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Foreword

The American experiment is a testament to a diverse group of people working together through our many voluntary associations, religious assemblies, political parties, and other groups to make our communities, cities, states and ultimately our country a better place for everyone. It is this “civic fabric” that holds our country together and makes it strong. Civic involvement does not simply happen however. It takes each generation to demonstrate and teach future generations what it is to be an active, engaged, and enlightened citizen.

This approach to the American experiment in democracy has succeeded only because so many people over so many generations decided to become engaged on matters of common interest. They studied current events and participated in debate on matters great and small, from the town hall to the national capital. We believe that America will be a stronger nation with a brighter future if the country’s institutions and its practices encourage the robust civic involvement that has served us so well for so long.

This third edition of the Indiana Civic Health Index™ seeks once again to measure just how successfully we are doing on this score. In this latest “report card” we are able to analyze some of the trends that begin to take shape over a longer period of analysis. Our progress continues in some areas as we continue to build on our strengths, while other areas are cause for concern and need to improve. We hope that by identifying and discussing these trends in how Hoosiers are performing our civic duty we will produce further debate and action on building civic engagement in the future.

Executive Summary

When we recognize the contributions of all Hoosiers to our overall civic health, we broaden and deepen our understanding and connections. The data in this report reveal the patterns of our civic engagement and the commitment of Hoosiers to building a civically engaged Indiana. During the period of analysis, our performance relative to that of other states, has improved in key areas, including measures of working with neighbors and attending public meetings. These civic actions speak to our need to connect to our communities, and to government. In other areas we show improvements overall since 2010, but small setbacks in these improvements in 2016. For example, Indiana was ranked 32 in volunteering in 2010, 18th in 2012 and 22nd in 2016. Charitable giving activity placed Indiana 45th in 2010, 22nd in 2012 and 27th in 2016.

Voting and registration show a similar pattern of improvement. In 2010, Indiana was ranked 48th in voting in the nation. We rose to the rank of 38 in 2012 and fell slightly to 41 in 2016. Despite the overall improvement during this period, Indiana still remains ranked in the bottom 50% of all states in voting. Indiana’s ranking for voter registration during this period is also in the bottom 50% of all states, with a most recent rank of 40. On these measures, in particular, debate and action will be important to building civic engagement for the future of Indiana.

Our challenge for the future will be to devise ways to improve our civic health, build on our unique strengths and interests, and act to build stronger communities. This report carries on the work of continuously improving our civic health.
INTRODUCTION

A look at our civic health is a look at our public life – how we interact with one another, with our communities and with the government. The original Indiana Civic Health Index (CHI) was published in 2011. Four years later, in 2015, we continued to demonstrate our commitment to continuing the conversation regarding our attitudes and actions in the civic arena. The 2015 CHI explored more deeply the impediments to civic participation and the resources that can be harnessed to further strengthen our civic commitments. Indiana’s dedication to civic health continues today, in the face of an ever-changing landscape. Since 2015, more data has become available on national elections as well as other forms of civic engagement that reveal important changes in our civic mind. We intend for the data in this third edition to further a civic conversation among citizens and community leaders that will lead to forms of engagement that improve our individual lives and our communities.

What is Civic Health?

Indiana (leads the nation) in careful examination of civic health having undertaken a Civic Health Index study three times since 2010. Civic health is a measure of how actively citizens engage in their communities. The Indiana CHI is one way that the State of Indiana actively seeks to understand the status of our civic health and educate and inspire citizens, including leaders, to engage in dialogue and actions that improve the well-being of our communities. This societal checkup, much like an individual’s physical checkup, keeps us on a path of improving our civic health by taking stock of our challenges, charting a course for improvement and celebrating our successes.

The focus of this report is to take a closer look at how our civic health has changed over time and raise important issues and questions that will determine our progress toward more active civic participation that meets the needs of individuals, the community, and the state.

One way that we can look at our civic challenges and plan for our progress is to examine our involvement in a wide variety of civic activities. This report examines Hoosier participation in and views on community-based, political, and voting-related activities. Promoting understanding and reinforcing the value of authentic civic engagement in our communities lies at the heart of our efforts to take stock of our civic health. While the data cited in this report does not capture the ways we are divided in our dialogue, it does provide information on our differences and similarities which can be useful to promoting understanding. We get a closer look at our neighbors – their political, social, and civic views and actions when we examine patterns of civic activity by education and income levels, as well as age and geographic area of residence.

