will also provide an overview of circumstances under which GenAI can complement human creativity, as well as of potential limitations and challenges.
Methodology	Literature Review
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Gordetzki, P., Blohm, I., Clegg, M., Schakols, F., & Hofstetter, R. (2026). Agency Configurations in Generative AI Ideation: How Textual and Visual Idea Concretizations Shape Idea Creativity and Ideator Effort. <i>Information Systems Research</i>, 1. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2024.0952 • T: Hou, J. (Jove), Wang, L., Wang, G., Wang, H. J., & Yang, S. (2025). The Double-Edged Roles of Generative AI in the Creative Process: Experiments on Design Work. <i>Information Systems Research</i>, 1. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2024.0937 • T: Luan, Y. L., Kim, Y. J., & Zhou, J. (2025). Augmented Learning for Joint Creativity in Human-GenAI Co-Creation. <i>Information Systems Research</i>, 1. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2024.0984 • T: Benbya, H., Strich, F., & Tamm, T. (2023). Navigating Generative Artificial Intelligence Promises and Perils for Knowledge and Creative Work. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 25(1), 23–36. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00861 • T: Wong, S. S. H., & Qiu, S. X. (2026). Think First, Chatgpt Later: Guiding Human–AI Collaboration for Learning Gains in Independent Human Creativity. <i>Educational Psychology Review</i>, 38(1), 45. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10648-026-10118-7 • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(6). • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems research. <i>Working Papers on Information System</i>, 10, 1–5. • M: Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information Privacy Research: An Interdisciplinary Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 980–1016. • M: Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 26(2), xiii–xxiii. • M: Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. P. (2013). Using Grounded Theory as a Method for Rigorously Reviewing Literature. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 22(1), 45–55.
Supervisor	Dr. Yulia Tseytlin

11	The Effects of AI Assistance on Human Cognitive Engagement and Critical Thinking – A Literature Review
Keywords	Artificial Intelligence, Human-AI Collaboration, Cognitive Engagement, Critical Thinking
Goal	As artificial intelligence (AI) tools transform numerous aspects of our daily life, researchers are examining their impact on human cognitive engagement and critical thinking, especially during knowledge-intensive activities. The aim of this bachelor thesis is to conduct a systematic literature review of existing information systems (IS) research on the impact of AI assistance on human cognitive engagement and independent reasoning. The thesis will examine how different forms of human-AI interaction support or constrain critical thinking, along with their influence on cognitive effort, reflection, reasoning, and performance.
Methodology	Literature Review
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Tarafdar, M., Adam, M., & Nguyen, L. T. (2026). How Reflection Enhances Task Factuality in the Use of Large Language Models. <i>Journal of Management Information Systems</i>, 43(3), 716–753. https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2026.2692283 • T: Shan, G., Rivera, M., Kumar, S., & Anand, P. (2026). Mind and the Machine: How Does Generative Artificial Intelligence Usage Affect the Coding Performance of Developers? <i>Journal of Management Information Systems</i>, 43(3), 754–785. https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2026.2692282 • T: Benbya, H., Strich, F., & Tamm, T. (2023). Navigating Generative Artificial Intelligence Promises and Perils for Knowledge and Creative Work. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 25(1), 23–36. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00861 • T: Gerlich, M. (2025). AI Tools in Society: Impacts on Cognitive Offloading and the Future of Critical Thinking. <i>Societies</i>, 15(1), 6. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15010006 • T: Liu, G., Christian, B., Dumbalska, T., Bakker, M. A., & Dubey, R. (2026). AI Assistance Reduces Persistence and Hurts Independent Performance. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2604.04721 • T: Lu, T., & Zhang, Y. (2025). 1 + 1 > 2? Information, Humans, and Machines. <i>Information Systems Research (INFORMS)</i>, 36(1), 394–418. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2023.0305 • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(6). • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems research. <i>Working Papers on Information System</i>, 10, 1–5. • M: Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information Privacy Research: An Interdisciplinary Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 980–1016. • M: Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 26(2), xiii–xxiii. • M: Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. P. (2013). Using Grounded Theory as a Method for Rigorously Reviewing Literature. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 22(1), 45–55.
Supervisor	Dr. Yulia Tseytlin

