



Institutional Information Quality – Construction and Validation of a Measurement Instrument

Activity Report No. 1

Authors

Gisela Klein

Inês Mendes

José Gabriel Andrade

Rita Araújo

Institutional Information Group

April 2026



Institutional Information Quality – Construction and Validation of a Measurement Instrument

AUTHORS

Gisiela Klein; Inês Mendes; José Gabriel Andrade; Rita Araújo

Institutional Information Group

© Barometer for Information Quality, 2026

Communication and Society Research Centre

Institute of Social Sciences, University of Minho

Campus de Gualtar, 4710-057 Braga, Portugal

<https://www.cecs.uminho.pt/>

<https://www.b-info.pt/>

bip@ics.uminho.pt

Machine Learning Post-Editing: Anabela Delgado

This work is supported by national funds through FCT – Foundation for Science and Technology, I.P., under the funding of the Communication and Society Research Centre (CECS) 2025–2029.

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTORY NOTE	4
1 – THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON MEASURING THE QUALITY OF INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION.....	6
2 – METHODOLOGICAL NOTE	12
3 – TESTING THE MODEL WITH EXPERTS.....	15
CONCLUDING NOTE	21
BIBLIOGRAPHY	22
APPENDIX 1- Instrument for assessing the quality of institutional information—initial version	24
APPENDIX 2 – Model for measuring the quality of institutional information – final version after validation rounds	32

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

Given the significance of information in contemporary societies and the current context—characterised by various disinformation phenomena, polarisation of opinions, and the rise of populism—it is essential to assess the quality of publicly available information. To achieve this goal, we have developed and validated an instrument to measure the quality of institutional information. This is a complex process that establishes a solid foundation for evaluating the quality of information the public receives in the institutional domain.

The proposed instrument consists of a model of criteria and indicators based on the convergence and adaptation of cross-cutting criteria for assessing information quality from the Barometer for Information Quality (2025), the model by Lee et al. (2002), and the approach used by the Vibrant Information Barometer¹. We employed the Delphi method, which involved three rounds of feedback: the first two rounds consisted of questionnaires administered to a group of experts (academics and professionals) to validate the criteria identified in the literature. The third round included interviews with select participants to review three criteria that had not reached consensus after the initial rounds. The model's validation at the end of this process enables its application across various case studies conducted by BIP researchers. Moreover, other research groups can replicate this tool for comparative analyses.

[BIP - Barometer for Information Quality](#) is an observatory associated with the [CECS - Communication and Society Research Centre](#) that monitors and analyses the quality of public information across different communication

¹ Now discontinued following the closure of USAID, the funding institution of this barometer.

ecosystems and platforms. BIP serves as a tool for understanding and improving the quality of available information, contributing to a more critical and informed society. Additionally, its activities promote transparency and accountability in all spheres of society (Barometer for Information Quality, 2025).

1 – THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES ON MEASURING THE QUALITY OF INSTITUTIONAL INFORMATION

High-quality information is essential for the functioning of society, democracy, and informed citizenship, impacting both individual and collective life. Therefore, assessing the quality of information is fundamental.

Information is shaped through the organisation of data, its meaning, and the relevance attributed to it (Nonaka & Takeuchi, 2008). It underpins thought and serves as the foundation for decision-making and problem-solving. It is crucial to base decisions on “good” information to ensure they are sound and well-informed. Moreover, the exponential growth of data makes it increasingly challenging to identify what is credible and relevant.

The quality of information is a cornerstone for the functioning of both societies and states. For instance, “a poorly informed citizen may struggle to access public services, fulfil obligations, or exercise their rights” (Barómetro para a Qualidade da Informação, 2025, p. 15). Access to high-quality information is also vital for organisations; studies from 15 years ago revealed that low-quality information could lead to revenue losses of up to 20% (Howard et al., 2011).

Several indicators can be used to measure information quality. In the context of journalistic information, commonly considered indicators include verification (Casero Ripollés & López Rabadán, 2013), accuracy (Zúñiga & Hinsley, 2013), timeliness (Guerra, 2023; Meier, 2019), and transparency (Meier, 2019), among others.

To develop a tool for assessing the quality of institutional information, we started with two models: the one proposed by Lee et al. (2002), which remains relevant despite being 24 years old, and the Vibrant Information Barometer model.

The Lee et al. (2002) model, summarised in Table 1, identifies four core dimensions of quality: intrinsic quality, accessibility quality, contextual quality, and representational quality.

Dimension	Main indicators
Intrinsic information quality	accuracy, objectivity, credibility, reliability, completeness
Accessibility information quality	accessibility, security
Contextual information quality	relevance, timeliness, completeness, quantity
Representational information quality	interpretability, understandability, consistent representation

Table 1. Information quality assessment model, according to Lee et al. (2002)

The authors derived this model from 14 empirical principles, which include:

- accessibility: ease of obtaining and retrieving information when needed;
- appropriate amount: volume of information adjusted to needs;
- credibility: trustworthiness and plausibility of the data;
- completeness: the extent and comprehensiveness of the information;
- consistent representation: a compact, coherent and standardised format;
- ease of operations: ease of manipulating, combining and using the data;
- accuracy: correctness and reliability of the information;

- interpretability: clarity in interpretation and meaning;
- objectivity: factual basis and impartiality of the data;
- relevance: usefulness and applicability of the information to the work context;
- reputation: perceived quality and trust in the sources;
- security: protection against unauthorised access;
- timeliness: currency and temporal relevance of the information;
- understandability: ease of understanding and semantic clarity.