There are many ways to be “actively engaged.” Surely volunteering, staying informed of current events, and voting are among some of the important ways we can be engaged. Other activities such as running for office, interacting with neighbors, and attending a religious service are also important and information on our engagement in these activities provides us with an indication of how involved individuals are with their communities.

On some measures of civic health, Hoosiers do better than the average American, however on others we see there is room for improvement. To continue our journey of improving our civic well-being in our communities we are examining changes in Hoosier civic health, both positive and negative, that occurred over the last four to five years. In sharing these changes, we can improve knowledge and inspire action in our communities while demonstrating our commitment to engaged citizenry.

Following the first Indiana Civic Health Index in 2011 and the second in 2015, this report furthers the civic conversation among citizens and community leaders.
Engaged citizens are the foundation of a well-functioning democracy. They get involved. They understand the world around them. They care about their communities and work to improve the world around them. In so doing, these citizens practice civility when faced with differences of opinion. When we are informed and recognize our differences (and similarities) we are taking the first steps toward a dialogue that is both substantive and factual, while simultaneously promoting civic health. Congressman Hamilton notes:

“In a democracy, it is not enough just to let politicians set the rules of engagement. As citizens, we need to know how to cultivate our own skills: to stay informed, volunteer, speak out, ask questions, make discriminating judgments about politicians and policies, and improve our neighborhoods and communities.

And we need to know the values that underlie productive civic dialogue: mutual respect and tolerance; the humility to know that sometimes we’re wrong; the honesty to keep deliberations open and straightforward; the resolve to surmount challenges whatever the obstacles; and, of course, the civility that allows us to find common ground despite our disagreements.”

Our civic health is strengthened when we find common ground and Hoosiers often participate in civic life in similar ways, as this report will show. Across income, race, and educational differences our shared belief in the public institutions anchors our civic engagement. Indiana is currently ranked 10th in the nation on this measure of civic engagement. Our confidence in these institutions signals that we value our economic system, believe in the importance of education, and acknowledge the role of the media.

Our understanding of our civic health is improving. Studies, such as this report, point to the importance of examining our civic health not only for the purpose of building a better democracy but also for building civility.
COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

Community involvement is a broad indicator of civic health. There are many ways for Hoosiers to participate in their communities, whether they are rural, urban or suburban. Some of the ways to engage in civic life include joining an organization, volunteering, and developing social connectedness that comes from spending time with family and neighbors. Our engagement in civic life speaks to our sense of community. It also speaks to the ways that we contribute to and value our communities. It is through community involvement that we develop new and enrich existing relationships, by sharing ideas and engaging in dialogue. We join groups, volunteer, and connect with one another as community and state residents and as citizens of our country.

GROUP ASSOCIATIONS

In all types of communities, urban, suburban and rural - Hoosiers participate in groups as a form of civic engagement. In 2016, 40.2% of all Hoosiers participated in at least one group regardless of where they live, an increase of 3.6% over 2011 participation rates. They are, on average, more likely than other Americans to be part of a civic or service organization and attend church. In fact, Indiana residents’ participation in all but one form of group, i.e., sports and recreation, increased over 2011 participation rates.

Table 1. Group Membership in Indiana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group Association</th>
<th>2006 %</th>
<th>2011 %</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School group, neighborhood/community</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>-2.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service or Civic</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>+3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports or Recreation</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>+1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious Institutions</td>
<td>24.1%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>+2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>+1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those living in urban areas, however, increased participation in school group and neighborhood community associations, in contrast to those living in suburban and rural areas where participation fell. Rural areas have slightly higher rates of participation in service or civic associations than those in urban areas, while suburban dwellers participated at the highest rates in religious institutions at 21.9%.
VOLUNTEERING