12	The Effects of AI Assistance on Human Cognitive Engagement (Critical Thinking) – A Case Study
Keywords	Artificial Intelligence, Human-AI Collaboration, Cognitive Engagement, Critical Thinking
Goal	As artificial intelligence (AI) tools transform numerous aspects of daily life, researchers are examining their impact on human cognitive engagement and critical thinking, especially during knowledge-intensive activities. The extent to which individuals develop their own understanding rather than relying primarily on AI-generated outputs is influenced by different forms of human-AI interaction. The aim of this case study is to gain a deeper understanding of the conditions under which the technology supports or constrains critical thinking, along with its influence on cognitive effort, reflection, reasoning, and independent performance. The study will identify relevant aspects, contexts, and patterns regarding the impact of AI assistance on human cognitive engagement and independent reasoning and present the findings in a comprehensive manner.
Methodology	Case Study – <i>Interviews can be conducted in-person or online (e.g., via Skype, Zoom, etc.)</i>
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Tarafdar, M., Adam, M., & Nguyen, L. T. (2026). How Reflection Enhances Task Factuality in the Use of Large Language Models. <i>Journal of Management Information Systems</i>, 43(3), 716–753. https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2026.2692283 • T: Shan, G., Rivera, M., Kumar, S., & Anand, P. (2026). Mind and the Machine: How Does Generative Artificial Intelligence Usage Affect the Coding Performance of Developers? <i>Journal of Management Information Systems</i>, 43(3), 754–785. https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2026.2692282 • T: Benbya, H., Strich, F., & Tamm, T. (2023). Navigating Generative Artificial Intelligence Promises and Perils for Knowledge and Creative Work. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 25(1), 23–36. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00861 • T: Gerlich, M. (2025). AI Tools in Society: Impacts on Cognitive Offloading and the Future of Critical Thinking. <i>Societies</i>, 15(1), 6. https://doi.org/10.3390/soc15010006 • T: Liu, G., Christian, B., Dumbalska, T., Bakker, M. A., & Dubey, R. (2026). AI Assistance Reduces Persistence and Hurts Independent Performance. arXiv. https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2604.04721 • T: Lu, T., & Zhang, Y. (2025). 1 + 1 > 2? Information, Humans, and Machines. <i>Information Systems Research (INFORMS)</i>, 36(1), 394–418. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2023.0305 • M: Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive Research: Notes on the Gioia Methodology. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>, 16(1), 15–31. • M: Myers, M. D. (2019). <i>Qualitative Research in Business and Management</i>. London: Sage. • M: Urquhart, C., Lehmann, H., & Myers, M. D. (2010). Putting the ‘Theory’ Back into Grounded Theory: Guidelines for Grounded Theory Studies in Information Systems. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 20(4), 357–381. • M: Walsham, G. (1995). Interpretive Case Research in IS: Nature and Method. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 4(2), 74–81.
Supervisor	Dr. Yulia Tseytlin

13	Connecting the Public Sector – A Systematic Literature Review on Interoperability in the Public Sector
Goal	Interoperability—defined as the “ability of two or more systems to exchange information and understand the information that is exchanged” (Hodapp and Hanelt, 2022, p. 407)—is a core prerequisite for digital transformation in the public sector. This is because public organizations need to exchange data and coordinate processes across organizational and technical boundaries. Common standards play an important role in enabling such interoperability, for example by facilitating data exchange, service integration, and coordinated digital infrastructures across agencies. At the same time, the adoption of interoperability standards in the public sector is often challenging due to, for example, institutional complexity or heterogeneous stakeholders. Prior research in information systems has examined interoperability and standards adoption in government from different perspectives, yet the literature remains fragmented and lacks a structured synthesis. The aim of this bachelor thesis is to conduct a systematic literature review on interoperability and standards adoption in the public sector in information systems and eventually structure the results in a comprehensive way.
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Henning, F. (2018). A theoretical framework on the determinants of organisational adoption of interoperability standards in Government Information Networks. <i>Government Information Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 61–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2015.11.008 • T: Hodapp, D., & Hanelt, A. (2022). Interoperability in the Era of Digital Innovation: An Information Systems Research Agenda. <i>Journal of Information Technology</i>, 37(4), 407–427. https://doi.org/10.1177/02683962211064304 • T: Klischewski, R. & Askar, E. (2012). Linking service development methods to interoperability governance in Egyptian government services. <i>Government Information Quarterly</i>, 29(1), 22–31. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2011.12.001 • T: El-Haddadeh, R., Weerakkody, V., & Al-Shafi, S. (2013). The complexities of electronic services implementation and institutionalisation in the public sector. <i>Information & Management</i>, 50(4), 135–143. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2013.02.005 • M: Leidner, D. E. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(6), 552–567. http://dx.doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00501 • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems research. <i>Working Papers on Information System</i>, 10, 1–5. • M: Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 26(2), xiii–xxiii. • M: Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. P. (2013). Using Grounded Theory as a Method for Rigorously Reviewing Literature. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 22(1), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2011.51
Supervisor	Verena Kessler Verzar