The Vibrant Information Barometer model (now discontinued following the closure of USAID, the US agency that funded it; the website is no longer publicly available: <https://vibe.irex.org/>) considered the following principles and respective indicators:

- Principle 1 – Information Quality:
 - availability of high-quality information across a range of topics;
 - predominance of fact-based content, with minimal disinformation;
 - absence of harmful intent, with low levels of misinformation and hate speech;
 - inclusion and diversity of content;
 - financial sustainability of information production.
- Principle 2 – Multiple Information Channels:
 - right to create, share and consume information;
 - adequate access to information channels;
 - existence of appropriate channels for government information;
 - diversity of information dissemination channels;
 - independence of information channels.
- Principle 3 – Information Consumption and Engagement:
 - security and privacy in Internet use;
 - media literacy and digital skills of audiences;
 - productive engagement with available information;
 - interaction between information producers and audiences;
 - relevance of community information for local engagement.
- Principle 4 – Transformative Action:
 - promotion of dialogue between different ideologies;

- o use of high-quality information to guide individual actions;
- o use of information by civil society to promote community improvements;
- o use of high-quality information by governments in public policy-making;
- o contribution of information to good governance and the strengthening of democratic rights.

Principles 3 and 4 are particularly suited to institutional communication, given their constituent criteria, such as engagement, public trust, and transformative impact.

We also referenced the model of cross-cutting criteria for assessing information quality developed by the Barometer for Information Quality (2025, Table 2), which served as a primary basis for adapting a framework specifically aimed at institutional information quality.

Concept	Dimensions	Components	Indicators
Information Quality	Intrinsic Quality	Credibility	Source reputation
			Absence of manipulation allegations
			Alignment with ethical standards
		Transparency	Statement of intent
			Disclosure of conflicts of interest
			Disclosure of editorial or creative processes
		Accuracy and Veracity	Percentage of verified facts
			Existence of public corrections
			Transparency in attribution of sources and authorship

		Impartiality and Inclusivity	Balanced representation of perspectives
			Absence of bias
			Inclusion of underrepresented groups
		Responsibility and Ethic	Compliance with legal standards
			Publication of social impact reports
			Respect for users' privacy
	Representational Quality	Clarity, Understandability, and Interpretability	Text readability
			Use of clear and concise language
			Logical organisation of ideas; Content completeness
		Originality and Innovation	Creation of original content
			Application of innovative formats
			Introduction of new approaches
	Contextual Quality	Relevance and Usefulness	Appropriateness to target audience
			Frequency of consultation
			Topical relevance at the time of publication
Access Quality	Interactivity	Existence of mechanisms for interaction with content	
		Ease of interacting with content	
		Existence of mechanisms for audience interaction with content producers	
	Accessibility	use of diverse channels for content dissemination	

			Availability in accessible formats compatible with multiple devices
			Content accessible to people with disabilities, special needs, or neurodivergence
		Social Impact	Audience reactions
			Contribution to literacy
			Influence on recipients' decisions

Table 2. *Model of cross-cutting criteria for assessing information quality of the Barometer for Information Quality (2025, p. 47)*

Building on this theoretical foundation, we developed a model for assessing the quality of institutional information, which was validated using the Delphi method (see Section 3).

2 – METHODOLOGICAL NOTE

To create and validate an instrument to measure the quality of institutional information, we used the Delphi method. This is a consensus-building method used when expert interpretation is required regarding a given object or phenomenon (Calabuig Moreno & Crespo Hervàs, 2009; Reguant-Álvarez & Torrado-Fonseca, 2016). The Delphi method involves successive rounds of consultation and requires the anonymity of individual responses to avoid the influence of opinion leaders. By relying on the opinions of individuals considered experts in the subject under analysis, the method is based on intersubjective judgement that overcomes the limitations of a single individual (Reguant-Álvarez & Torrado-Fonseca, 2016), allowing decisions that should not be taken unilaterally by the researcher (García Valdés & Suárez Marín, 2013).

Based on the theoretical framework and the criteria outlined in the previous section, the research team developed a data collection instrument in the form of a questionnaire comprising 37 criteria grouped into eight components: credibility; transparency; accuracy; responsibility and ethics; clarity, understandability and interpretability; originality and innovation; relevance and usefulness; accessibility and information security. This instrument (Appendix 1) resulted from the convergence and adaptation of the cross-cutting criteria for assessing information quality of the Barometer for Information Quality (2025), the model of Lee et al. (2002), and the model used by the Vibrant Information Barometer.

Each criterion is assessed on a five-point self-rating scale, reflecting the respondent's perceived importance (1 = not important; 2 = slightly important; 3 = moderately important; 4 = very important; 5 = essential).

The expert panel should complete the questionnaire via an online Microsoft Forms survey, accessible with institutional credentials. Online tools are commonly used in Delphi studies because they ensure anonymity for experts, enable participation from various geographic locations, and minimise travel expenses (García Valdés & Suárez Marín, 2013).

