Review of: "Cultural and Regional Influences on Global AI Apprehension"

Ingvild Bode[1]

1 University of Southern Denmark, Denmark

Potential competing interests: No potential competing interests to declare.

The article makes a fine, commendable contribution to the literature on AI governance by reviewing contributions focusing on non-Western geographies. This diversification is much-needed and valuable. The article has a clear research objective and is well-located in relevant literature.

The piece reviews others' arguments rather than positing its own arguments to the same extent. That is certainly sensible given where we are in the state of the art, but I would have appreciated the author's voice coming out more strongly.

Further, as the piece seeks to review many diverse sets of contributions, its discussion can be short in places that would have benefitted from more substance. An example is section 2 – why it matters. This is a crucial section, but the author moves through some of the arguments presented rather quickly and, at times, in a truncated way. For example, noting that a lower degree of digital literacy may lead to fear and doubt surrounding AI does not address the other side of this argument that more familiarity with AI may equally lead to a more critical attitude towards these technologies due to dysfunctionalities and failures.

Further, some of the language around how AI is viewed in large geographies could be more nuanced. The author notes, in section 3, for example, that "Asia" views AI predominantly "as a driver of economic growth and technological supremacy", with particular reference to China. This brief statement appears to generalise across a large and diverse group of Asian states. In addition, this particular framing of AI can also be found across Western nations. Although the author focuses on particular countries in the latter sections, these early statements do not easily fit with the more nuanced discussion that follows later on. With regard to case selection in Asia, it would be useful for the author to reflect on why they only chose Northeast Asian rather than also Southeast Asian states, especially given ASEAN's recent AI governance initiative.

The discussion of regional variations in AI apprehension is very ambitious, diverse, and interesting. Again, some of the discussion appears truncated, potentially because of the article's overall grand scope. But this leads to some statements lacking nuance, e.g., the discussion of Japan's relatively positive perception of AI (section 6.1). It is actually unclear whether the state's attitudes towards social robotics necessarily translate to disembodied AI. What appears to be a key factor—an ageing population – is only mentioned in passing. AI "solutions" are potentially attractive because of the labour shortage. Notably, this paragraph on Japan, similarly to the subsequent paragraph on China, would benefit from consistent referencing. In addition, the brief summary of China shows disparate tendencies that should be addressed.

Finally, it would have been very interesting for the author to include a side note on AI governance in the military domain. I understand that the literature on AI and apprehension towards AI is currently split between contributions focusing either on civilian or on military applications. But as AI is a dual-use technology, more efforts will be needed to integrate these two lines of thinking. I would like to encourage the author to keep this in mind in their further work in this field.