14	The AI Divide – A Systematic Literature Review on Digital Inequality in the Age of Artificial Intelligence
Keywords	Artificial Intelligence, Digital Inequality, Digital Divide
Goal	The increasing diffusion of artificial intelligence (AI) into everyday life, education, and work creates new opportunities, but may also reinforce existing or create new forms of digital inequality. Traditional research on the Digital Divide distinguishes inequalities in access to digital technologies, digital skills and usage, and the benefits individuals derive from technology. With the growing importance of AI, these inequalities may take new forms, for example through differences in access to AI systems, AI literacy, effective use, or the ability to critically evaluate AI-generated outputs. The aim of this bachelor thesis is to conduct a systematic literature review on the emerging AI Divide. The thesis should identify and structure key dimensions, antecedents, and consequences of AI-related inequalities and examine how the AI Divide relates to and extends established research on the Digital Divide.
Methodology	Literature Review
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Riggins, F. J., & Dewan, S. (2005). The Digital Divide: Current and Future Research Directions. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 6(12), 4. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00074 • T: Hsieh, J. J. P.-A., Rai, A., & Keil, M. (2011). Addressing Digital Inequality for the Socioeconomically Disadvantaged Through Government Initiatives: Forms of Capital That Affect ICT Utilization. <i>Information Systems Research</i>, 22(2), 233–253. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.1090.0256 • T: Peeters, R., Miller, S. M., & Schuilenburg, M. (2025). Digital government inclusion: Exploring strategies for inclusive government automation. <i>Government Information Quarterly</i>, 42(2), 102028. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2025.102028 • M: Leidner, D. E. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(6), 552–567. http://dx.doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00501 • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems research. <i>Working Papers on Information System</i>, 10, 1–5. • M: Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 26(2), xiii–xxiii. • M: Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. P. (2013). Using Grounded Theory as a Method for Rigorously Reviewing Literature. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 22(1), 45–55. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2011.51
Supervisor	Verena Kessler Verzar

15	When Digital Services Fail – A Case Study on User Responses to Digital Service Failure
Keywords	Digital Service Failure; User Response; Service Continuance
Goal	Digital services have become an integral part of everyday life. However, users frequently encounter service failures such as unavailable systems, incorrect information, malfunctioning features, or failed transactions. Such experiences can shape users' perceptions of a service and influence whether they continue using it, search for alternatives, or develop workarounds. The aim of this thesis is to conduct a case study to investigate how users experience and respond to digital service failures. The thesis should identify relevant types of failures, examine users' reactions, and explore which factors influence whether users tolerate, circumvent, or discontinue the service.
Methodology	Case Study – <i>Interviews can be conducted in-person or online (e.g., via Zoom)</i>
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Tan, C.-W., Benbasat, I., & Cenfetelli, R. T. (2016). An exploratory study of the formation and impact of electronic service failures. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 40(1), 1-29. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2016/40.1.01 • T: Tsohou, A., Siponen, M., & Newman, M. (2020). How does information technology-based service degradation influence consumers' use of services? An information technology-based service degradation decision theory. <i>Journal of Information Technology</i>, 35(1), 2-24. https://doi.org/10.1177/0268396219856019 • M: Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive Research: Notes on the Gioia Methodology. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>, 16(1), 15–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112452151 • M: Myers, M. D. (2019). <i>Qualitative Research in Business and Management</i>. London: Sage. • M: Urquhart, C., Lehmann, H., & Myers, M. D. (2010). Putting the 'theory' back into grounded theory: guidelines for grounded theory studies in information systems. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 20(4), 357–381. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2575.2009.00328.x • M: Walsham, G. (1995). Interpretive Case Research in IS: Nature and Method. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 4(2), 74–81. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.1995.9
Supervisor	Verena Kessler Verzar

16	Too Much of a Good Thing? – A Case Study on Social Media Overload and Discontinuance
Keywords	Social Media Overload; Technostress; Discontinuance
Goal	Social media platforms provide opportunities for communication, entertainment, and information exchange, but their intensive use can also lead to negative experiences such as information overload, social pressure, exhaustion, or technostress. As a consequence, users may reduce their usage, take temporary breaks, or discontinue the use of certain platforms altogether. Prior research suggests that different forms of overload and stress can shape such discontinuance behaviors. The aim of this thesis is to conduct a case study of a selected social media platform and investigate how users experience social media overload and how these experiences influence their usage behavior. The thesis should identify relevant sources of overload and explore how users respond, for example by adapting, reducing, temporarily suspending, or discontinuing their use of the platform.
Methodology	Case Study – <i>Interviews can be conducted in-person or online (e.g., via Zoom)</i>
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Maier, C., Laumer, S., Eckhardt, A., & Weitzel, T. (2015). Giving too much social support: Social overload on social networking sites. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 24(5), 447-464. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.2014.3 • T: Maier, C., Laumer, S., Weinert, C., & Weitzel, T. (2015). The effects of technostress and switching-stress on discontinued use of social networking services: A study of Facebook use. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 25(3), 275-308. https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12068 • M: Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive Research: Notes on the Gioia Methodology. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>, 16(1), 15–31. https://doi.org/10.1177/1094428112452151 • M: Myers, M. D. (2019). <i>Qualitative Research in Business and Management</i>. London: Sage. • M: Urquhart, C., Lehmann, H., & Myers, M. D. (2010). Putting the ‘theory’ back into grounded theory: guidelines for grounded theory studies in information systems. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 20(4), 357–381. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2575.2009.00328.x • M: Walsham, G. (1995). Interpretive Case Research in IS: Nature and Method. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 4(2), 74–81. https://doi.org/10.1057/ejis.1995.9
Supervisor	Verena Kessler Verzar

