Our vision: A better information environment that restores trust

FULL FACT

The problem

Bad information ruins lives. Health misinformation has cost lives, as people refuse treatment that could have saved them. Lies and hate online have led to violence in the streets. When trust in politics and public institutions breaks down, polarisation rises and democracy itself begins to falter.

Why it matters

A healthy society needs verifiable facts as a basis for vigorous debates, and depends on all of us having the confidence to make informed choices.

Mission

We champion reliable information as a public service and confront the most harmful misinformation head-on.

How we work

As an impartial charity, we promote the public interest and challenge those who shape the global flow of information, including technology platforms — when we work with them we always maintain our independence.

Inputs

- **Full Fact team, including operations and fundraising**
- **Full Fact AI and other technology**
- **Funding and partnerships**
- **The public**

Activities

- Checking facts and investigating claims as they emerge and promoting accurate information on high-risk topics
- Holding government, tech companies and others in positions of power to account
- Training professionals and citizens to deal confidently with harmful mis- and disinformation, and with AI produced content
- Publishing explainers and guidance that help people find and judge reliable information
- Advocating for better legislation, policy, regulation and institutions
- Developing AI tools to enable Full Fact, its partners and its clients to track false and misleading information at internet scale

Short-term outcomes

- More people access reliable, original information
- Questions are asked in Parliament and policy papers influence debate
- Technology increases the speed and scale of fact checking for partners and clients
- Fewer people spread or share false or misleading information
- Official information sources are more accurate and open
- AI-driven monitoring builds sustained support for the idea that technology is part of the solution as well as part of the problem

Long-term outcomes

- A sustained increase in public access to good information, contributing to a population able to make informed decisions on a consistent basis
- A gradual, population-level reduction in the belief in and spread of misinformation helps build greater trust across society
- The systems and institutions that shape how information is produced, distributed and accessed (laws, regulators, platforms, AI companies and official bodies) increasingly support reliable information
- Official information sources are consistently accurate and open, contributing to a more trusted information environment
- Better legislation and more effective regulation is produced in the public interest
- Internet platform policies are improved to the benefit of the wider public

How it fits together

Our work is designed to reinforce itself.

1. **Fact-checking** builds the expertise and evidence everything else relies on.
2. **Policy work** uses that evidence to improve the rules and institutions that shape information.
3. **AI tools** take our methods to greater scale, at home and internationally.
4. **Training** spreads them through the professionals who reach far larger audiences.

Together, each strand turns activity into short-term results that build into lasting change.

Impact

People are less harmed by false and misleading information, online and offline. Public debate is more factually accurate and people are more confident they can make decisions, debate and cast votes with access to reliable information.

Our theory of change

The evidence behind each pathway

FULL FACT

The problem: the evidence

Promotes hate

The UK riots of summer 2024 were fuelled by false claims online about the Southport attacker's identity [16]

Damages health

Paloma Shemirani died in 2024 after refusing chemotherapy; a coroner found she had been "adversely influenced" by her parents [17]

Hurts democracy

Young voters were recommended AI-generated fake videos of party leaders in the 2024 election; modelling suggests misinformation can drive polarisation [18, 19]

Journalism and fact checking

Strong evidence

What must hold true

Meta continues its third-party fact checking programme

Full Fact keeps its reputation for impartiality

Our work reaches enough people to shift trust

Evidence

Warning labels cut belief in false headlines by 27.6% and sharing by 24.7%; a field study confirms they reduce reach [1, 2]

Community notes rely on fact checkers, who see them as support, not a replacement [11, 12, 22]

A harms-based model focuses checks on claims that cause real-world harm [20]

A woman falsely linked to a viral video of the PM said we were the only organisation to check with her [15]

Accountability

Moderate evidence

What must hold true

Decision-makers act on evidence and pressure

Institutions that adopt better practices sustain them

Evidence

The ONS changed how it publishes suicide statistics after a Full Fact investigation, and publicly credited our role [9]

All MPs can now correct the official record after our campaign [23]

Google updated its public AI detector after our investigation found it labelling apparently real images as AI [6]

Advocacy

Strong evidence

What must hold true

Policy wins come mainly from direct, ongoing policy work

The political environment stays open to evidence-based change

New laws and platform rules are implemented and enforced

Evidence

The Representation of the People Bill now includes our recommendation to extend the Electoral Commission's investigative powers [4]

The government agreed to review whether electoral offences cover deepfakes [4]

Cross-party MPs raised our proposals in a Commons debate [4]

58% of the UK public want an independent regulator to make sure AI is used safely [14]

Caution: platforms' commitments to work with fact checkers are not matched in practice [21]

Training

Emerging evidence

What must hold true

Civil servants and others in public organisations carry what they learn into their work, reaching a wider public

Evidence

91% of trainees highly recommend our courses, rating them 8, 9 or 10 out of 10, across five years of post-training surveys [10]

AI tools

Moderate evidence

What must hold true

Our AI tools perform reliably enough to license

Partners can adopt and use them effectively

International demand keeps growing

Evidence

45% of AI assistant answers misrepresented news content (EBU/BBC) [3]

Weekly use of generative AI nearly doubled in a year, to 34% [13]

Our tools are used by 430+ organisations in around 100 countries [5]

136 million words analysed in the 2024 election; 11,000+ AI model responses benchmarked since January 2026 [7]

Across all pathways

Our day-to-day fact checking builds the expertise that gives us legitimacy with policymakers and the understanding to build effective AI tools.

