

Title	Description	Supervisor
<b>1. Improving Online Discourse: Mitigating Toxicity Across Web Platforms</b>	<p>Recent research and media reports highlight a concerning trend in online interactions: the increasing prevalence of unfriendly, toxic, and even hateful language. This phenomenon extends beyond social networks, permeating collaborative knowledge-sharing platforms such as Wikipedia or StackOverflow. Such environments, heavily reliant on the contributions of volunteer users, are at risk as toxicity deters participation and drives users away.</p> <p>In light of these challenges, your task is to conduct a comprehensive literature review focused on existing and proposed strategies for reducing toxicity on online platforms. This review should encompass various mechanisms, critically analyzing their effectiveness and the broader impact they have within these digital communities. Your analysis should aim to provide a nuanced understanding of how these approaches can foster healthier, more constructive discourse across diverse online platforms, as well as what limitations and drawbacks they have.</p> <p><b>References</b></p> <p>Lowry, P. B., Zhang, J., Wang, C., &amp; Siponen, M. (2016). Why do adults engage in cyberbullying on social media? An integration of online disinhibition and deindividuation effects with the social structure and social learning model. <i>Information Systems Research</i>, 27(4), 962–986. (<a href="https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2016.0671">https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2016.0671</a>)</p> <p>Arora, A., Nakov, P., Hardalov, M., Sarwar, S. M., Nayak, V., Dinkov, Y., Zlatkova, D., Dent, K., Bhatawdekar, A., Bouchard, G., &amp; Augenstein, I. (2024, March). Detecting harmful content on online platforms: What platforms need vs. where research efforts go. <i>ACM Computing Surveys</i>, 56(3), Article 72. (<a href="https://doi.org/10.1145/3603399">https://doi.org/10.1145/3603399</a>)</p>	Jonas Bauer
<b>2. Engagement Dynamics in User-Generated-Content Communities: Drivers and Design Implications</b>	<p>Sustained user participation is critical for the vitality of crowdsourced knowledge platforms. Research has examined many aspects (e.g. onboarding processes, social feedback loops, gamification, content policies, ...), yet findings are dispersed across disciplines. Undertake a systematic literature review that clusters antecedents of user engagement (e.g., intrinsic motivation, social capital, platform affordances) and extract actionable design implications for platform operators seeking to foster healthy contribution patterns.</p> <p><b>References</b></p> <p>Rode, H. (2016). To share or not to share: The effects of extrinsic and intrinsic motivations on knowledge-sharing in enterprise social media platforms. <i>Journal of Information Technology</i>, 31(2), 152–165. (<a href="https://doi.org/10.1057/jit.2016.8">https://doi.org/10.1057/jit.2016.8</a>)</p>	Jonas Bauer

<p><b>3. Large Language Models and Human Participation on Knowledge-Sharing Platforms</b></p>	<p>Since the public release of ChatGPT and similar LLMs, many users now obtain coding fixes, explanations, or help directly from an AI instead of visiting Q&amp;A sites, wikis, or support forums. At the same time, some contributors employ LLMs to draft answers or moderate content. Your task is to conduct a targeted literature review of empirical studies that analyze how external or built-in LLMs affect human behavior on knowledge-sharing platforms.</p> <p><b>References</b></p> <p>Sanatizadeh, A., Lu, Y., Zhao, K., &amp; Hu, Y. (2025). Engagement or entanglement? The dual impact of generative artificial intelligence in online knowledge exchange platforms. <i>Information &amp; Management</i>, 62(6), Article 104178. (<a href="https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2025.104178">https://doi.org/10.1016/j.im.2025.104178</a>)</p> <p>Quinn, M., &amp; Gutt, D. (2025). Heterogeneous effects of generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) on knowledge seeking in online communities. <i>Journal of Management Information Systems</i>, 42(2), 370–399. (<a href="https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2025.2487313">https://doi.org/10.1080/07421222.2025.2487313</a>)</p>	<p>Jonas Bauer</p>
<p><b>4. Nudges on User-Generated-Content Platforms</b></p>	<p>User-generated-content platforms increasingly rely on subtle “nudges” (e.g. prosocial reminders, default settings, timing cues, social signals) to guide behavior without imposing hard rules. Your task is to survey the empirical literature on how these nudges are designed, implemented, and evaluated, and assess their effectiveness in shaping key behaviors. Compare the nudge designs, the moments in the user journey when they are delivered, and the behavioral theories that justify them.</p> <p><b>References</b></p> <p>Zeng, Z., Dai, H., Zhang, D. J., Zhang, H., Zhang, R., Xu, Z., &amp; Shen, Z.-J. M. (2022). The impact of social nudges on user-generated content for social network platforms. <i>Management Science</i>, 69(9), 5189–5208. (<a href="https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2022.4622">https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.2022.4622</a>)</p> <p>Hwang, E. H., &amp; Lee, S. (2024). A nudge to credible information as a countermeasure to misinformation: Evidence from Twitter. <i>Information Systems Research</i>, 35(4), 621–636. (<a href="https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2021.0491">https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2021.0491</a>)</p>	<p>Jonas Bauer</p>
<p><b>5. Agents in the era of LowCode/NoCode</b></p>	<p>The rise of low-code and no-code development platforms (LCDPs/NCDPs) is fundamentally reshaping the software development landscape. Not only do these platforms empower non-technical users—often referred to as “citizen developers”—to build applications independently, but they also introduce new forms of autonomous agents, such as AI-driven assistants and automation bots, that can take over or augment parts of the development and interaction processes.</p> <p>This shift raises important questions about human-computer interaction, the distribution of autonomy, and decision-making power within software development and business processes. To what extent are agents—whether human or algorithmic—delegated autonomy in such environments? How do interactions between human actors and digital agents evolve in LCDP-driven workflows?</p> <p><b>Research Objective</b></p> <p>This seminar thesis aims to investigate how autonomy is redefined and redistributed in low-code/no-code environments, with a dual focus on:</p>	<p>Marcel-René Wepper</p>

