

1	Clicking Green? How Information Systems Shape Sustainable Consumer Choices
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.
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 REDUSE. <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

2	Opting Out of Digital? A Review of Digital Disconnection in an Always-Online World
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 master seminar 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.
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

3	IT Failure, Implications And Consequences. A Synthesis Of Research In The Information Systems Domain
Goal	Everyone increasingly relies on information technology (IT), whether privately or in a work context. Reliance on IT that functions correctly spans over safety features whether in automobiles or other devices. Minor to severe consequences have to be expected when IT fails. Hence IT failure and its implications represent a relevant research topic for academia, managers and the general public. This thesis aims at identifying and systematically synthesizing what is known about IT failure and its implications in the information systems research domain and beyond.
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Cecez-Kecmanovic, D., Kautz, K., & Abrahall, R. (2014). Reframing Success and Failure of Information Systems: A Performative Perspective. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 38(2), 561–588. • 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. • 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. • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(06), 552–567. • 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), 989–1016. • 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), 13–23. • 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. Bruckner Moritz

4	Implications Of Machine Learning Applications And Cognitive Computing From Everyday Use Of Smart Devices. – Literature Review
Goal	Everyday electronic devices like smartphones, cameras or laptops are increasingly equipped with seemingly smart, machine learning applications. Such applications are aimed at aiding end consumers in everyday tasks and more. Nonetheless, also voices raising awareness of negative ramifications of everyday use of such technology are gaining attraction. Implications span over considerations of copyright, data security and privacy. A consensus and systematic summary of such implications is currently missing. Therefore, this bachelor thesis topic is aimed at providing a systematic literature review on potentials and negative ramifications of the everyday use of machine learning applications in electronic devices.
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. • T: Berente, N., Bin Gu, Recker, J., & Santhanam, R. (2021). Managing Artificial Intelligence. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 45(3), 1433–1450. • T: Rai, A., Constantinides, P., & Sarker, S. (2019). Next-Generation Digital Platforms: Toward Human-AI Hybrids. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 43(1), Article 1. • T: Sturm, T., Gerlach, J. P., Pumplun, L., Mesbah, N., Peters, F., Tauchert, C., Nan, N., & Buxmann, P. (2021). Coordinating Human and Machine Learning for Effective Organizational Learning. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 45(3), 1581–1602. • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(06), 552–567. • 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), 989–1016. • 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), 13–23. • 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. Bruckner Moritz

5	Technology Dependence and Employee Deskillling – A Systematic Literature Review
Goal	The growing integration of information technologies, automation, and artificial intelligence in the workplace has altered the way employees perform tasks and apply their knowledge and expertise. While information systems support decision-making, boost efficiency, and enhance human capabilities, excessive reliance on technology may also lead to skill erosion. The aim of this master seminar thesis is to conduct a structured literature review in the field of information systems (IS) on technology dependence and deskillling. The work will examine how reliance on information systems and automation contributes to skill erosion and contrast these mechanisms with those encouraging skill augmentation, reskilling, and new forms of human–technology collaboration.
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Rinta-Kahila, T., Penttinen, E., Salovaara, A., Soliman, W., & Ruissalo, J. (2023). The Vicious Circles of Skill Erosion: A Case Study of Cognitive Automation. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 24(5), 1378–1412. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00829 • T: Coombs, C., Hislop, D., Taneva, S. K., & Barnard, S. (2020). The Strategic Impacts of Intelligent Automation for Knowledge and Service Work: An Interdisciplinary Review. <i>The Journal of Strategic Information Systems</i>, 29(4). https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2020.101600 • T: Crowston, K., & Bolici, F. (2025). Deskillling and Upskilling with AI Systems. <i>Information Research</i>, 30, 1009–1024. https://doi.org/10.47989/ir30iConf47143 • T: Currie, W. L., Seddon, J. J. M., & Willcocks, L. P. (2026). Automation Anxiety in Information Systems Research: A Meta-Narrative Review. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 1–28. https://doi.org/10.1080/0960085x.2026.2708104 • 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 • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(6), 552–567. • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems Research. <i>Sprouts: Working Papers on Information Systems</i>, 10(26), 1–5. • M: Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information Privacy Research: An Interdisciplinary Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 989–1016. • 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), 13–23. • 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. Yulia Tseytlin