17	When Digital Dependence Becomes a Concern: A Case Study on the Development of Digital Sovereignty Aspirations
Keywords	Digital Sovereignty, Digital Dependence, Perceived Control, User Autonomy
Goal	Users often rely on digital platforms without actively considering how much control providers have over access, functionality, and the conditions of participation. Experiences such as an account restriction, a service shutdown, or a unilateral change to terms or features can make this dependence visible. These experiences may prompt users to question who controls their digital activities and whether they need greater autonomy. However, dissatisfaction with a service does not necessarily lead to broader concerns about dependence. Investigating how users interpret such experiences can help explain when aspirations for individual digital sovereignty emerge. The aim of this bachelor thesis is to explore how concrete experiences lead users to recognize digital dependence and develop, revise, or dismiss aspirations for greater control. To better understand this phenomenon, a qualitative case study shall be conducted within a clearly defined digital service context, such as social networking or personal communication. The case study shall include either at least 2 focus groups (4–5 participants each) or at least 5 semi-structured interviews with users who have experienced a provider decision or service disruption that affected their use. Participants do not need technical expertise or familiarity with the term digital sovereignty. The work should reconstruct how participants interpreted these experiences and identify when concerns extend beyond service dissatisfaction to questions of provider power, autonomy, and control. The findings should be structured into an account of how sovereignty aspirations emerge and what responses users consider possible.
Methodology	Case Study – <i>Interviews can be conducted in-person or online (e.g., via Skype, Zoom, etc.)</i>
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Abbas, A. E., Van Velzen, T., Ofe, H., Van De Kaa, G., Zuiderwijk, A., & De Reuver, M. (2024). Beyond control over data: Conceptualizing data sovereignty from a social contract perspective. <i>Electronic Markets</i>, 34(1), 20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-024-00695-2 • T: Wang, B., Ciriello, R. F., & Richter, A. (2026). Digital Sovereignty. <i>Business & Information Systems Engineering</i>. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-026-01018-9 • T: Zamani, E. D., & Pouloudi, N. (2021). Generative Mechanisms of Workarounds, Discontinuance and Reframing: A Study of Negative Disconfirmation with Consumerised IT. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 31(3), 384–428. https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12315 • T: Salo, M., & Frank, L. (2017). User Behaviours After Critical Mobile Application Incidents: The Relationship with Situational Context. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 27(1), 5–30. https://doi.org/10.1111/isj.12081 • M: Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive Research: Notes on the Gioia Methodology. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>, 16(1), 15–31. • M: Myers, M. D. (2019). <i>Qualitative Research in Business and Management</i>. London: Sage. • M: Urquhart, C., Lehmann, H., & Myers, M. D. (2010). Putting the ‘theory’ back into grounded theory: guidelines for grounded theory studies in information systems. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 20(4), 357–381. • M: Walsham, G. (1995). Interpretive Case Research in IS: Nature and Method. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 4(2), 74–81.
Supervisor	Laura Macpherson