Before dissemination to the experts, a pilot test was conducted to ensure the questions adhered to the principles of accuracy and independence.

The validation process consisted of three rounds. The first round, involving the panel of experts ($N = 7$), took place between 26 June and 14 July 2025; the second round ran from 21 October to 12 November 2025; and the third round, conducted on 26–27 January 2026, comprised interviews with experts whose responses had led to disagreement.

Throughout the rounds, no changes were made to the question wording to maintain consistent evaluation. The methodological process was clearly and transparently explained to the experts, emphasising that a lack of consensus is not inherently problematic. Understanding the sources of dissent is essential; hence, the method allows for re-evaluation (and, if necessary, justification) of responses, taking into account the opinions of other panel members (Reguant-Álvarez & Torrado-Fonseca, 2016).

Between February and March 2025, ten experts in Institutional Communication and Public Relations, from academic and professional backgrounds in Portugal and Brazil, were contacted by email. Selection was based on each participant's scientific and/or professional relevance in Institutional Communication, Transparency, and Information Management. This resulted in a non-probabilistic purposive sample of female experts ($N = 7$; three academics and four practitioners). This sample aligns with García Valdés and Suárez Marín's (2013) recommendation of a minimum of seven experts and a maximum of thirty.

Response dispersion was analysed using the standard deviation as a measure of consensus/dissent. The following scale was applied to interpret agreement: 0–0.5 = very high; 0.5–0.75 = high; 0.75–1.49 = moderate; > 1.5 = low. A conservative approach was adopted, setting 0.75 as the cut-off for high and

very high agreement, although the literature frequently suggests a standard deviation below 1 indicates high agreement on self-assessment scales (Blunch, 2013; Hair et al., 2019).

3 – TESTING THE MODEL WITH EXPERTS

Before the first round of questionnaire application to the panel, an online meeting was held with the experts to present the instrument and methodology. The same guidelines were emailed to all participants.

Round 1 – first application of the questionnaire

The first round of evaluation took place between 26 June and 14 July 2025, and yielded the following results (Table 3):

Criteria	Standard deviation value
1- Should institutional information be credible?	0,48
2- Should institutional information be reliable?	0,48
3- Should institutional information be disseminated by an official source?	0,48
4- Should institutional information comply with the institution's transparency and compliance criteria?	0,69
5- Should institutional information be free from conflicts of interest?	0,53
6- Should institutional information allow the identification of the operational and strategic processes to which it is related?	0,95
7- Should institutional information present identifiable sources and/or authors?	0,53
8- Should institutional information present objective data to support it?	0,53
9- Should institutional information undergo identifiable public corrections?	0,75

10- Should the data presented in institutional information be capable of validation?	0,53
11- Should institutional information comply with legal standards?	0,37
12- Should institutional information meet the institution's social and environmental commitments?	0,78
13- Should institutional information respect the privacy principles of the individuals involved?	0,00
14- Should institutional information use clear and accessible language?	0,37
15- Should institutional information be easy to understand?	0,53
16- Should institutional information be easy to interpret?	0,53
17- Should institutional information be sufficiently complete to meet the public's needs?	0,48
18- Should institutional information be presented in a consistent format?	0,95
19- Should institutional information be adapted to different types of media?	0,75
20- Should institutional information present original content?	0,95
21- Should institutional information employ innovative formats?	0,53
22- Should institutional information introduce new approaches?	0,53
23- Should institutional information be appropriate for its intended audience?	0,53
24- Should institutional information be sufficiently up to date?	0,53
25- Should institutional information prove useful to its intended audience?	0,95
26- Should mechanisms exist for public interaction with the content?	0,53
27- Should mechanisms exist for public interaction with content producers?	1,13

28- Should mechanisms exist for public interaction with the institution?	0,75
29- Should institutional information be easily accessible when needed?	0,48
30- Should institutional information be easily retrievable when needed?	0,53
31- Should institutional information be easily combined with other information?	0,48
32- Should institutional information be manipulable to meet public needs?	0,69
33- Should the amount of information provided be adequate to the public's needs?	0,75
34- Should institutional information be protected against unauthorised access?	0,53
35- Should access to certain information be restricted for specific audiences?	1,11
36- Should there be an assessment of whether institutional information may put any person's integrity at risk?	0,00
37- Should consideration be given to whether institutional information may compromise the institution's reputation?	0,48

Table 3. Standard deviation of expert responses per criterion. Items in bold indicate criteria that only achieved moderate agreement.

As shown in Table 3, in the first round, seven of the 37 criteria showed moderate to low agreement, indicating that consensus was not reached. Consequently, these criteria were considered for a second round:

- Should institutional information allow the identification of the operational and strategic processes to which it is related?
- Should institutional information meet the institution's social and environmental commitments?
- Should institutional information be presented in a consistent format?
- Should institutional information present original content?
- Should institutional information prove useful to its intended audience?
- Should mechanisms exist for public interaction with content producers?

- Should access to certain information be restricted for specific audiences?

Round 2 – second application of the questionnaire

The seven criteria were tested again in a second round, conducted between 21 October and 12 November 2025. After participation by all seven experts, and without any modifications to the wording of the questions or the administration process, three criteria still lacked consensus, as shown in Table 4:

- Should institutional information meet the institution's social and environmental commitments?
- Should institutional information present original content?
- Should institutional information prove useful to its intended audience?

