

## FPI Results Framework - Indicator Methodology Note

1. Indicator Name and Code
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Level of awareness and critical thinking about disinformation spread by extremists</b></p> <p><u>OPSYS Code:</u> 18615</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 resilience to extremist narratives” or “Enhanced ability to recognise and question disinformation”.</p> <p><u>Disaggregation:</u></p> <p>Mandatory: <b>By sex:</b> Female; Male; Intersex.</p>
3. Description
<p>This indicator assesses whether EU/FPI interventions have contributed to changes in individuals’ capacity to recognise, question and critically assess disinformation disseminated by extremist actors. It focuses on perceived awareness and critical thinking skills regarding the nature, sources and objectives of manipulative content. The indicator is applicable in contexts where interventions aim to strengthen media literacy, promote critical engagement with information, and enhance societal resilience to radicalisation and polarisation. It is particularly relevant in environments exposed to systematic disinformation campaigns targeting vulnerable populations or undermining democratic processes.</p>
4. Calculation of Values and Example
<p>This indicator is measured through a qualitative assessment using the following three-point scale: Fully, Partially, Not at all. The assessment should be based on data collected through surveys, structured interviews, or other validated tools measuring individual perceptions and self-reported capacity.</p> <p><u>Technical definitions:</u></p> <p><b>Awareness:</b> The individual’s understanding of the existence, nature and objectives of disinformation produced and disseminated by extremist actors. This includes recognising that certain content is intentionally manipulated to mislead or influence public opinion.</p> <p><b>Critical thinking:</b> The ability to question, analyse and evaluate information sources, content and intentions. This implies applying judgment and reasoning to identify biased, false or manipulative narratives.</p> <p><b>Disinformation spread by extremists:</b> False or misleading information deliberately created, presented and disseminated by actors advocating extremist ideologies or objectives, including violent radical groups or movements seeking to polarise, recruit or destabilise communities.</p> <p><u>Counting Guidance:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Measurement Approach:</b> The rating should reflect the degree to which individuals report that they are both <u>aware of and able to critically assess</u> extremist disinformation. A rating of “Fully” indicates consistent awareness and demonstrated confidence in critically evaluating such content; “Partially” reflects partial or occasional capacity; “Not at all” indicates no awareness or critical thinking reported.</li> <li>• <b>Attribution:</b> Assessment requires evidence that changes in awareness or critical thinking can be attributed, in whole or in part, to the concerned EU/FPI intervention (e.g., media literacy training, community dialogues, information campaigns).</li> </ul>

- **Rating Basis:** A rating should be assigned based on aggregated responses from the relevant target population. The assessment must consider the consistency of reported awareness and critical thinking across key topics addressed by the intervention.
- **Avoid Double Counting:** Each respondent should be counted only once per reporting cycle. If the intervention reaches the same individuals multiple times, only the most recent assessment should be used for reporting purposes.

Quality Control Checklist:

1. Is there documented evidence (from surveys, interviews or validated tools) confirming the reported level of awareness and critical thinking?
2. Does the assessment clearly distinguish between awareness and critical thinking?
3. Is the rating based on aggregated responses rather than isolated cases?
4. Is attribution to the EU/FPI intervention explicit and supported by evidence of direct contribution?
5. Has each respondent been assessed only once per reporting cycle to avoid double counting?
6. Are the categories “Fully”, “Partially” and “Not at all” applied consistently in line with definitions?

Example:

In Year Y, an EU/FPI-funded intervention in Country X implemented a media literacy campaign targeting young adults. Pre- and post-intervention surveys measured awareness and critical thinking regarding extremist disinformation. 72% of respondents reported consistent recognition of manipulative narratives and confidence in questioning sources. Attribution to the EU intervention was documented. Based on the evidence, the assessment was: “Fully”. The value to be reported is “Fully”, disaggregated by sex.

## 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 OM. Examples of data sources: Pre- and post-intervention survey data assessing awareness and critical thinking; Structured interviews or focus groups with participants; Self-assessment questionnaires administered during or after training sessions; Evaluation reports or studies documenting changes in knowledge and attitudes; Triangulated evidence combining participant feedback with external assessments or observational data.

## 6. Other Uses / Potential Issues

This indicator helps track the impact of EU support on enhancing the resilience of individuals and communities to extremist disinformation. It provides insight into perceived changes in awareness and critical thinking skills that are essential for reducing the effectiveness of manipulative narratives.

Potential issues: Attribution challenges when similar initiatives are implemented by other actors. Respondent bias or overreporting due to social desirability or perceived expectations. Limited access to target groups or incomplete survey coverage. Difficulties in measuring actual behavioural change versus self-reported perceptions. Mitigation measures include triangulating multiple data sources, ensuring clear documentation of attribution, using independent survey instruments, and applying robust sampling methods to improve reliability.