

# Generative AI Adoption in Dutch Public Institutions: Implications for Political Actors' Critical Thinking

**RESEARCH QUESTION**  
How does the internal adoption of genAI tools by Dutch public institutions illustrate the influence of genAI on political actors' critical thinking?

**RESEARCH GAP**

**Existing research:** impact of AI on **citizens**. The internal impact of genAI on political actors' decision making and critical thinking remains underexplored



**OBJECTIVE** - To explore how digital transformation initiatives, particularly genAI, support and shape political actors' decision making processes within public institutions



## FINDING 1

**GenAI's effect on critical thinking is not uniform; depends on user experience level**

- **Experienced users:** AI complementary cognitive tool → +25% quality improvement.
- **Junior users:** substitutive use (Gerlich, 2025) → outputs appear coherent but lack contextual depth. Risk: unverified pass-up through institutional hierarchy.
- **AI tends to confirm not challenge user input** → reinforcing unearned certainty



**1 day → 5 mins**  
Research reduction time  
+25% quality gain



## FINDING 2

**Institutional adoption has outpaced oversight infrastructure**

- Both institutions: **limited compliance monitoring & no internal checks of AI impact**
- **No reliable data anonymization tools** - GDPR, data protection risks
- **AI literacy programmes:** technical use only (prompt engineering) → risks: hallucination, bias and over-reliance not adequately addressed
- Resource constraints in the **organisational TOE dimension** limit governance capacity.



**Freed by genAI yet oversight has not kept pace; substantial cost, no clear financial impact**



## FINDING 3

**A structural gap exists in the legal governance of AI use**

- **EU AI Act obligations** → focus mainly on senior/high-risk roles yet uncritical AI use is prevalent among junior staff.
- **Regulatory obligations** follow institutional hierarchy, not actual cognitive risk distribution (Andrews, 2012).
- **Epistemocracy** corrective framework: accountability follow cognitive risk, not authority (Kahl, 2025)



**AI literacy in force: Feb 2025**  
External enforcement begins August 2026 (EU AI Act, art.4)



## METHODOLOGY

- **Two semi-structured interviews** with individuals from **two Dutch public institutions**
- Analyzed and coded using **inductive thematic analysis**
- **Consultation with AI experts** from the corporate and academic fields
- **Technology-Organization-Environment framework**



## INSIGHTS

- **Organisational and environmental factors** of the TOE framework play **crucial role** in determining **level of AI adoption**
- **Awareness** of possible **impact on critical thinking** exists but is **not investigated internally**



## RECOMMENDATIONS

- AI implementation** should follow these **key steps**:
- 1) Identify possible use cases
  - 2) **Partner up with similar parties** and hire a consulting firm to help with implementation
  - 3) Have a **step-by-step implementation process** with a bottom-up approach to ensure regular feedback