Criteria	Standard deviation value
Should institutional information allow the identification of the operational and strategic processes to which it is related?	0,53
Should institutional information meet the institution's social and environmental commitments?	1,13
Should institutional information be presented in a consistent format?	0,49
Should institutional information present original content?	0,95
Should institutional information prove useful to its intended audience?	1,11
Should mechanisms exist for public interaction with content producers?	0,64
Should access to certain information be restricted for specific audiences?	0,64

Table 4. Standard deviation of expert responses per criterion. Items in bold indicate criteria that only achieved moderate agreement.

Round 3 – interviews with the experts

To evaluate the retention of these criteria in the model, the next phase involved individual interviews with experts who held dissenting views to understand the reasons for their disagreement. These interviews were conducted remotely between 26 and 27 January 2026, each lasting approximately 20 minutes. The aim was to clarify the rationale for each response and determine whether the dissent stemmed from the wording of the question.

The interview results were subsequently discussed within the research team to decide whether to retain or discard the aforementioned criteria.

The criterion corresponding to the question “Should institutional information prove useful to its intended audience?” was removed, while the others were retained (Appendix 2). The legal obligation of institutions to provide accountability was highlighted by the experts, which may motivate the dissemination of information that is not always directly useful to the intended audiences. Such information often consists of financial reports, regulations, and legal statutes that demonstrate the organisation’s compliance with the requirements for its proper operation.

Regarding alignment between institutional information and the institution’s social and environmental commitments, the interviewed expert cited practical difficulties in meeting this criterion daily, citing the example of Artificial Intelligence (AI). Indeed, the water and energy consumption associated with AI does not align with the environmental and social commitments assumed by most institutions; however, AI is a widespread practice, which explains why her response differed from the others.

Finally, the arguments provided for dissent on the question “Should institutional information present original content?” led to the decision to retain this item. The interviewed experts consider that content originality should be the standard in institutional information.

This process validated the final model for measuring the quality of institutional information, comprising 36 indicators, which can be replicated

by other researchers and applied in both academic and professional contexts. The final model is available in Appendix 2.

CONCLUDING NOTE

The work carried out enabled the achievement of a solid, coherent outcome in the construction and validation of a model to measure the quality of institutional information. The integration of the theoretical framework with the adopted methodological procedure proved productive, resulting in high convergence across most of the defined criteria. This consensus confirms the suitability of the dimensions, components, and indicators employed to understand and evaluate the quality of information in an institutional context.

The validation process, enriched by successive rounds of consultation and complemented by individual interviews, helped clarify specific aspects of the instrument and contributed to its conceptual refinement. The decisions made throughout this process strengthened the measure's internal consistency and alignment with the actual practices of institutional communication and the normative frameworks that govern it.

Thus, the final instrument presents itself as a robust, clear, and operational tool, with potential for application across different case studies and for replication by other researchers. Its use may contribute to comparative analyses and deepen both academic and applied reflection on the quality of institutional information in contemporary societies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Barómetro para a Qualidade da Informação. (2025). *Avaliar a qualidade da informação: Referencial teórico-metodológico*. CECS.

Blunch, N. J. (2013). *Introduction to structural equation modelling using IBM SPSS Statistics and AMOS*. Sage Publications.

Calabuig Moreno, F., & Crespo Hervàs, J. (2009). Uso del método Delphi para la elaboración de una medida de la calidad percibida de los espectadores de eventos deportivos. *RETOS. Nuevas Tendencias en Educación Física, Deporte y Recreación*, (15) 21-25.

Casero Ripollés, A., & López Rabadán, P. (2013). La gestión de fuentes informativas como criterio de calidad profesional. In J. L. Gómez Mompert, J. F. Gutiérrez Lozano & D. Palau Sampio (Eds.), *La calidad periodística. Teorías, investigaciones y sugerencias profesionales* (pp. 73–89). aldea global.

García Valdés, M., & Suárez Marín, M. (2013). *Revista Cubana de Salud Pública*, 39(2) 253-267.

Guerra, J. L. (2023). A abordagem estratégica da qualidade em jornalismo: Inovação, tecnologia e pesquisa aplicada. *Comunicação e Sociedade*, 44, e023023. [https://doi.org/10.17231/comsoc.44\(2023\).4736](https://doi.org/10.17231/comsoc.44(2023).4736)

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Babin, B. J., & Anderson, R. E. (2019). *Multivariate data analysis* (8th Edition). Cengage.

Howard, G., Lubbe, S., & Klopper, R. (2011). The impact of information quality on information research. *Alternation*, [Edição especial 4], 288–305.

Lee, Y. W., Strong, D. M., Kahn, B. K., & Wang, R. Y. (2002). AIMQ: A methodology for information quality assessment. *Information & Management*, 40, 133–146.

Meier, K. (2019). Quality in journalism. In T. Vos & F. Hanusch (Eds.), *The international encyclopedia of journalism studies*. John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Nonaka, I., & Takeuchi, H. (2008). *Gestão do conhecimento*. Bookman.