18	Breaking Free or Trading Dependencies? A Literature Review of Open Source and Digital Sovereignty
Keywords	Digital Sovereignty, Open Source Software, Technological Dependencies
Goal	Open source software can offer alternatives to proprietary systems and provide opportunities to reduce dependence on individual technology vendors. However, organizations using open source software may continue to rely on maintainers, external expertise, or service providers. Moving to open source may therefore change the nature and distribution of dependencies rather than eliminate them. These relationships are not necessarily incompatible with digital sovereignty, but their governance may influence an organization's ability to maintain, adapt, and make decisions about its digital resources. The aim of this bachelor thesis is to conduct a systematic literature review of how open source software reduces, reshapes, or creates dependencies relevant to digital sovereignty. The review shall focus on organizations adopting or relying on open source software and their relationships with other actors in the software ecosystem. It should draw on Information Systems (and related) research explicitly addressing digital sovereignty and relevant open source studies examining governance, corporate influence, capabilities, and control. The work should identify which dependencies are reduced, which remain or emerge, and how these relationships enable or constrain organizations' capacity to act. The findings should be structured into a synthesis of the findings (e.g. dependency types, governance arrangements, and their implications for digital sovereignty). Based on this synthesis, the thesis may identify conditions under which dependence remains compatible with effective control.
Methodology	Literature Review
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Abbas, A. E., Van Velzen, T., Ofe, H., Van De Kaa, G., Zuiderwijk, A., & De Reuver, M. (2024). Beyond control over data: Conceptualizing data sovereignty from a social contract perspective. <i>Electronic Markets</i>, 34(1), 20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-024-00695-2 • T: Wang, B., Ciriello, R. F., & Richter, A. (2026). Digital Sovereignty. <i>Business & Information Systems Engineering</i>. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-026-01018-9 • T: Daniel, S. L., Maruping, L. M., Cataldo, M., & Herbsleb, J. (2018). The Impact of Ideology Misfit on Open Source Software Communities and Companies. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 42(4), 1069-A10. • T: Schaarschmidt, M., Walsh, G., & Von Kortzfleisch, H. F. O. (2015). How Do Firms Influence Open Source Software Communities? A Framework and Empirical Analysis of Different Governance Modes. <i>Information and Organization</i>, 25(2), 99–114. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.infoandorg.2015.03.001 • T: Kauffman, R. J., McAndrews, J., & Wang, Y.-M. (2000). Opening the „Black Box“ of Network Externalities in Network Adoption. <i>Information Systems Research</i>, 11(1), 61–82. • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(6). • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems research. <i>Working Papers on Information System</i>, 10, 1–5. • M: Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information Privacy Research: An Interdisciplinary Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 980–1016. • M: Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 26(2), xiii–xxiii.

	• M: Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. P. (2013). Using Grounded Theory as a Method for Rigorously Reviewing Literature. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 22(1), 45–55.
Supervisor	Laura Macpherson

19	Choosing Between Payment and Consent: A Literature Review of User Autonomy in Digital Services
Keywords	Pay or Consent, User Autonomy, Informed Consent, Decision-Making, Information Privacy
Goal	Pay-or-consent models confront users with a choice between paying for a digital service and consenting to the collection and processing of personal data. The availability of these options raises questions about whether users can make informed and voluntary decisions, how the presentation of alternatives influences their choices, and which conditions support meaningful control over personal information. These questions connect pay-or-consent models to established Information Systems research on privacy decision-making, consent, perceived control, and digital choice architecture. The aim of this bachelor thesis is to conduct a systematic literature review of the Information Systems literature on the conditions that enable or constrain meaningful choice and user autonomy, with a specific focus on their relevance to pay-or-consent models. The review shall include research directly addressing pay-or-consent models as well as relevant studies of consent and privacy decisions in digital services. It should synthesize how concepts such as autonomy, voluntariness, and informed choice are conceptualized and which factors influence them. Findings directly established in pay-or-consent settings should be distinguished from implications derived from related contexts. The work should structure the findings in a comprehensive way and identify research needs concerning the design and evaluation of pay-or-consent models.
Methodology	Literature Review
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Adjerid, I., Peer, E., & Acquisti, A. (2018). Beyond The Privacy Paradox: Objective Versus Relative Risk in Privacy Decision Making. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 42(2), 465–488. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2018/14316 • T: Gal-Or, E., Gal-Or, R., & Penmetsa, N. (2018). The Role of User Privacy Concerns in Shaping Competition Among Platforms. <i>Information Systems Research</i>, 29(3), 698–722. https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2017.0730 • T: Wu, C.-H. (2025). Data Disclosure Strategy: Navigating the Balance Between Privacy and Profit in a Dynamic System. <i>Decision Support Systems</i>, 197, 114510. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dss.2025.114510 • T: Oh, H., Animesh, A., & Pinsonneault, A. (2016). Free Versus For-a-Fee: The Impact of a Paywall on the Pattern and Effectiveness of Word-of-Mouth Via Social Media. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 40(1), 31–56. https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2016/40.1.02 • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(6). • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems research. <i>Working Papers on Information System</i>, 10, 1–5. • M: Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information Privacy Research: An Interdisciplinary Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 980–1016. • M: Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 26(2), xiii–xxiii. • M: Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. P. (2013). Using Grounded Theory as a Method for Rigorously Reviewing Literature. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 22(1), 45–55.
Supervisor	Laura Macpherson