6	Accountability in Artificial Intelligence: Who is Responsible for AI-Based Decisions in Organizations? – A Systematic Literature Review
Keywords	Artificial Intelligence, Accountability, Responsibility, Organizational Decision-Making
Goal	Artificial Intelligence (AI) is increasingly used in organizations to support or automate decisions. As AI systems become more autonomous and influential, questions of accountability become more important: Who is responsible when AI-based systems produce harmful, biased, or erroneous outcomes? Accountability in the context of AI concerns the assignment of responsibility, answerability, oversight, and justification across different actors such as developers, managers, organizations, and users. Existing research in information systems has addressed these issues from different angles, including algorithmic accountability, responsible AI, governance, and human oversight. However, the literature remains fragmented, and a structured synthesis of current insights is still missing. The aim of this seminar thesis is to conduct a systematic literature review on accountability in artificial intelligence in information systems and eventually structure the results in a comprehensive way. Relevant questions may include how accountability for AI systems is conceptualized, which actors are held accountable, which mechanisms support accountability in practice, and which tensions emerge in organizational contexts.
Methodology	Literature Review
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Horneber, D., & Laumer, S. (2023). Algorithmic Accountability. <i>Business & Information Systems Engineering</i>, 65, 723–730. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12599-023-00817-8 • T: Bartsch, S. C., Nguyen, L.H., Schmidt, J., Du, G., Adam, M., Benlian, A., & Sunyaev, A. (2025). The Present and Future of Accountability for AI Systems: A Bibliometric Analysis. <i>Information Systems Frontiers</i>, 27, 2463–2484. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10796-025-10636-9 • 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. https://doi.org/10.17705/1jais.00945 • 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

7	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, commercial sponsors, 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 master seminar 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 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
8	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 master seminar 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

9	Who is responsible in the Digital Age? A Systematic Literature Review on Digital Responsibility
Goal	Digital technologies have fundamentally transformed human life and society in virtually every aspect – from social interactions and personal decisions to work practices, education and healthcare. While these developments have opened up tremendous potential for economic and societal progress, they have also led to the emergence of various social and environmental challenges. Thereby, human and technological agencies become increasingly entangled systems, making the question of responsibility multidimensional and complex. By unravelling the meaning of responsibility in the digital age, individuals, organizations and society can benefit from upsides of digital technology, while mitigating its downsides. Therefore, the aim of this master seminar is to systematically review the information systems literature on digital responsibility. The work should identify the relevant literature streams and structure the results of previous studies in a comprehensive way, distinguish e.g., between theories applied, concepts and constructs used, research methods applied, as well as different contexts in which digital responsibility has been studied, and possibly conclude with an agenda for future research.
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: De Vaujany, F.-X., Leclercq-Vandelannoitte, A., Aroles, J., Introna, L., & Davidson, S. (2025). Rethinking Responsibility in the Digital Age: A Narrative Approach. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 49(4), 1295–1318. • 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: Recker, J., Chatterjee, S., Sundermeier, J., & Tarafdar, M. (2025). Digital Responsibility: Current Perspectives and Future Directions. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 26(5), 1222–1238. • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(6), 552–567. • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems Research. <i>Sprouts: Working Papers on Information Systems</i>, 10(26), 1–5. • M: Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information Privacy Research: An Interdisciplinary Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 989–1016. • 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), 13–23. • 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	Leonie Feser

10	Fake News and News Perception: A Systematic Literature Review
Goal	The increasing use of digital media and social networking platforms has fundamentally changed how individuals access and share news. At the same time, the spread of fake news and misinformation poses significant challenges, as users must assess the credibility and accuracy of large amounts of information, often with limited context and time. Recent developments in generative AI and AI-based recommendation systems further increase the relevance of this topic and raises the question of how users' perception, evaluation and engagement with news is affected by the increasing involvement of AI in news production and recommendation. The aim of this master seminar is to systematically review the Information Systems literature on fake news and AI-mediated news perception. The work should identify the relevant literature streams and structure the results of previous studies in a comprehensive way, distinguish e.g., between theories applied, concepts and constructs used, research methods applied, as well as different contexts in which fake news and AI-mediated news perception has been studied, and possibly conclude with an agenda for future research.
Readings on the Topic (T) and possible Methods (M)	• T: Liu, Y., Zeng, J., Liu, S., & Han, L. (2026). The impact of generative AI on news believability: A mind perception perspective. <i>Information & Management</i>, 63(8), 104418. • T: Ma, H., Dennis, A. S., Dennis, A. R., & Huang, W. (2025). Artificial Intelligence Recommendations Amplify the Sharing of True and Fake News on Social Media by Appealing to Fast Cognition. <i>Journal of Management Information Systems</i>, 42(4), 987–1016. • T: Olenberger, C., Schoch, M., & Utz, L. (2026). The information processing of fake news: How intervention order influences perception over time. <i>Information & Management</i>, 63(1), 104256. • M: Leidner, D. (2018). Review and Theory Symbiosis: An Introspective Retrospective. <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i>, 19(6), 552–567. • M: Okoli, C., & Schabram, K. (2010). A Guide to Conducting a Systematic Literature Review of Information Systems Research. <i>Sprouts: Working Papers on Information Systems</i>, 10(26), 1–5. • M: Smith, H. J., Dinev, T., & Xu, H. (2011). Information Privacy Research: An Interdisciplinary Review. <i>MIS Quarterly</i>, 35(4), 989–1016. • 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), 13–23. • 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	Leonie Feser