Reguant-Álvarez, M. y Torrado-Fonseca, M. (2016). *El método Delphi*. *REIRE, Revista d'Innovació i Recerca en Educació*, 9(1), 87-102.
<https://doi.org/10.1344/reire2016.9.1916>

Zúñiga, H., & Hinsley, A. (2013). The press vs the public. What is 'good journalism'? *Journalism Studies*, 14(6), 926–942.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1461670X.2012.744551>

APPENDIX 1- Instrument for assessing the quality of institutional information—initial version

1. CREDIBILITY COMPONENT—CREDIBILITY CRITERION: Should institutional information be credible?

This criterion concerns the extent to which information appears truthful and acceptable, as determined by its consistency, clarity, and adherence to established standards of trustworthy information. The assessment aims to establish whether the information inspires initial confidence, even without formal verification.

2. CREDIBILITY COMPONENT—RELIABILITY CRITERION: Should institutional information be reliable?

This criterion concerns the degree to which information conveys security and stability, thereby fostering public trust. The assessment focuses on content coherence, data accuracy, and the historical reliability of the source.

3. CREDIBILITY COMPONENT—INSTITUTIONAL ORIGIN CRITERION: Should institutional information be disseminated by an official source?

This criterion examines the legitimacy of the information's origin, specifically whether it is disseminated through official institutional channels such as the website, verified social media accounts, or formal communications. The objective is to determine if the source is institutionally recognised and authorised.

4. TRANSPARENCY COMPONENT—COMPLIANCE CRITERION: Should institutional information comply with the institution's transparency and compliance criteria?

This criterion evaluates compliance with institutional standards and guidelines concerning transparency, integrity, and accountability. The assessment focuses on the clarity of legal, ethical, and regulatory commitments associated with information disclosure.

5. TRANSPARENCY COMPONENT—CONFLICT OF INTEREST
CRITERION: Should institutional information be free from conflicts of interest?

This criterion assesses whether personal, corporate, or institutional interests could compromise the impartiality of the disclosed information. The evaluation focuses on neutrality and integrity in contexts where undue influence may occur.

6. TRANSPARENCY COMPONENT—PROCESS TRACEABILITY
CRITERION: Should institutional information allow the identification of the operational and strategic processes to which it is related?

This criterion evaluates the degree to which information can be linked to specific institutional procedures, actions, or decisions. The assessment emphasises procedural transparency and contextualisation within institutional workflows.

7. TRANSPARENCY COMPONENT—SOURCE IDENTIFICATION
CRITERION: Should institutional information present identifiable sources and/or authors?

This criterion examines the clarity of authorship, the origin of the information, and the sources used to produce it. The assessment considers the verifiability of the information's provenance and the assignment of responsibility for its content.

8. ACCURACY COMPONENT—OBJECTIVITY CRITERION: Should institutional information present objective data to support it?

This criterion assesses the presence of evidence, figures, facts, or verifiable documents that substantiate the content. The evaluation focuses on the level of objectivity and empirical support.

9. ACCURACY COMPONENT—CORRECTION HISTORY CRITERION: Should institutional information undergo identifiable public corrections?

This criterion evaluates whether publicly available records document adjustments, updates, or retractions to disclosed information. The

assessment emphasises institutional transparency and responsibility in error correction.

10. ACCURACY COMPONENT—DATA VERIFIABILITY CRITERION: Should the data presented in institutional information be capable of validation?

This criterion assesses whether reported data can be checked, verified, or reproduced using reliable external sources, public databases, or consistent internal evidence. The evaluation focuses on data verifiability and precision.

11. RESPONSIBILITY AND ETHICS COMPONENT—LEGAL COMPLIANCE CRITERION: Should institutional information comply with legal standards?

This criterion evaluates the information's compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and norms. The assessment determines whether the disclosed content aligns with relevant legal frameworks, including administrative, civil, environmental, or access-to-information legislation.

12. RESPONSIBILITY AND ETHICS COMPONENT—SOCIO-ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENT CRITERION: Should institutional information meet the institution's social and environmental commitments?

This criterion examines the alignment of information with institutional values, principles, and guidelines concerning socio-environmental responsibility. The assessment focuses on whether communication demonstrates a commitment to ethics, inclusion, sustainability, and the public interest.

13. RESPONSIBILITY AND ETHICS COMPONENT—RESPECT FOR PRIVACY CRITERION: Should institutional information respect the privacy principles of the individuals involved?

This criterion evaluates the protection of personal and sensitive data, as well as respect for the identity and privacy of referenced individuals. The assessment determines whether information adheres to principles of privacy, confidentiality, and consent.

14. CLARITY, COMPREHENSIBILITY, AND INTERPRETABILITY COMPONENT—CLEAR LANGUAGE CRITERION: Should institutional information use clear and accessible language?

This criterion assesses the use of language that is understandable to the target audience, avoiding jargon and technical terms that may impede comprehension.

15. CLARITY, COMPREHENSIBILITY, AND INTERPRETABILITY COMPONENT—EASE OF UNDERSTANDING CRITERION: Should institutional information be easy to understand?

This criterion evaluates the simplicity and directness of information presentation, ensuring that the public can understand content without ambiguity.

16. CLARITY, COMPREHENSIBILITY, AND INTERPRETABILITY COMPONENT—INTERPRETABILITY CRITERION: Should institutional information be easy to interpret?