Hoosiers donate their time and talents to a wide array of organizations. Volunteers provide services in many areas including hospitals, religious organizations, schools, homeless shelters and food banks. While volunteering peaked in 2012 at 30.4%, volunteering rates have remained close to the peak. For instance, in 2016, 28.7% of Hoosiers contributed their time to volunteer activities, a rate close to that in 2011 (27.3%). These consistent volunteer participation rates are a reflection of the residents’ desire to give to their communities in time and talent. This volunteer ethic is also consistent across geographic regions. In 2016, volunteering occurred at a rate of 27% in urban areas, 32.9% in suburban areas and 27.2% in rural areas. Prior year percentages are similar. Finally, those who are employed volunteer at higher rates (31.5%) as opposed to those not in the labor force (23.6%) and the participation rate for those whose incomes exceed $75,000 (40.1%) is twice that of those whose incomes are $35,000 or less.

Other indicators of community involvement include attending public meetings, working with neighbors and charitable giving. There is an increase in the rate of these activities when election years are nearing or present. For example, in 2012 and 2016, Hoosiers attend public meetings at a rate of 8.4% and 8.1% respectively. In 2011 and 2013, these rates were 7.3% and 6.2%. Attendance at public meetings is an important way to learn about our government and to express our views. Election activities can motivate residents to act. However, it should be noted that regardless of election activities, less than 10% of Hoosiers attend public meetings, thus, few share their views and learn about the process of public deliberation through meeting attendance. Those most actively participating in this form of civic activity live in urban areas (9.5%) while 4.8% of rural residents attend public meetings.

The urban communities also lead the way in working with neighbors, showing an increase of 1.7% from 2012 to 2016. Rural community residents also increased their rate of working with neighbors by 1.3%. Only in suburban areas did the rate at which residents work with their neighbors decrease from 2012 to 2016. Charitable giving however, decreased in both urban (-3%) and suburban (-4.6%) areas during the 2012 to 2016 period. Charitable giving, like volunteering, peaked in 2012 at 55.1%. Yet, even in 2016, with decreases in giving rates, over half of all Hoosiers in 2016 made charitable gifts of at least twenty-five dollars.

SOCIAL CONNECTIVITY

Social connectivity, already strong in 2011, improved even more over time. We are deeply connected with our families, as is evidenced by the percentage of Hoosiers who said they eat dinner with their family a few times a week or more. Almost 93% of Hoosiers are connected to their families in this way. The 2016 national estimate for this indicator was 87.8%. In addition, over the course of the past six years, Indiana’s rank also improved. In 2010, the state was ranked 17th in the nation. Our current rank of 3rd in the nation demonstrates Indiana’s strong commitment to social connectivity through our family relationships.

Our civic engagement networks also include our neighbors. In 2016, more Hoosiers talked politics with friends and family than in 2010. Estimates for 2016 indicate that participation rose from 21.6% to 30.4% during this time. The rate at which we trust our neighbors also has improved over time. In 2011, the state ranked 31st in trusting our neighbors and in 2016 we were ranked 26th. Trust rose in urban and suburban communities and fell slightly in rural communities, where the largest percentage (75.2% in 2016) of the residents expressed trust in their neighbors. Trust increased as educational attainment increased. Pooled estimates of trust in neighbors from 2013 show the highest level of trust among those with bachelor degrees or higher and the lowest levels (54.1%) among those with high school diplomas. These differences point to potential areas of improvement for our civic health. We see some evidence of improving trust in suburban and urban areas, that will require closer examination. A better understanding of how education may contribute to trust is also worth exploring.
VOTER REGISTRATION AND TURNOUT

In the 2016 Presidential Election, Indiana ranked 41st in voter turnout among eligible citizens (U.S. citizens aged 18 and over) with a rate of 58.3%. The national turnout rate was 61.4% that year. When asked about the main reason for not voting in the 2016 Presidential Election, 22.4% percent of Hoosiers indicated that they “didn’t like the candidates or campaign issues.” This was also the primary reason at the national level with nearly one-quarter of eligible voters conveying this as a reason for not voting in the 2016 election.