20	Who is Digitally Sovereign? A Systematic Literature Review on the Relationships Between Individual, Organizational, and State Digital Sovereignty
Keywords	Digital Sovereignty, Individual Autonomy, Organizational Control, State Sovereignty, Multilevel Relationships
Goal	Digital sovereignty is discussed in relation to individuals, organizations, states, and supranational actors such as the European Union. These actors seek control over different digital resources and decisions, and their objectives do not necessarily align. Measures intended to strengthen an organization's control over its digital systems may restrict employees' choices, while state initiatives may enable or constrain the autonomy of organizations and citizens. Assessing digital sovereignty therefore requires attention to whose sovereignty is pursued and how greater control for one actor affects the possibilities available to others. The aim of this bachelor thesis is to conduct a systematic literature review of how Information Systems (and related) research addresses relationships between individual, organizational, and state digital sovereignty, including the European level where relevant. The review should identify whose sovereignty is examined, what forms of control or self-determination are envisaged, and how relationships with other actors are conceptualized. Particular attention should be paid to situations in which sovereignty objectives reinforce one another or give rise to tensions and trade-offs. The work should go beyond classifying actors and definitions by synthesizing the mechanisms and conditions through which one actor's pursuit of sovereignty enables or constrains another's. Explicitly examined relationships should be distinguished from connections inferred during the synthesis. The findings should be structured in a comprehensive way and used to identify relationships and perspectives that require further investigation.
Methodology	Literature Review
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Abbas, A. E., Van Velzen, T., Ofe, H., Van De Kaa, G., Zuiderwijk, A., & De Reuver, M. (2024). Beyond control over data: Conceptualizing data sovereignty from a social contract perspective. <i>Electronic Markets</i>, 34(1), 20. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-024-00695-2 • T: Wang, B., Ciriello, R. F., & Richter, A. (2026). Digital Sovereignty. <i>Business & Information Systems Engineering</i>. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-026-01018-9 • T: Floridi, L. (2020). The Fight for Digital Sovereignty: What It Is, and Why It Matters, Especially for the EU. <i>Philosophy & Technology</i>, 33(3), 369–378. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13347-020-00423-6 • T: Braun, M., & Hummel, P. (2024). Is Digital Sovereignty Normatively Desirable? <i>Information, Communication & Society</i>, 0(0), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118X.2024.2332624 • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(6). • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems research. <i>Working Papers on Information System</i>, 10, 1–5. • M: Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information Privacy Research: An Interdisciplinary Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 980–1016. • M: Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 26(2), xiii–xxiii. • M: Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. P. (2013). Using Grounded Theory as a Method for Rigorously Reviewing Literature. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 22(1), 45–55.
Supervisor	Laura Macpherson

21	From “I” to “AI”: Exploring Responsibility in Human-AI Collaboration
Keywords	Collaboration with Generative AI, Human-AI interaction, AI-based Decision Support, Responsibility, Autonomy, Agency
Goal	Artificial intelligence (AI) is fundamentally transforming the way individuals work and learn and has become an integral part of activities such as organizing, problem-solving and decision-making. While AI can significantly enhance efficiency and task performance, it is increasingly taking over responsibilities traditionally undertaken by users, which may, in turn, affect how individuals allocate and exercise their own task- and problem-solving agency. This development raises questions about how responsibility is distributed between humans and AI and how individuals perceive and negotiate their own agency when interacting with AI systems. In this context, examining the circulation of responsibility and the emergence of agency loops in human-AI collaboration opens up new avenues for research in Information Systems. Against this background, this bachelor’s thesis aims to investigate how individuals perceive and experience responsibility in human-AI collaboration in studying and working, with a particular focus on when and why they delegate responsibility to AI, when they retain responsibility themselves, and how they perceive and experience this delegation. In order to grasp an understanding of the phenomenon, a case study shall be conducted. The case study shall include either at least 2 focus groups (4-5 participants each) or at least 5 semi-structured interviews with people who are familiar with or have used AI tools for work or study purposes. The work should identify the relevant experiences, perceptions, and patterns of responsibility delegation and allocation in human-AI collaboration and eventually structure the results in a comprehensive way.
Methodology	Case Study – <i>Interviews can be conducted in-person or online (e.g., via Skype, Zoom, etc.)</i>
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Adam, M., Diebel, C., Goutier, M., & Benlian, A. (2024). Navigating autonomy and control in human-AI delegation: User responses to technology- versus user-invoked task allocation. <i>Decision Support Systems</i>, 180, 114193. • T: Henkenjohann, R., & Trenz, M. (2026). The responsible worker in the age of generative AI: How human-AI co-creation shapes experienced responsibility for work outcomes. <i>Decision Support Systems</i>, 207, 114699. • T: Heyder, T., Passlack, N., & Posegga, O. (2023). Ethical management of human-AI interaction: Theory development review. <i>The Journal of Strategic Information Systems</i>, 32(3), 101772. • T: Leonardi, P. M. (2025). Homo agenticus in the age of agentic AI: Agency loops, power displacement, and the circulation of responsibility. <i>Information and Organization</i>, 35(3), 100582. • M: Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive Research: Notes on the Gioia Methodology. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>, 16(1), 15–31. • M: Myers, M. D. (2019). <i>Qualitative Research in Business and Management</i>. London: Sage. • M: Urquhart, C., Lehmann, H., & Myers, M. D. (2010). Putting the ‘theory’ back into grounded theory: guidelines for grounded theory studies in information systems. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 20(4), 357–381. • M: Walsham, G. (1995). Interpretive Case Research in IS: Nature and Method. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 4(2), 74–81.
Supervisor	Leonie Feser