This criterion assesses the extent to which the public can derive clear and accurate meaning from information without undue effort.

17. CLARITY, COMPREHENSIBILITY, AND INTERPRETABILITY COMPONENT—COMPLETENESS CRITERION: Should institutional information be sufficiently complete to meet the public's needs?

This criterion evaluates the comprehensiveness and detail of the information, ensuring it is sufficient to provide a complete understanding of the topic.

18. CLARITY, COMPREHENSIBILITY, AND INTERPRETABILITY COMPONENT—FORMAT CONSISTENCY CRITERION: Should institutional information be presented in a consistent format?

This criterion assesses the uniformity of visual and structural presentation, ensuring the format facilitates comprehension and navigation.

19. CLARITY, COMPREHENSIBILITY, AND INTERPRETABILITY COMPONENT—MEDIA APPROPRIATENESS CRITERION: Should institutional information be adapted to different types of media?

This criterion evaluates the suitability of information for the selected communication channel or medium, ensuring effective dissemination and audience reach.

20. ORIGINALITY AND INNOVATION COMPONENT—CONTENT ORIGINALITY CRITERION: Should institutional information present original content?

This criterion assesses the uniqueness and novelty of content, emphasizing the avoidance of repetition of widely disseminated information.

21. ORIGINALITY AND INNOVATION COMPONENT—INNOVATIVE FORMATS CRITERION: Should institutional information employ innovative formats?

This criterion concerns the use of new forms of presentation, technologies, or visual resources that enhance the engagement and effectiveness of information.

22. ORIGINALITY AND INNOVATION COMPONENT—INNOVATIVE APPROACHES CRITERION: Should institutional information introduce new approaches?

This criterion concerns the capacity to present original perspectives, methods, or ideas that enrich understanding of the addressed topic.

23. RELEVANCE AND USEFULNESS COMPONENT—AUDIENCE APPROPRIATENESS CRITERION: Should institutional information be appropriate for its intended audience?

This criterion concerns the extent to which information aligns with the target audience's needs, characteristics, and expectations, taking into account the audience's profile and context.

24. RELEVANCE AND USEFULNESS COMPONENT—TIMELINESS
CRITERION: Should institutional information be sufficiently up to date?

This criterion concerns the timeliness of information, ensuring that data and content reflect the most recent state of knowledge or circumstances.

25. RELEVANCE AND USEFULNESS COMPONENT—USEFULNESS
CRITERION: Should institutional information prove useful to its intended audience?

This criterion evaluates the degree to which information meets the practical or informational needs of the public, providing effective value in application.

26. INTERACTIVITY COMPONENT—CONTENT INTERACTION
MECHANISMS CRITERION: Should mechanisms exist for public interaction with the content?

This criterion concerns the presence of tools or resources that enable the public to explore, comment on, or interact directly with information provided by the institution through official communication channels.

27. INTERACTIVITY COMPONENT—INTERACTION WITH CONTENT
PRODUCERS CRITERION: Should mechanisms exist for public interaction with content producers?

This criterion concerns the public's ability to engage in dialogue, provide feedback, or seek clarification directly from individuals responsible for the information.

28. INTERACTIVITY COMPONENT—INTERACTION WITH THE INSTITUTION
CRITERION: Should mechanisms exist for public interaction with the institution?

This criterion concerns the existence of formal, accessible channels through which the public can communicate, participate in, or influence institutional actions associated with disclosed information.

29. ACCESSIBILITY COMPONENT—EASE OF ACCESS CRITERION: Should institutional information be easily accessible when needed?

This criterion concerns the availability and ease of obtaining information when required by the public, free from technical or bureaucratic barriers.

30. ACCESSIBILITY COMPONENT—EASE OF RETRIEVAL CRITERION: Should institutional information be easily retrievable when needed?

This criterion concerns the capacity to locate and access information efficiently, using effective search mechanisms and appropriate organisation.

31. ACCESSIBILITY COMPONENT—INTEGRABILITY CRITERION: Should institutional information be easily combined with other information?

This criterion concerns the possibility of integrating information with other data or content, facilitating analysis and the development of broader knowledge. For example, public institutions' open data repositories support this integration.

32. ACCESSIBILITY COMPONENT—ADAPTABILITY CRITERION: Should institutional information be manipulable to meet public needs?

This criterion concerns the flexibility of the information, allowing it to be adjusted, filtered, or customised to serve different user profiles better or meet specific demands.

33. ACCESSIBILITY COMPONENT—APPROPRIATE AMOUNT CRITERION: Should the amount of information provided be adequate to the public's needs?

This criterion concerns the balance between excess and insufficiency of content, ensuring information is adequate and relevant without overwhelming the public.

34. INFORMATION SECURITY COMPONENT—PROTECTION AGAINST UNAUTHORISED ACCESS CRITERION: Should institutional information be protected against unauthorised access?

This criterion concerns technical and administrative measures that ensure only authorised individuals have access to information, thereby preserving confidentiality.

35. INFORMATION SECURITY COMPONENT—ACCESS RESTRICTION
CRITERION: Should access to certain information be restricted for specific audiences?

This criterion concerns the clear definition and application of access levels based on users' profiles, roles, or authorisations.