Indiana performed even more poorly in the 2014 midterm elections. According to the United States Elections Project, in the most recent midterm election, Indiana ranked last in the nation with only 27.8% of the voting-eligible population participating. The national turnout rate in 2014 was 35.9%. In 2010, the previous midterm election year, the national turnout rate was 45.5% for all citizens aged 18 and older. Indiana’s voter turnout in 2010 was 39.4%; six percentage points lower than the national average, ranking the state 48th.

There are some trends in the area of voting. In 2016, Indiana ranked 40th among all states and the District of Columbia in the rate of citizens registered to vote, at 68.8%. Indiana’s voter registration rate in 2012 was somewhat higher, at 71.25, with the state ranking 37th in the nation on this measure. The national voter registration rate for all eligible citizens was 71.2% in 2012 and 65.1% in 2010.

In 2016, presidential year voting in Indiana was slightly below that of the national voting rate. Approximately 58% of all Hoosiers came to the polls in the 2016 elections, compared to almost 61% of all Americans. Among suburban voters, 63% participated in the 2016 elections while 57.1% of rural voters and 54.7% of urban voters came to the polls. Hoosiers in suburban communities also registered to vote at the highest rates (72.9%) as compared to urban residents (64.9%) and rural residents (71.5%).
In 2016, Indiana ranked 19th nationally in the percentage of eligible citizens voting for local offices, with 64.6% of residents saying that they sometimes or always voted in local elections, such as those for mayor or school board. The rate nationally in 2016 was 58.5% of citizens voting in local elections.

Rates of eligible voter participation increase with age, educational attainment, and household income levels.

In Indiana, among 65 to 74 year olds, 68.4% voted in the 2016 Presidential Election compared with 43% of 18 to 24 year olds. However, among the latter age cohort, the rate of voter turnout rose roughly 7% from 36.4% in the 2012 Presidential Election.

Table 2. Voting and Registration by Age Group in Indiana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>18-24</th>
<th>25-34</th>
<th>35-44</th>
<th>45-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65-74</th>
<th>75+</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting (2012)</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>44.5%</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>71.6%</td>
<td>76.2%</td>
<td>69.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting (2016)</td>
<td>43.0%</td>
<td>50.2%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>66.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration (2012)</td>
<td>48.2%</td>
<td>57.7%</td>
<td>68.6%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>78.6</td>
<td>79.9%</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration (2016)</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>62.5%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>68.2%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voter registration and participation increases considerably with educational attainment. In Indiana, 80% of eligible voters with a bachelor’s degree or higher turned out in the 2016 Presidential Election, compared to 23.1% of voters with less than a high school diploma.

Table 3. Voting and Registration by Educational Attainment in Indiana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment</th>
<th>Less than High School</th>
<th>High School Diploma</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>Bachelor’s or Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting (2012)</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting (2016)</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
<td>66.9%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration (2012)</td>
<td>41.5%</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
<td>86.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration (2016)</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>62.4%</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td>86.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Voter registration and turnout rates increase as household income rises. However, only among households making less than $35,000 annually was there an increase in registration and voting between the 2012 (45.5%) and 2016 (47.1%) Presidential Elections.
Table 3. Voting and Registration by Income Level in Indiana

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than $35,000</th>
<th>$35,000 - $49,999</th>
<th>$50,000 - $74,999</th>
<th>$75,000 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voting (2012)</td>
<td>45.5%</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>59.9%</td>
<td>73.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting (2016)</td>
<td>47.1%</td>
<td>58.4%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration (2012)</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
<td>70.2%</td>
<td>66.8%</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration (2016)</td>
<td>61.6%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
<td>77.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**POLITICAL INVOLVEMENT**

Political involvement was highest among Indiana residents living in suburban communities. Voting in local elections, boycotting or buying products/services, and using the internet to express public opinions all occurred more frequently among those living in the suburbs. In only one area of political involvement (contacting or visiting public officials) was the rate of involvement higher in urban areas than in suburban areas.

In 2013, Indiana ranked 30th in the percentage of residents who reported contacting or visiting a public official at any level of government, with a rate of 11.1%, while the national rate was 10.8%. Our 2013 ranking was slightly above that of the 2011 Indiana ranking on this form of civic participation. However, in both years, our rankings earned placed the state in the lower half of all states.