22	AI with Responsibility: Mapping Research on Responsible AI
Keywords	Responsible AI, Algorithmic Fairness, Algorithmic Bias
Goal	Artificial intelligence (AI) is fundamentally transforming human life and society, bringing about significant changes in social, environmental and industrial contexts: from social interactions and personal decisions to education, work practices and establishing environmentally efficient processes. While promising considerable opportunities for progress and innovation, AI systems also raise important ethical questions that need to be carefully addressed to ensure that the advantages of AI do not come at an unacceptable social and environmental cost. As a result, the concept of responsible AI has gained increasing attention among researchers, businesses, and policymakers. Therefore, the aim of this bachelor thesis is to conduct a systematic literature review of the Information Systems literature on responsible AI. The work should identify the relevant literature streams and provide a comprehensive synthesis of findings from previous studies. Specifically, it may distinguish between theories applied, concepts and constructs used, research methods employed, as well as different contexts in which responsible AI has been studied. This synthesis may be used to conclude the thesis with an agenda for future research.
Methodology	Literature Review
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Ghasemaghaei, M., & Kordzadeh, N. (2025). Ethics in the Age of Algorithms: Unravelling the Impact of Algorithmic Unfairness on Data Analytics Recommendation Acceptance. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 35(4), 1166–1197. • T: Rivera, A., Abhari, K., & Xiao, B. (2025). Responsible AI Design: The Authenticity, Control, Transparency Theory. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 26(5), 1337–1389. • T: Ruster, L. P., Oliva-Altamirano, P., & Daniell, K. A. (2026). The Dignity Lens: Advancing Human-Centred Protective and Proactive Algorithmic Responsibility. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 36(1), 5–28. • T: Tarafdar, M., Rets, I., & Hu, Y. (2026). Catch Me If You Can: The Dynamic Nature of Bias in Machine Learning Applications. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 36(5), 710–742. • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(6). • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems research. <i>Working Papers on Information System</i>, 10, 1–5. • M: Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information Privacy Research: An Interdisciplinary Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 980–1016. • M: Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 26(2), xiii–xxiii. • M: Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. P. (2013). Using Grounded Theory as a Method for Rigorously Reviewing Literature. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 22(1), 45–55.
Supervisor	Leonie Feser