	<p>1. Information Systems Development – Understanding how agent-based design and automation affect roles, responsibilities, and collaboration in application development.</p> <p>2. Human-Computer Interaction (HCI) – Examining how AI-driven agents (e.g., Copilot, Power Automate, bots) support, augment, or replace human decision-making and creative input.</p>	
<b>6. Use of AI to Enhance Education</b>	<p>Artificial intelligence has experienced unprecedented exponential growth, posing significant challenges but also opportunities for higher education. Although generative AI often fuels multi-purpose technologies, domain-specific learning applications promise the best learning outcomes. AI tools as teaching enhancements must be carefully configured to ensure adoption, continued use, and effectiveness in the classroom.</p> <p>In this thesis/seminar paper, you are supposed to conduct a systematic literature review of research on the use of AI to enhance education, with a special focus on Information Systems and IT education. Based on the outcome of this review, your thesis will provide a structured overview of the findings according to self-defined criteria, e.g., learning subject domain, type of AI used, or similar.</p> <p><b>References:</b></p> <p>Holmes, W., &amp; Tuomi, I. (2022). State of the art and practice in AI in education. <i>European journal of education</i>, 57(4), 542-570.</p>	Dr. Hannah Sperling
<b>7. Domain-specific Data Anonymization for Privacy Assurance</b>	<p>Privacy risks, regulatory obligations, and data sensitivities vary significantly across industries and use cases. A one-size-fits-all approach to privacy often fails to address sector-specific requirements, such as patient confidentiality in healthcare, employee privacy in HR analytics, or compliance in market research data handling. By tailoring data anonymization techniques and assurance mechanisms to specific domains, organizations can more effectively balance the privacy-utility tradeoff.</p> <p>In this thesis/seminar paper, you are conducting a systematic literature review of existing research on data anonymization for privacy assurance. In your analysis of the literature, you are focusing on domain-specific approaches that exist for different areas of application.</p> <p><b>References:</b></p> <p>Li, Shaobo, Schneider, Matthew J., Yu, Jan, Gupta, Sachin (2022): Reidentification Risk in Panel Data: Protecting for k-Anonymity. <i>Information Systems Research</i> 34(3):1066-1088. <a href="https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2022.1169">https://doi.org/10.1287/isre.2022.1169</a></p> <p>Kartal, Hasan B. and Li, Xiao-Bai (2020): "Protecting Privacy When Sharing and Releasing Data with Multiple Records per Person," <i>Journal of the Association for Information Systems</i> 21(6), DOI: 10.17705/1jais.00643.</p>	Dr. Hannah Sperling
<b>8. AI Anthropomorphism</b>	<p>Research shows that anthropomorphism is an important determinant for user trust in nonhuman agents. Anthropomorphism refers to the process of inductive inference whereby people attribute to nonhumans distinctively human characteristics, particularly the capacity for rational thought (agency) and conscious feeling. The human computer interaction (HCI) literature provides a large body of knowledge regarding the anthropomorphization of technology, which continues to be relevant for the case of AI. This includes different dimensions in the operationalization of technology anthropomorphism.</p>	Dr. Hannah Sperling

	<p>In this thesis/seminar paper, you are supposed to conduct a systematic literature review of technology anthropomorphism with a focus on AI-based conversational agents.</p> <p><b>References:</b></p> <p>Moussawi, S., Koufaris, M., &amp; Benbunan-Fich, R. (2023). The role of user perceptions of intelligence, anthropomorphism, and self-extension on continuance of use of personal intelligent agents. <i>European Journal of Information Systems</i>, 32(3), 601–622.</p>	
<b>9. Trust in Human-Robot Interaction</b>	<p>Multiple studies show that people often trust automated recommendations more than human expertise, even when the AI fares equal or worse in accuracy metrics. Examples include medical diagnosis, financial forecasting, hiring decisions, moral judgments, or navigation/automation tasks. This (often subconscious) automation bias or algorithmic authority has severe consequences for decision-making.</p> <p>In this thesis/seminar paper, you are supposed to trace the origins of algorithmic authority research and then conduct a systematic literature review of the Information Systems (IS) literature since the emergence of large language models such as ChatGPT.</p> <p><b>References:</b></p> <p>Jussupow, Ekaterina; Benbasat, Izak; Heinzl, Armin; An Integrative Perspective on Algorithm Aversion and Appreciation in Decision-Making. <i>MIS Quarterly</i> (1) December 2024; 48 (4): 1575–1590. <a href="https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2024/18512">https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2024/18512</a>.</p> <p>Aroyo, Alexander; Bruyne, Jan; Dheu, Orian et al. (2021): Overtrusting robots: Setting a research agenda to mitigate overtrust in automation. <i>Paladyn, Journal of Behavioral Robotics</i>, 12. 423-436. 10.1515/pjbr-2021-0029. c</p>	Dr. Hannah Sperling