As a state Indiana ranked 14th in 2013 in the percentage of people who bought or boycotted a product or service because of a socially or politically conscious view or stance. Statewide, 15.8% of individuals engaged in this behavior, compared to 12.8% of residents nationally. In 2011, 12.1% of people nationwide engaged in this behavior, compared to 8.1% in Indiana, ranking the state 47th at that time.

In Indiana, rates of civic participation among citizens increase with both educational attainment and household income. Among citizens with a bachelor’s degree or higher, slightly more than one-fifth contacted or visited a public official (20.8%) or bought or boycotted a product or service (21.6%). The rates of participation drop to 2.4% and 2.2% respectively among Indiana residents who have not graduated from high school. Among households making less than $35,000 annually, 6.2% have contacted or visited a public official and 6.4% have bought or boycotted a product or service as a form of political engagement. Roughly, 17% of citizens from households making $75,000 or more have contacted or visited a public official (16.6%) or bought or boycotted a product or service (17.3%).
Table 5. Political Involvement by Educational Attainment in Indiana (25 years and older)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than High School</th>
<th>High School Diploma</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>Bachelor’s or Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonelectoral participation:</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contacted or visited public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>official?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonelectoral participation:</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bought or boycotted a product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data pooled 2010, 2011, 2013

Table 6. Political Involvement by Income Level in Indiana (25 years and older)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than $35,000</th>
<th>$35,000 - $49,999</th>
<th>$50,000 - $74,999</th>
<th>$75,000 or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonelectoral participation:</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>contacted or visited public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>official?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonelectoral participation:</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>11.4%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bought or boycotted a product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>or service?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data pooled 2010, 2011, 2013

While over 90% of residents, both in Indiana and around the nation report never or infrequently using the Internet to express a public opinion, the rate of individuals in Indiana who indicate they frequently engage in such activity has risen slightly from 5.9% in 2011 to 8.8% in 2013. Nationwide, those who report frequently using the Internet to express a public opinion has remained stable between 2011 (8.0%) and 2013 (7.9%).
CONFIDENCE IN PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS

The Current Population Survey asks about people’s levels of confidence in three major social institutions—corporations, the media, and the public-school system.

Overall, Indiana is above the national average regarding residents’ confidence in public institutions. Specifically, Hoosiers’ confidence in corporations and the media ranks highly when compared to the national average.

Hoosiers ranked 8th in the nation in their confidence in corporations in 2016, with 70% of residents responding that they had “most” or “all” confidence in corporations. This figure is 5.5% higher than the 2016 national average of 64.5%, and represents a rise of 1.6% from the most recent estimates.

Although there was an overall drop in our confidence in the media, Indiana still ranked 18th in the nation in that category in 2016. Almost 58% of Hoosiers in 2016 identified as having “most” or “all” confidence in the media. That number was a decrease from the pooled estimates from 2013 to 2015 of 60.2%. However, Hoosiers’ confidence in the media is still 2.7% above the national average in 2016. Additionally, the decline in confidence in the media was not as sharp in Indiana as it was nationally (when comparing the pooled estimates to the 2016 data). Indiana experienced a 2.5% decrease in confidence in the media, whereas the nation encountered a 3% decrease.

The one public institution surveyed for which Hoosiers were not above the national average was our confidence in public schools. The pooled estimates from 2013 to 2015 showed that 85% of Hoosiers surveyed had a level of “most” or “all” confidence in public schools. This was 1.1% behind the national average of 86.1% for those combined years. The year 2016 represented a declining level of confidence in public schools, both in Indiana and throughout the country. However, the drop-off was not as severe in this state as it was nationally. In 2016, 84.4% of those surveyed in Indiana had “most” or “all” confidence in public schools. That number ranked Indiana 34th in the nation, and was a tenth of a percent behind the national average of 84.5%.

The data is very interesting when various subgroups within it are analyzed. Differences in civic participation can be observed across geographic lines, as well as age, level of education, and family income.