From long-term outcomes to impact

This final step depends on governments, institutions and the public, so it rests on reasoned inference rather than direct evidence.

Sources for the evidence

1 **Martel & Rand (2024), "Fact-checker warning labels are effective even for those who distrust fact-checkers", Nature Human Behaviour.** Meta-analysis of 21 experiments. nature.com/articles/s41562-024-01973-x

2 **Sciences Po / AFP Factuel 18-month field study,** reported by Indicator Media (January 2026). indicator.media

3 **EBU / BBC (October 2025), "News Integrity in AI Assistants".** 22 media organisations in 18 countries. bbc.co.uk/mediacentre

4 **Full Fact (2026), grant application on the Representation of the People Bill.** Internal.

5 **Full Fact (2026), technology usage data** across Full Fact AI, Prebunking at Scale and MediaVault. Internal.

6 **Full Fact (October 2026), "Google updates AI detector after Full Fact investigation finds it flagging apparently real images".** fullfact.org/toolkit/google-synthid-detector-flagging-apparently-real-images/

7 **Full Fact (2026), "Full Fact Report 2026: A system under strain".** Funded by the Nuffield Foundation. fullfact.org/policy/reports/full-fact-report-2026/

8 **Full Fact / University of Westminster (2026), "AI-Generated Misinformation in the UK: Harm, Context, and Classification".** AISI Challenge Fund. fullfact.org/policy/reports/ai-generated-misinformation-in-the-uk-harm-context-and-classification/

9 **Full Fact (October 2025), "ONS acts to improve understanding of suicide rates, after Full Fact investigation".** fullfact.org/health/suicide-statistics-changed-after-investigation/

10 **Full Fact post-training survey,** last five years. Internal.

11 **Borenstein, Warren, Elliott & Augenstein (2025), "Can Community Notes Replace Professional Fact-Checkers?",** ACL 2025. arxiv.org/abs/2502.14132

12 **Maldita.es (2025), "Faster, trusted, and more useful: the impact of fact-checkers in X's Community Notes".** files.maldita.es

13 **Reuters Institute (2025), "Generative AI and News Report 2025: How People Think About AI's Role in Journalism and Society".** reutersinstitute.politics.ox.ac.uk

14 **Ada Lovelace Institute & Alan Turing Institute (2025), "How do people feel about AI?" (wave two).** adalovelaceinstitute.org

15 **Full Fact (July 2025), "Woman falsely linked to viral video involving the PM: how fact checking could have helped".** fullfact.org/culture-and-society/woman-falsely-linked-viral-video-involving-prime-minister/

16 **BBC News (2024), on false claims about the Southport attacker's identity spreading on social media before the summer riots.** bbc.co.uk/news

17 **BBC News (October 2025), on the coroner's conclusion in the inquest into the death of Paloma Shemirani.** bbc.co.uk/news

18 **BBC News (June 2024), "UK election: TikTok users being fed misleading election news, investigation finds".** bbc.co.uk/news

19 **Azzimonti & Fernandes (2023), "Social media networks, fake news, and polarization", European Journal of Political Economy, vol. 76.** ideas.repec.org

20 **Cunliffe-Jones, P. (2026), "Fact-checking what matters: How a harms-based model for selecting claims works",** HKS Misinformation Review 7(3). misinforeview.hks.harvard.edu

21 **Botan, M. (2026), "Accountability in name only: Fact-checking under the EU's Code of Practice on Disinformation",** HKS Misinformation Review 7(3). misinforeview.hks.harvard.edu

22 **Bozkurt, B., Mosleh, M. & Margetts, H. (2026), "Fact-checking at a crossroads: Fact checkers' perspectives on Community Notes, AI integration, and design recommendations",** HKS Misinformation Review 7(3). misinforeview.hks.harvard.edu

23 **Full Fact (April 2024), "Parliamentary corrections system overhaul: Speaker responds to Full Fact's campaign".** fullfact.org/blog/2024/apr/new-parliamentary-correction-system-speaker-announces-changes-after-long-standing-calls-from-full-fact/

Our theory of change

Intervening throughout the information lifecycle

FULL FACT

01 Creation

Where claims and underlying information originate

What we do

Full Fact advocates for better legislation and pushes for open, accurate official data. We track and give guidance on spotting and avoiding misinformation before it has gone viral, and train others to be more confident in dealing with a fast moving information environment.

Outcomes

- Official sources more accurate and open
- Legislative advances
- Systemic levers improved

02 Production

Where that information is turned into content people encounter

What we do

Full Fact produces fact checks and investigations, and promotes accurate and impartial information. We gather data and evidence on the output of large language models to monitor their accuracy and raise public awareness.

Outcomes

- Greater awareness of LLM accuracy among developers, policymakers and the public
- AI companies held to account for the accuracy of their models

03 Distribution

How content reaches people

What we do

Full Fact promotes its work on its website, on social media feeds and via partnerships with big media players. We develop AI tools to monitor and react to harmful misinformation at scale, and engage government and tech platforms to advocate for better regulation. We label false and misleading information on social media platforms.

Outcomes

- Fewer people misled
- Better platform policies
- Faster and wider international fact checking

04 Consumption

How people receive, judge and act on information

What we do

Full Fact provides training on fact checking and public guidance on misinformation. We engage our supporter base to share reliable information, and support our work. We promote critical thinking to increase public confidence that trustworthy sources of information are still available.

Outcomes

- More people see good information
- Increased confidence technology can be part of the solution