23	Who Decides? LLMs, Responsibility and Social Conflict Resolution
Keywords	AI Companions, Generative AI, Large Language Models (LLMs), AI-based Decision Support, Social Conflict Resolution, Responsibility, Agency
Goal	Large language models (LLMs) are increasingly becoming part of people's everyday decision-making. Beyond information-seeking tasks, individuals may turn to AI when navigating personal struggles and interpersonal conflicts - for example, when deciding how to address a conflict with a friend or approaching a challenging conversation. In such situations, LLMs can provide not only information but also concrete recommendations for action. Individuals may therefore rely on AI when making decisions that previously involved their own judgement or consultation with other people. This raises interesting questions regarding the role of LLMs in situations where decisions have direct consequences for interpersonal relationships. The aim of this bachelor thesis is to investigate how individuals integrate LLMs into the resolution of real-life social conflicts and how this use of AI may affect perceptions and practices of responsibility in interpersonal decision-making. In particular, the thesis may examine how individuals use LLMs when dealing with social conflicts, what motivates them to seek AI-based advice, which aspects of a decision they delegate to the LLM, and how they perceive their own responsibility for decisions that are influenced by AI. In order to grasp an understanding of the phenomenon, a case study shall be conducted. The case study shall include either at least 2 focus groups (4-5 participants each) or at least 5 semi-structured interviews with people who are familiar with or have used AI tools in their everyday lives. The work should identify the relevant dimensions, processes, and patterns of perceived responsibility in human-AI interaction in the context of social decision-making and eventually structure the results in a comprehensive way.
Methodology	Case Study – <i>Interviews can be conducted in-person or online (e.g., via Skype, Zoom, etc.)</i>
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Adam, M., Diebel, C., Goutier, M., & Benlian, A. (2024). Navigating autonomy and control in human-AI delegation: User responses to technology- versus user-invoked task allocation. <i>Decision Support Systems</i>, 180, 114193. • T: Heyder, T., Passlack, N., & Posegga, O. (2023). Ethical management of human-AI interaction: Theory development review. <i>The Journal of Strategic Information Systems</i>, 32(3), 101772. • T: Leonardi, P. M. (2025). Homo agenticus in the age of agentic AI: Agency loops, power displacement, and the circulation of responsibility. <i>Information and Organization</i>, 35(3), 100582. • T: Raimi, R., Kim, A., Ayabakan, S., & Dennis, A. R. (2025). Judgmental Bot: Conversational Agents in Online Mental Health Screening. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 49(4), 1319–1356. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2025/18555 • M: Gioia, D. A., Corley, K. G., & Hamilton, A. L. (2013). Seeking Qualitative Rigor in Inductive Research: Notes on the Gioia Methodology. <i>Organizational Research Methods</i>, 16(1), 15–31. • M: Myers, M. D. (2019). <i>Qualitative Research in Business and Management</i>. London: Sage. • M: Urquhart, C., Lehmann, H., & Myers, M. D. (2010). Putting the 'theory' back into grounded theory: guidelines for grounded theory studies in information systems. <i>Information Systems Journal</i>, 20(4), 357–381. • M: Walsham, G. (1995). Interpretive Case Research in IS: Nature and Method. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 4(2), 74–81.
Supervisor	Leonie Feser

24	Pay or Consent: A Systematic literature Review on User Autonomy, Privacy, and Willingness to Pay
Keywords	Pay or Consent, Privacy, Willingness to Pay, Autonomy, Fairness, Information Transparency, Voluntariness, Informed Consent
Goal	With the increasing digitalization of the economy, digital business models have gained growing importance. Many of these business models rely on the collection and processing of personal data, creating tensions between economic value creation and individual privacy. In this context, so-called pay-or-consent models, which allow users to choose between a free digital service in exchange for consenting to the processing of their personal data and a paid, more privacy-friendly alternative, have gained increasing attention. Such models raise important questions regarding how users perceive and evaluate these choices and which factors influence their decision-making. Therefore, the aim of this bachelor thesis is to synthesize the existing Information Systems literature on pay-or-consent models and related approaches to the monetization of privacy. The review shall focus on how the opportunity to choose between sharing data and making a payment affects user's willingness to pay for privacy-friendly services. Furthermore, the review shall investigate how perceived autonomy and fairness, voluntariness, information transparency and informed consent influence this decision. Specifically, it may distinguish between theories applied, concepts and constructs used, research methods employed, as well as different contexts in which pay-or-consent models have been studied. This synthesis may be used to conclude the thesis with an agenda for future research.
Methodology	Literature Review
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Adjerid, I., Peer, E., & Acquisti, A. (2018). Beyond The Privacy Paradox: Objective Versus Relative Risk in Privacy Decision Making1. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 42(2), 465–488. • T: Bassellier, G., & Ramaprasad, J. (2023). All External Reference Prices Are Not the Same: How Magnitude, Source, and Fairness Shape Payment for Digital Goods. <i>Information Systems Research</i>, 34(4), 1761–1774. • T: Feng, N., Zhu, J., Zhang, W., & Feng, H. (2026). Traditional, subscription, or data compensation: An economic analysis of optimal privacy protection models on ad-supported platforms. <i>Decision Support Systems</i>, 209, 114733. • T: Wang, W., & Li, B. (2025). Learning Personalized Privacy Preference from Public Data. <i>Information Systems Research</i>, 36(2), 761–780. • T: Wu, C. H. (2025). Data disclosure strategy: Navigating the balance between privacy and profit in a dynamic system. <i>Decision Support Systems</i>, 197, 114510. • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(6). • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems research. <i>Working Papers on Information System</i>, 10, 1–5. • M: Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information Privacy Research: An Interdisciplinary Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 980–1016. • M: Webster, J., & Watson, R. T. (2002). Analyzing the Past to Prepare for the Future: Writing a Literature Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 26(2), xiii–xxiii. • M: Wolfswinkel, J. F., Furtmueller, E., & Wilderom, C. P. (2013). Using Grounded Theory as a Method for Rigorously Reviewing Literature. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 22(1), 45–55.
Supervisor	Leonie Feser