The geographic differences seem stark. For example, when comparing data from 2012 and 2016, those Hoosiers living in urban areas had decreases in their confidence in all three public institutions surveyed (corporations, media, and public schools). Meanwhile, suburban dwellers in Indiana showed notable increased levels of confidence for all three institutions. Rural respondents had the highest levels of confidence for all three institutions. However, from 2012 to 2016 rural residents’ confidence levels did change, with an increased level of confidence in corporations in 2016, but decreases in confidence for the media and public schools from 2012 to 2016.

Table 6. Voting and Registration by Income Level in Indiana (25 years and older)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in Corporations</td>
<td>64.2%</td>
<td>62.1%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td>73.3%</td>
<td>75.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in Media</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>58.7%</td>
<td>59.7%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
<td>68.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence in Public Schools</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>77.7%</td>
<td>80.5%</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The data also shows differences by age to be quite significant. In general, the 35 to 44 age group was consistently expressed the highest or near highest level of confidence in corporations, the media, and public schools in 2012 and 2016. Those aged 25 to 34-year had the lowest level of confidence in corporations among all age groups. Although their confidence level rose from 62.4% in 2012 to 63.5% in 2016, it was still behind the 2016 national average of 64.5%. Comparison data was not available for the 65 to 74-year-old group and for the 75+ group, however, the 2016 data does indicate that they were the two age groups with the lowest levels of confidence in both the media and in public schools in 2016. While the national average of those who had “most” or “all” confidence in the media was 55% in 2016, it was only 49% among Hoosiers in the 65 to 74-year age demographic. The national average of those with high degrees of confidence in public schools was 84.5% in 2016. However, it was only 82.3% among 65 to 74-year-olds in Indiana, and an even lower 81.8% among those Hoosiers surveyed who were over the age of 75.

Education level was another significant indicator of one’s confidence in public institutions. When analyzing the data from 2012 to 2016, only those Hoosiers with a bachelor’s degree or higher had higher levels of confidence in corporations, the media, and public schools in 2016 than they did in 2012. Those who had some level of college, in fact, had noticeable decreases in confidence levels for all three. Most notably were there dramatic losses in confidence in both the media (from 73.2% in 2012 to 57.9% in 2016) and in public schools (89.3% in 2012, down to 83.4% in 2016). Those with a high school diploma were at or near the bottom in their confidence levels for all three public institutions surveyed. They did experience an increase in their confidence in corporations (65.5% in 2012 to 67.3% in 2016), but their confidence in both the media and public schools fell from 2012 to 2016. There was no data available for those with less than a high school education.

Analyzing the data by family income also proved noteworthy. Only one group surveyed in Indiana saw an increase in their confidence levels in corporations, the media, and public schools from 2012 to 2016: those whose family income was greater than $75,000. Confidence in corporations grew for all income groups from 2012 to 2016. However, the groups’ overall confidence level was directly proportional to their overall family income (both for 2012 and 2016). Those with a family income of less than $35,000 had, by far, the lowest levels of confidence in corporations. In 2016, only 63% had a high level of confidence in corporations (the only group below the 2016 national average of 64.5%), compared to 69.8% of those earning between $35,000 and $49,999, 72% of those with family incomes of $50,000 to $74,000, and 73.2% of those earning over $75,000 a year. Every income group besides those with family incomes exceeding $75,000 saw decreases in their confidence levels in both the media and public schools from 2012 to 2016.
**HOW INDIANA COMPARES TO THE REST OF THE NATION**

While Hoosiers perform fairly well in the social aspects of civic life such as group membership, family meals and volunteering, there are other aspects of civic life where Hoosiers can look for growth and improvement.

Indiana is ranked 3rd in the nation in the number of families that eat dinner together, 18th in sharing political views with family or friends, 32nd in working with neighbors to fix or improve our communities, and 29th in attending a public meeting. All of these rankings are improvements over those reported for 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eat dinner with a member of household frequently</td>
<td>90.1%</td>
<td>92.7%</td>
<td>17th</td>
<td>3rd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talk about politics with friends and family frequently</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>48th</td>
<td>18th</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with neighbors</td>
<td>6.5%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>45th</td>
<td>32nd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending public meetings</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>44th</td>
<td>29th</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Unfortunately, Indiana ranks in the lower half of all states and the District of Columbia in other civic categories. Hoosiers rank 44th in our participation in school, neighborhood or community associations. Our rank in voting and voter registration, once improved from 2010 (48th) to 2012 (38th) has now fallen to a rank of 41st.
DISCUSSION