36. INFORMATION SECURITY COMPONENT—PERSONAL INTEGRITY
CRITERION: Should there be an assessment of whether institutional information may put any person's integrity at risk?

This criterion refers to the assessment of potential physical, psychological, or moral harm that disclosure of information may cause to individuals involved.

37. INFORMATION SECURITY COMPONENT—INSTITUTIONAL
REPUTATION CRITERION: Should consideration be given to whether institutional information may compromise the institution's reputation?

This criterion refers to the potential for information, if poorly managed or incorrectly disclosed, to damage the institution's image, trust, or credibility.

APPENDIX 2 – Model for measuring the quality of institutional information – final version after validation rounds

Concept	Dimensions	Components	Indicators
Quality of institutional information	Intrinsic quality	Credibility	Credibility Reliability Institutional origin
		Transparency	Compliance Conflict of interest Traceability of processes Identification of sources
		Accuracy	Objectivity History of corrections Verifiability of data
		Responsibility and ethics	Legal compliance Socio-environmental commitment Respect for privacy
	Representational quality	Clarity, comprehensibility, and interpretability	Clear language Ease of understanding Interpretability Completeness Format consistency Media appropriateness

		Originality and innovation	Originality of content Innovative formats Innovative approaches
	Contextual quality	Relevance and usefulness	Audience appropriateness Timeliness
	Accessibility quality	Interactivity	Mechanisms for interaction with content Mechanisms for interaction with content producers Mechanisms for interaction with the institution
		Accessibility	Ease of access Appropriate amount Retrievability Integrability Adaptability
		Security	Protection against unauthorised access Access restriction Personal integrity Institutional reputation

1. CREDIBILITY COMPONENT—CREDIBILITY CRITERION:

This criterion concerns the extent to which information appears truthful and acceptable, as determined by its consistency, clarity, and adherence to established standards of trustworthy information. The assessment aims to establish whether the information inspires initial confidence, even without formal verification.

2. CREDIBILITY COMPONENT—RELIABILITY CRITERION:

This criterion concerns the degree to which information conveys security and stability, thereby fostering public trust. The assessment focuses on content coherence, data accuracy, and the historical reliability of the source.

3. CREDIBILITY COMPONENT—INSTITUTIONAL ORIGIN CRITERION:

This criterion examines the legitimacy of the information's origin, specifically whether it is disseminated through official institutional channels such as the website, verified social media accounts, or formal communications. The objective is to determine if the source is institutionally recognised and authorised.

4. TRANSPARENCY COMPONENT—COMPLIANCE CRITERION:

This criterion evaluates compliance with institutional standards and guidelines concerning transparency, integrity, and accountability. The assessment focuses on the clarity of legal, ethical, and regulatory commitments associated with information disclosure.

5. TRANSPARENCY COMPONENT—CONFLICT OF INTEREST CRITERION:

This criterion assesses whether personal, corporate, or institutional interests could compromise the impartiality of the disclosed information. The evaluation focuses on neutrality and integrity in contexts where undue influence may occur.

6. TRANSPARENCY COMPONENT—PROCESS TRACEABILITY CRITERION:

This criterion evaluates the degree to which information can be linked to specific institutional procedures, actions, or decisions. The assessment emphasises procedural transparency and contextualisation within institutional workflows.

7. TRANSPARENCY COMPONENT—SOURCE IDENTIFICATION CRITERION:

This criterion examines the clarity of authorship, the origin of the information, and the sources used to produce it. The assessment considers the verifiability of the information's provenance and the assignment of responsibility for its content.

8. ACCURACY COMPONENT—OBJECTIVITY CRITERION:

This criterion assesses the presence of evidence, figures, facts, or verifiable documents that substantiate the content. The evaluation focuses on the level of objectivity and empirical support.

9. ACCURACY COMPONENT—CORRECTION HISTORY CRITERION:

This criterion evaluates whether publicly available records document adjustments, updates, or retractions to disclosed information. The assessment emphasises institutional transparency and responsibility in error correction.

10. ACCURACY COMPONENT—DATA VERIFIABILITY CRITERION:

This criterion assesses whether reported data can be checked, verified, or reproduced using reliable external sources, public databases, or consistent internal evidence. The evaluation focuses on data verifiability and precision.

11. RESPONSIBILITY AND ETHICS COMPONENT—LEGAL COMPLIANCE CRITERION:

This criterion evaluates the information's compliance with applicable laws, regulations, and norms. The assessment determines whether the disclosed content aligns with relevant legal frameworks, including administrative, civil, environmental, or access-to-information legislation.

12. RESPONSIBILITY AND ETHICS COMPONENT—SOCIO-ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENT CRITERION:

This criterion examines the alignment of information with institutional values, principles, and guidelines concerning socio-environmental

responsibility. The assessment focuses on whether communication demonstrates a commitment to ethics, inclusion, sustainability, and the public interest.

13. RESPONSIBILITY AND ETHICS COMPONENT—RESPECT FOR PRIVACY CRITERION:

This criterion evaluates the protection of personal and sensitive data, as well as respect for the identity and privacy of referenced individuals. The assessment determines whether information adheres to principles of privacy, confidentiality, and consent.

