

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

Student Matriculation No.	Glasgow 2571555L DCU 20109750 Charles 15481502 Trento
Dissertation Title	Framing Artificial Intelligence: The Interplay between AI Policies and Security in the European Union

INDIVIDUAL INSTITUTION GRADING

Reviewer 1 Initial Grade A5 [18]	Reviewer 2 Initial Grade A5 [18]	Late Submission Penalty no penalty
Word Count Penalty (1-15% over/under = 1gr point; 15-20% over/under = 2 gr points; 20-25% over/under = 3 gr points; more than 25% over/under = 0 fail)		
Word Count: 20797 Suggested Penalty: no penalty		

JOINT GRADING (subject to agreement of the external examiner and approval at Joint Exam Board)

Final Agreed Mark. (Following correspondence reviewers should list the agreed final internal grade taking before and after any penalties to be applied).

Before Penalty: A5 [18] **After Penalty:** A5 [18]

DISSERTATION FEEDBACK

Assessment Criteria	Rating
A. Structure and Development of Answer	
This refers to your organisational skills and ability to construct an argument in a coherent and original manner	
• <i>Originality of topic</i>	Excellent
• <i>Coherent set of research questions and/or hypothesis identified</i>	Very Good
• <i>Appropriate methodology and evidence of effective organisation of work</i>	Good
• <i>Logically structured argument and flow of ideas reflecting research questions</i>	Very Good
• <i>Application of theory and/or concepts</i>	Very Good
B. Use of Source Material	
This refers to your skills to select and use relevant information and data in a correct manner	
• <i>Evidence of reading and review of published literature</i>	Excellent
• <i>Selection of relevant primary and/or secondary evidence to support argument</i>	Very Good
• <i>Critical analysis and evaluation of evidence</i>	Very Good
• <i>Accuracy of factual data</i>	Excellent
C. Academic Style	
This refers to your ability to write in a formal academic manner	

IMSIS Dissertation Feedback & Mark Sheet

• <i>Appropriate formal and clear writing style</i>	Excellent
• <i>Accurate spelling, grammar and punctuation</i>	Excellent
• <i>Consistent and accurate referencing (including complete bibliography)</i>	Excellent
• <i>Is the dissertation free from plagiarism?</i>	Yes
• <i>Evidence of ethics approval included (if required based on methodology)</i>	Not required
• <i>Appropriate word count</i>	Yes

ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS

Reviewer 1

Initial chapters very clearly outlined the significance and originality of the study from the outset. The work was also very well situated in relation to different literatures and contexts. There was a mostly logical and coherent setting out of the Framing Theory methodology, structure, and approach for the chapters – in places the method in terms of juxtaposition of the two different EU bodies.

Case studies were well-qualified and analysed in the chapters, making very good use of the sources and literature, in arguments around the different frames involving economic, social, and political security. There were instances in which points could have been improved by some analytical development (such as further extending the otherwise interesting arguments about certain findings, including within Political Security on decision-making transparency and the different kinds of AI challenge cited).

The dissertation was well presented, including in links between sections and chapters. A few typographical/formatting changes would enhance otherwise well-formulated sections. The conclusion provided a very good summary of different areas explored.

A well-researched and effective dissertation, original in its angle and engaging well with a range of sources and reading. It could be improved by selective development of analysis and formatting, but otherwise makes an effective contribution to this significant and under-explored area of scholarship on EU AI policymaking.

Reviewer 2

The dissertation compares how the European Commission and Parliament frame AI security policies. The research design is clear, which positively contributes to the dissertation's readability. Further, both the conceptualization and operationalization are done well and prepare a solid ground for empirical analysis, interpreting the content of the selected documents. It is also clear that the author managed to connect the analysis with a broader context of AI security issues, which nicely complements everything. From the conceptual point of view, Framing Theory seems a fitting choice to examine the institutional policy stances towards AI. That being said, an explanation of what motivates the comparison should be more elaborated, and this is a considerable shortcoming given the fact that a different treatment of AI is expected when comparing the positions of the European Commission and Parliament. Additionally, the promised content analysis is not fully unpacked in the dissertation. Despite the above-mentioned shortcomings, this is still a solid piece of work on AI EU policies, which will prove to be a vibrant research area in the future.