Differences in civic participation also can be observed across geographic and educational lines. The most significant positive changes in civic participation from 2012 to 2016, varied by geographic area. Urban areas for example, saw increases in residents’ working with neighbors. In rural areas, charitable giving rose 1.8%. The gains in suburban areas were minimal. All indicators of volunteering and giving in suburban areas declined with the exception of volunteering which rose by 0.3%. While improvements did occur, there is much work to be done particularly in the categories of volunteering, public meeting attendance and working with neighbors. The highest participation rates in these categories occurred in suburban areas, and never exceeded a third of the population. As a state, a discussion of our goals and plans for improvement, could greatly improve our participation rates in the future.

We must also raise awareness and ask questions related to voting and voter registration. While the national average for voting and voter registration was lower in 2016 than in 2012, the decline in Indiana was more than twice that of the nation in both forms of civic engagement. Improvements were seen in voting and voter registration rates among younger voters, however, participation among those over 44-years-of-age generally declined.

These findings show that our Hoosier communities strongly value charitable giving and believe in supporting our public well-being, despite our differences and unique socio-economic experiences.

### Table 9. Voting and Registration by Income Level in Indiana (25 years and older)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volunteering</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attending Public Meeting</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working with Neighbors</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>11.8%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charitable Giving</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
<td>63.9%</td>
<td>38.2%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voting</td>
<td>59.1%</td>
<td>54.7%</td>
<td>65.1%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
<td>50.3%</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registration</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>64.9%</td>
<td>74.3%</td>
<td>72.9%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>71.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Volunteering and Giving (CPS 2013 September Volunteering Supplement, 16+); Voting and Registrations (CPS 2012 November Voting and Registration Supplement, 18+ Citizens); Interactions with Neighbors (CPS 2013 November Civic Engagement Supplement, 18+); Communication with Family and Friends (CPS 2013 November Civic Engagement Supplement, 18+); Political Involvement (CPS 2013 November Civic Engagement Supplement, 18+); Group Membership (CPS 2013 November Civic Engagement Supplement, 18+); Confidence in Public Institutions, (CPS 2013 November Civic Engagement Supplement, 18+).
CIVIC EDUCATION EFFORTS IN INDIANA

Of the many civic education programs and initiatives currently underway in Indiana, one of the most effective at promoting greater civic health is the *We the People* program, administered here by the Indiana Bar Foundation and nationwide by the Center for Civic Education. *We the People* was created in 1987 to celebrate the bicentennial of the U.S. Constitution. The program teaches students in elementary, middle, and high schools about the United States Constitution, the Bill of Rights, and the rule of law.

In 2014, Georgetown University conducted a study of *We the People* students in Indiana. The results revealed significant gains in students’ civic knowledge, disposition, and skills directly related to participation in the program. In general, *We the People* students were more politically knowledgeable than students who took other civics classes. Specifically, *We the People* students scored significantly higher, on average, than other students on knowledge of U.S. constitutional principles, the Bill of Rights, U.S. government institutions, political parties and elections, race and politics, economic principles, and U.S. foreign policy.

Such results suggest that communities can increase their civic awareness when particular civic education programs such as *We the People* are implemented in primary and secondary schools. This program has over 30 years of history in Indiana. In 2017 alone, over 5,000 young people in Indiana will participate and complete a *We the People* course.

Many non-profit, educational and government groups in the state have as their mission the promotion of a strong and engaged citizenry. The Indiana Supreme Court, for example, runs Courts in the Classroom (CITC). CITC’s primary objective is to help educators, students, historians and interested citizens learn more about Indiana’s judicial branch. Since 2008, the Indiana Bar Foundation has administered the Indiana Legislative Youth Advisory Council (ILYAC) charged with advising the general assembly on proposed and pending legislation, among its many other legislatively authorized responsibilities. The Indiana High School Mock Trial program and the United States Senate Youth Program (USSYP), also administered by the Indiana Bar Foundation, are designed to engage Hoosier students in the workings of government.

