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**Abstract**

The abstract tells prospective readers what you did and what the important findings in your research were. Make it interesting and easily understood without reading the whole thesis. However, keep it as short as possible with no more than 250 words and avoid using jargon, uncommon abbreviations and references.

You must be accurate, using the words that convey the precise meaning of your research. The abstract provides a short description of the perspective and purpose of your paper. It gives key results but minimizes experimental details. Consider the two *whats*: *What has been done?* and *What are the main findings?*. It is very important to remind that the abstract offers a short description of the interpretation/conclusion in the last sentence.

**Highlights**

* Three to five bullet points: "elevator pitch" of your article
* Capture the novel results of your research as well as new methods used (if any)
* No jargon, acronyms, or abbreviations: aim for a general audience and use keywords
* Each Highlight can be no more than 85 characters, including spaces
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# Labelling of figures and tables

Labels are positioned centrally below the accompanying table or figure and labelled by “Tab.” or “Fig.”. Therein, one has to comply to the following scheme: *Fig. [chapter number of the first level]-[serial number]: [title] of the figure/table.*

Numbering of figures and tables of subchapters of the first chapter starts with “1” for each table/figure. References are inserted next to the label. The **first table** **of chapter one** looks as follows (examples from Webster and Watson 2002):

A literature review is concept-centric. Thus, concepts determine the organizing framework of a review. In contrast, some authors take an author-centric approach and essentially present a summary of the relevant articles. This method fails to synthesize the literature. The two approaches are easily recognized, as Illustrated in Table 1.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Concept-centric** | **Author-centric** |
| Concept X ... [author A, author B, ...]  Concept Y ... [author A, author C, ...] | Author A ... concept X, concept Y, …  Author B ... concept X, concept W, … |

Tab. 1‑1: Approaches to Literature Reviews ([Webster and Watson, 2002](#_ENREF_6))

The **second table** **of chapter one** looks as follows:

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Articles** | **Concepts** | | | | |
|  | A | B | C | D | … |
| 1 |  | **ᵡ** | **ᵡ** |  | **ᵡ** |
| 2 | **ᵡ** | **ᵡ** |  |  |  |
| … |  |  | **ᵡ** | **ᵡ** |  |

Tab. 1‑2: Concept Matrix ([Webster and Watson, 2002](#_ENREF_6))

The **first table of chapter two** looks as follows (example from Gregor 2006):

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Theory Types** | **Distinguishing Attributes** |
| I. Analysis | *Says what is*. The theory does not extend beyond analysis and description. No causal relationships among phenomena are specified and no predictions are made. |
| II. Explanation | *Says what is, how, why, when, and where.* The theory provides explanations but does not aim to predict with any precision. There are no testable propositions. |
| III. Prediction | *Says what is and what will be*. The theory provides predictions and has testable propositions but does not have well-developed justificatory causal explanations |
| IV. Explanation and prediction (EP) | *Says what is, how, why, when, where, and what will be.* Provides predictions and has both testable propositions and causal explanations |
| V. Design and action | *Says how to do something*. The theory gives explicit prescriptions (e.g., methods, techniques, principles of form and function) for constructing an artefact. |

Tab. 2‑1: A Taxonomy of Theory Types in Information Systems Research ([Gregor, 2006](#_ENREF_2))

The four primary goals of theory discerned are

* Analysis and description. The theory provides a description of the phenomena of interest, analysis of relationships among those constructs, the degree of generalizability in constructs and relationships and the boundaries within which relationships, and observations hold.
* Explanation. The theory provides an explanation of how, why, and when things happened, relying on varying views of causality and methods for argumentation. This explanation will usually be intended to promote greater understanding or insights by others into the phenomena of interest.
* Prediction. The theory states what will happen in the future if certain preconditions hold. The degree of certainty in the prediction is expected to be only approximate or probabilistic in IS.
* Prescription. A special case of prediction exists where the theory provides a description of the method or structure or both for the construction of an artefact (akin to a recipe). The provision of the recipe implies that the recipe, if acted upon, will cause an artefact of a certain type to come into being.

This is an example for a **figure** in chapter one (example from Gregor 2006).

A diagram of theory and analysis

Description automatically generated

Fig. 1‑1: Interrelationships among Theory Types ([Gregor, 2006](#_ENREF_2))

Figure 1 depicts graphically the interrelationships among the classes of theory. The most basic type of theory, analytic theory, is necessary for the development of all of the other types of theory. Clear definition of constructs is needed in all theory formulation. Both theory for explaining and theory for predicting can sow seeds for the development of EP theory that encompasses both explanation and prediction. Design theory can be informed by all the other classes of theory. A design methodology can build on particular idiographic studies of what has worked in practice, on predictive relation ships that are known but not fully understood (such as the relationship between organizational size and innovativeness), and on fully developed EP theories such as those relating to data representation or human behavior.

# Example for chapter titles of the first level

## Example for chapter titles of the second level

### Example for chapter titles of the third level

#### Example for chapter titles of the fourth level

##### Example for chapter titles of the fifth level

I am a continuous text. Please insert continuous text by adhering to this format. Please insert continuous text by adhering to this format. Please insert continuous text by adhering to this format. Please insert continuous text by adhering to this format. Please insert continuous text by adhering to this format. Please insert continuous text by adhering to this format.

# Use of literature sources

I am a citation of a source by a single author ([Gregor, 2006](#_ENREF_2)). I am a citation of a source by several authors ([Buxmann et al., 2013](#_ENREF_1))

„I am a direct quote” ([Webster and Watson, 2002](#_ENREF_6)). Quotation marks indicate direct quotes which are immediately followed by the reference with page number(s).

The definition of the concept of organizations by Webster and Watson (2002, p. xviii) particularly refers to new media. In this way, one can include authors directly in a sentence.

A conference proceeding such as [Nagel et al. (2019)](#_ENREF_4) is cited similarly to journal articles like [Urquhart et al. (2010)](#_ENREF_5). However, further information including the name and the place of the conference are necessary in the bibliography. Page numbers can be left out, if they are not indicated by the conference proceeding.

I am an online source ([Klöppel, 2009](#_ENREF_3)). Online source citations are implemented in the same way as book or journal citations. Nonetheless, the year specification refers to the date of retrieval. Page numbers are not required.
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