EPS { European Politics and Society

Name of the student:	Miras Tolepbergen
Title of the thesis:	European Union Artificial Intelligence Regulation: framework and discussion
Reviewer:	Dr hab. Jacek Kołodziej, JU professor

1. KNOWLEDGE AND CONNECTION TO THE FIELD
(relevance of the research question, research objective, literature review):

The dissertation deals with a research problem that seems crucial to our future: artificial intelligence. In this context, the research questions are indeed interesting, as they provide insight into how knowledge is shaped at the intersection of the European Commission's specialized discourse and those European media outlets that undertake a serious debate on artificial intelligence. The dissertation is based on a rich literature and a very abundant bibliography. First, it accurately describes and justifies the chosen methodology - comparative framework analysis; second, it provides a basis for the study of the relationship between power communication and the media; third, it considers the factors of development of new technologies in the context of media coverage and potential influence. Due to the nature of the topic, quite current literature and recent examples and legal documentation related to the activities of European institutions predominate.

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

The author presents great scientific independence, supported by good methodological decisions. Wanting to compare the institutional discourse of the European Union on artificial intelligence, with the language of media descriptions, he rightly decided to prepare thematic frameworks, according to the popular method of framework analysis. In his analysis, he correctly and innovatively conceptualizes the discursive framework with indicators, then applies the developed analytical model to the European Commission's documents, juxtaposing them with journalistic texts from selected quality newspapers. The analysis yields interesting and important results, confirming the regulatory focus and limitations of the Commission, seeing AI as a huge opportunity for development but also a big risk. The optimistic side in this case prevails, while the press seems to mainly refer to the various risks and dangers arising from the free market and the dynamics of research development by private corporations.

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

This work is an example of well-designed research on an important topic. The author aptly selects empirical data, formulates hypotheses and constructs an analytical tool. The empirical chapter contains an interesting and well-conducted analysis, based on a solid recognition of the theoretical preconditions. He manages to answer research questions completely, what is followed by critical assessment or limitations of his research.

4. FORMAL ASPECTS AND LANGUAGE
(appropriate language, adherence to academic standards, citation style, layout):

The thesis is matching academic standards in all major aspects.

5. SUMMARY ASSESSMENT
(strong and weak point of the dissertation, other issues)

The work is a good example of a very good dissertation based on empirical research. Its great advantage is the importance of the topic and the innovative model of using frame analysis to compare institutional and media discourse.

Grade (A-F):	A (Kraków bardzo dobry)
Date: 21. 06. 2023	Signature:

classification scheme

Percentile	Prague		Krakow		Leiden		Barcelona	
A (91–100)	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'.