Finally, our higher education institutions actively promote and support our state’s Civic Health. Hoosiers know more about the workings of Congress thanks to the important work of the Center for Representative Government. This Indiana University-supported non-partisan, educational center has been working since 1999 to encourage civic engagement. Indiana University – Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) faculty and students in the School of Public and Environmental Affairs (SPEA) built the Center for Civic Literacy, which both studies the dynamics of citizenship and engagement and supports projects that may enrich community action. The Mike Downs Center for Indiana Politics was created to study state and local politics emphasizing the importance of citizens’ role in political and public processes. Indiana Campus Compact (ICC) supports higher education’s efforts to support student development along the path of engaged citizenship. ICC is a catalyst for campus and community action focused on improving people’s lives through service-learning and civic engagement initiatives. On many campuses in the state, including Indiana University Northwest, Constitution Day, is observed annually on September 17th. Programming delivered on this day builds connections between citizens and the U.S. Constitution.
A FUTURE FOR INDIANA’S CIVIC HEALTH

Hoosiers are unique in our social and economic heritage, but we are all committed to strengthening our communities. Undoubtedly, it is this continued collaboration and dedication to each other in communities throughout our state that provides our greatest strength. In the end, we seek to become a more engaged, enlightened and active citizenry and to rise to the challenge of meeting the highest standards of civic participation. These goals deserve our best efforts.

By taking what we know and building upon our strengths, while working to minimize our weaknesses, we can accomplish our goal. If there is one overriding theme to take away from this study it is that Indiana’s commitment to civic engagement is unwavering. While, like many states we have taken steps forward in some areas and realized losses in others, we stay steadfast in our commitment to understand and improve our civic health. While there may not be one formula that is best suited to all areas of civic health in Indiana, we know that a commitment to excellence is best demonstrated by continuous improvement. Hoosiers of all income levels, living in all geographic areas, participate in civic life, in meaningful and valued ways. Harnessing Hoosiers energy and ideas, providing information to inform decision-making and dialogue at all levels, will ensure that all communities grow together.

Our communities and their residents are diverse, our connections are growing, and with the Indiana Civic Health Index as a foundation for discussion and action, we can enhance our civic lives.
**TECHNICAL NOTES**

Findings presented above are based on the National Conference on Citizenship (NCoC) analysis of the Census Current Population Survey (CPS) data. Any and all errors are our own. Volunteering estimates are from CPS September Volunteering Supplement, 2002 - 2015, Voting and registration data come from the CPS November Voting/Registration Supplement, 1972-2016, and all other civic engagement indicators, such as discussion of political information and connection to neighbors, come from the 2013 CPS Civic Engagement Supplement.

Estimates for the volunteering indicators (e.g., volunteering, working with neighbors, making donations) are based on U.S. residents’ ages 16 and older. Estimates for civic engagement and social connection indicators (e.g., exchanging favors with neighbors, discussing politics) are based on U.S. residents ages 18 and older. Voting and registration statistics are based on U.S. citizens who are 18 and older (eligible voters). Any time we examined the relationship between educational attainment and engagement, estimates are only based on adults ages 25 and older, based on the assumption that younger people may still be completing their education.

Because we draw from multiple sources of data with varying sample sizes, we are not able to compute one margin of error for the state across all indicators. In Indiana, the margins of error for major indicators varied from *+/- 1.4% to 3.8%*, depending on the sample size and other parameters associated with a specific indicator. Any analysis that breaks down the sample into smaller groups (e.g., gender, education) will have smaller samples and therefore the margin of error will increase. It is also important to emphasize that our margin of error estimates are approximate, as CPS sampling is highly complex and accurate estimation of error rates involves many parameters that are not publicly available.
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State and Local Partnerships

NCoC began America’s Civic Health Index in 2006 to measure the level of civic engagement and health of our democracy. In 2009, the Edward M. Kennedy Serve America Act directed NCoC to expand this civic health assessment in partnership with the Corporation for National and Community Service and the US Census Bureau.

NCoC now works with partners in more than 30 communities nationwide to use civic data to lead and inspire a public dialogue about the future of citizenship in America and to drive sustainable civic strategies.
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