14. CLARITY, COMPREHENSIBILITY, AND INTERPRETABILITY COMPONENT—CLEAR LANGUAGE CRITERION:

This criterion assesses the use of language that is understandable to the target audience, avoiding jargon and technical terms that may impede comprehension.

15. CLARITY, COMPREHENSIBILITY, AND INTERPRETABILITY COMPONENT—EASE OF UNDERSTANDING CRITERION:

This criterion evaluates the simplicity and directness of information presentation, ensuring that the public can understand content without ambiguity.

16. CLARITY, COMPREHENSIBILITY, AND INTERPRETABILITY COMPONENT—INTERPRETABILITY CRITERION:

This criterion assesses the extent to which the public can derive clear and accurate meaning from information without undue effort.

17. CLARITY, COMPREHENSIBILITY, AND INTERPRETABILITY COMPONENT—COMPLETENESS CRITERION:

This criterion evaluates the comprehensiveness and detail of the information, ensuring it is sufficient to provide a complete understanding of the topic.

18. CLARITY, COMPREHENSIBILITY, AND INTERPRETABILITY COMPONENT—FORMAT CONSISTENCY CRITERION:

This criterion assesses the uniformity of visual and structural presentation, ensuring the format facilitates comprehension and navigation.

19. CLARITY, COMPREHENSIBILITY, AND INTERPRETABILITY COMPONENT—MEDIA APPROPRIATENESS CRITERION:

This criterion evaluates the suitability of information for the selected communication channel or medium, ensuring effective dissemination and audience reach.

20. ORIGINALITY AND INNOVATION COMPONENT—CONTENT ORIGINALITY CRITERION:

This criterion assesses the uniqueness and novelty of content, emphasizing the avoidance of repetition of widely disseminated information.

21. ORIGINALITY AND INNOVATION COMPONENT—INNOVATIVE FORMATS CRITERION:

This criterion concerns the use of new forms of presentation, technologies, or visual resources that enhance the engagement and effectiveness of information.

22. ORIGINALITY AND INNOVATION COMPONENT—INNOVATIVE APPROACHES CRITERION:

This criterion concerns the capacity to present original perspectives, methods, or ideas that enrich understanding of the addressed topic.

23. RELEVANCE AND USEFULNESS COMPONENT—AUDIENCE APPROPRIATENESS CRITERION:

This criterion concerns the extent to which information aligns with the target audience's needs, characteristics, and expectations, taking into account the audience's profile and context.

24. RELEVANCE AND USEFULNESS COMPONENT—TIMELINESS CRITERION:

This criterion concerns the timeliness of information, ensuring that data and content reflect the most recent state of knowledge or circumstances.

25. INTERACTIVITY COMPONENT—CONTENT INTERACTION MECHANISMS CRITERION:

This criterion concerns the presence of tools or resources that enable the public to explore, comment on, or interact directly with information provided by the institution through official communication channels.

26. INTERACTIVITY COMPONENT—INTERACTION WITH CONTENT PRODUCERS CRITERION:

This criterion concerns the public's ability to engage in dialogue, provide feedback, or seek clarification directly from individuals responsible for the information.

27. INTERACTIVITY COMPONENT—INTERACTION WITH THE INSTITUTION CRITERION:

This criterion concerns the existence of formal, accessible channels through which the public can communicate, participate in, or influence institutional actions associated with disclosed information.

28. ACCESSIBILITY COMPONENT—EASE OF ACCESS CRITERION:

This criterion concerns the availability and ease of obtaining information when required by the public, free from technical or bureaucratic barriers.

29. ACCESSIBILITY COMPONENT—EASE OF RETRIEVAL CRITERION:

This criterion concerns the capacity to locate and access information efficiently, using effective search mechanisms and appropriate organisation.

30. ACCESSIBILITY COMPONENT—INTEGRABILITY CRITERION:

This criterion concerns the possibility of integrating information with other data or content, facilitating analysis and the development of broader knowledge. For example, public institutions' open data repositories support this integration.

31. ACCESSIBILITY COMPONENT—ADAPTABILITY CRITERION:

This criterion concerns the flexibility of the information, allowing it to be adjusted, filtered, or customised to serve different user profiles better or meet specific demands.

32. ACCESSIBILITY COMPONENT—APPROPRIATE AMOUNT CRITERION:

This criterion concerns the balance between excess and insufficiency of content, ensuring information is adequate and relevant without overwhelming the public.

33. INFORMATION SECURITY COMPONENT—PROTECTION AGAINST UNAUTHORISED ACCESS CRITERION:

This criterion concerns technical and administrative measures that ensure only authorised individuals have access to information, thereby preserving confidentiality.

34. INFORMATION SECURITY COMPONENT—ACCESS RESTRICTION CRITERION:

This criterion concerns the clear definition and application of access levels based on users' profiles, roles, or authorisations.

35. INFORMATION SECURITY COMPONENT—PERSONAL INTEGRITY CRITERION:

This criterion refers to the assessment of potential physical, psychological, or moral harm that disclosure of information may cause to individuals involved.

36. INFORMATION SECURITY COMPONENT—INSTITUTIONAL REPUTATION CRITERION:

This criterion refers to the potential for information, if poorly managed or incorrectly disclosed, to damage the institution's image, trust, or credibility.