

## FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Level of tolerance of communities towards different religious, linguistic and community groups</b></p> <p><u>OPSYS Code:</u> 10071417</p>
2. Technical Details
<p><u>Unit of measure:</u> Qualitative scale</p> <p><u>Type of indicator:</u> Qualitative; Perception-based; Actual (ex-post).</p> <p><u>Level of measurement:</u> This is an <b>Outcome</b> indicator. It is typically used to measure results such as “Increased social cohesion and stability” or “Reduced discrimination and social tensions among different community groups”.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u> Not applicable.</p>
3. Description
<p>This indicator assesses whether EU/FPI interventions have contributed to changes in the level of tolerance expressed by communities towards members of different religious, linguistic or other identity groups. It focuses on perceptions and attitudes regarding acceptance of diversity and peaceful coexistence. The indicator is particularly relevant in contexts where polarisation, discrimination or communal tensions undermine social cohesion and stability. It applies to interventions aimed at promoting intergroup dialogue, inclusive community engagement, and respect for diversity.</p>
4. Calculation of Values and Example
<p>This indicator is measured through a qualitative assessment using the following five-point scale: Very poor/limited, Poor/limited, Moderate, Strong/easy, Very strong/easy.</p> <p><u>Technical definition:</u></p> <p><b>Tolerance:</b> The degree to which individuals or communities express acceptance of and respect for people from different religious, linguistic or community groups. Tolerance includes openness to interaction, recognition of equal rights, and willingness to coexist peacefully.</p> <p><u>Counting Guidance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Measurement approach:</b> The assessment should be based on data collected through surveys, structured interviews, or other validated tools measuring perceptions and attitudes towards diversity and coexistence. The assessment must be based on consistent criteria applied across all data sources. Reported changes must be attributable, at least in part, to the concerned EU/FPI interventions (e.g., community dialogues, education campaigns, intergroup engagement activities).</li> <li>• <b>Rating basis:</b> The rating should reflect the aggregated perception of the target community regarding acceptance of diversity and coexistence. A rating is assigned based on aggregated evidence from surveys or interviews with relevant community representatives or a representative sample of community members.</li> <li>• <b>Avoid double counting:</b> Each respondent should be assessed only once per reporting cycle. If multiple assessments are conducted, use the most recent or consolidated result.</li> <li>• <b>Consistency:</b> Ensure categories are applied in line with the definitions above and documented evidence supports the chosen rating.</li> </ul> <p><u>Quality Control Checklist:</u></p>

1. Is there documented evidence (surveys, interviews, focus groups) confirming the reported level of tolerance?
2. Has the assessment applied the five-point scale definitions consistently?
3. Is attribution to the EU/FPI intervention explicit and supported by evidence?
4. Has each respondent been assessed only once per reporting cycle to avoid duplication?
5. Are aggregated results representative of the target community rather than isolated perceptions?

Example:

In Year Y, an EU/FPI-funded intervention in Country X implemented community dialogues and education campaigns promoting respect for religious and linguistic diversity. Post-intervention surveys and focus groups showed that 68% of respondents expressed acceptance and willingness to engage with members of other groups, while 20% reported moderate reservations and 12% reported predominantly negative attitudes. Attribution to the EU/FPI intervention was documented. Based on the evidence, the assessment was: Strong/easy. The value to be reported is: Strong/easy.

## 5. Data Sources

Reported values should derive primarily from the internal monitoring systems of EU-funded interventions. Data must be collected and reported by the implementing partner and verified by the Operational Manager (OM). Examples of data sources: Pre- and post-intervention surveys assessing perceptions of tolerance and acceptance; Structured interviews or focus group discussions with community representatives; Self-assessment questionnaires administered to participants in community engagement activities; Observation reports documenting intergroup interactions or community attitudes; Evaluation studies or assessments combining participant feedback with independent analysis; Triangulated evidence from multiple sources confirming the consistency of reported perceptions.

## 6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator helps track the impact of EU/FPI support on fostering social cohesion, respect for diversity, and peaceful coexistence among different community groups. It provides insights into perceived changes in intergroup attitudes and the effectiveness of dialogue or education efforts.

Potential issues: Attribution challenges may arise where similar activities are conducted by other actors. Respondent bias or overreporting may occur due to social desirability or perceived expectations. Limited access to some groups or incomplete survey coverage can affect representativeness. Difficulties may also emerge in distinguishing actual behavioural change from self-reported attitudes. Mitigation measures include triangulating multiple data sources, ensuring clear documentation of attribution, using independent survey instruments, and applying robust sampling methods to improve reliability.