

Name of the student:	Miras Tolepbergen
Title of the thesis:	European Union Artificial Intelligence Regulation: framework and discussion
Reviewer:	Eliška Tomalová, Ph.D.

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD

(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

Miras has chosen a very up to date and constantly evolving topic. Artificial intelligence, its role in our societies and its impact on different actors has motivated many local, state level and international institutions to start developing a regulatory framework. In this context, Miras focuses on the way, how Brussels media frame the debate and translate the European commission regulatory activity vis a vis artificial intelligence. His thesis aims at answering the main research question: “How does the media’s discourse relate to the Commission’s institutional discourse on AI regulation?” (p.8) and offers an “analytical study of framing by connecting frames produces and disseminated by media and the Commission” (p.8).

2. ANALYSIS

(methodology, argument, theoretical backing, appropriate work with sources):

The object of the study is well defined, concerning both the content and the timeline. The empirical part of the study concentrates on the period 2018-2022 (last AI regulation related document). The literature review situates well the research within the relevant academic debate, however, it is quite long in proportion to the empirical part of the thesis. Miras’s research is based on a comparative approach and relies on framing analysis theory, while media framing is “conceptualized as a dependant variable” (p.9) and the European Commission’s framing as an independent variable. For the purpose of his thesis, Miras uses various primary and secondary sources.

3. CONCLUSIONS

(persuasiveness, link between data and conclusions, achievement of research objectives):

In the introduction, the author asks the main research question and a set of additional questions (4), a list of hypotheses connected to the main questions is presented (H1-H5, p. 9). In the conclusion, he refers to prevalent frames and hypotheses it thus offers exactly what Miras promised in the introduction His research design is well built and the arguments are persuasive. (the link between frames and hypotheses could have been more direct).

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE

(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

The language is appropriate, the citation style is consistent, grammar and layout are correct.

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT

(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

In sum, I think Miras’s thesis is excellent. It shows that its author has done a very detailed preparatory and analytical work. The author mastered the bridging between theory and its application and did also highlight the potential risks and obstacles the researcher may face while referring to framing theories in social sciences. I do also appreciate the

questions for future research agenda that are mentioned in the conclusion (although I would recommend to rather include this part in the introduction).

Based on this assessment, let me offer three questions the author can answer during the defense:

- a) How do competing frames of EU institutions vis a vis AI coexist in the Brussels media environment?
- b) Are these frames different when it comes to specific AI tools?
- c) Currently (in June 2023), the European Parliament has passed its own document on AI, the next trialogue stage is approaching. Has the Brussels media bubble framed differently the EP's position?

Grade (A-F):	A
Date:	Signature:
23/6/2023	

classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
	91-100 %	8,5%	5	6,7%	8,5-10	5,3%	9-10	5,5 %
B (81-90)	81-90 %	16,3%	4,5	11,7%	7,5-8,4	16,4%	8-8,9	11,0 %
C (71-80)	71-80 %	16,3%	4	20%	6,5-7,4	36,2%	7-7,9	18,4 %
D (61-70)	61-70 %	24%	3,5	28,3%			6-6,9	35,2 %
E (51-60)	51-60 %	34,9%	3	33,4 %	6-6,4	42,1 %	5-5,9	30,1 %

Assessment criteria:

Excellent (A): 'Outstanding performance with only minor errors';

Very good (B): 'Above the average standard but with some errors';

Good (C): 'Generally sound work but with a number of notable errors';

Satisfactory (D): 'Fair but with significant shortcomings';

Sufficient (E): 'Performance meets the minimum criteria';

Fail: 'Some/considerable more work required before the credit can be awarded'.