

## Developing and Testing Civic Engagement Scale for India

T. R. GOPALAKRISHNAN



### ABSTRACT

What factors contribute to the success of Indian democracy as political systems holding a country with ethnic, linguistic, caste, class diversity as India? Political science scholarship has identified several factors that seek to explain the relative success of democracy in India. Most of these explanations converge on the idea of public engagement-participation of citizens in the democratic process. Available studies on Civic Engagement in India have followed through the recommendations of a qualitative methodological stance (Bhangaokar & Mehta, 2012). While globally quantitative surveys have dominated inquires in civic and political engagement, Indian studies have predominantly adopted qualitative, small sample, and, interview-based case studies. A key challenge to the study of civic engagement in India has been the lack of availability of reliable and valid measures of the concept adapted to the Indian context. Given that civic engagement plays a vital role in the improvement of the quality of democracy, this gap needs to be addressed empirically as well as theoretically. This study proposes to fill this gap by developing, testing and validating a scale for civic engagement using a standard survey method. A factor analysis of the results indicates that civic engagement in India has five significant dimensions: Altruistic Engagement, Symbolic Engagement, Voluntary Association Membership, Neighbourhood

Engagement and Deliberative Engagement.

**Keywords** : *Civic Engagement, India, Measurement, Scale Development, Factor Analysis.*

### INTRODUCTION

Civic Engagement is a central concern in the study of political mobilization of social movements and democracy (Putnam, 1995; Armony, 2004). The importance of active citizenry for the building of strong democracy has been the focal point of much debate amongst crucial stakeholders such as scholars, civil society organizations and government institutions (Sherrod, Torney-Purta, Flanagan, 2010). Perceived changes in common engagement patterns amongst young people have attracted disproportionately dominant attention in the literature, especially in liberal democratic countries like US Canada and EU member states (Clark 2012; Flanagan, 2003). Civic Engagement remains an understudied area in India. Most studies draw predominantly from empirical research from western democracies, while in the last ten years we see an increasing trend towards internationalization, with studies from

T. R. Gopalakrishnan

From  
Assistant Professor, Department of  
Journalism and Communication,  
University of Madras, Chennai,  
Tamil Nadu.

Article Is Published On April 2015  
Issue & Available At  
[www.lbp.world](http://www.lbp.world)

Gulf nations, Korea, Japan a few south Asian countries (Flanagan and Faison, 2001; Flanagan, 2009). Few studies in India examine the general pattern of civic engagement. Pradeep Chhibber (1999), reports on a survey he conducted in six Indian states indicating that only 13 per cent of the respondents are members of an association, a figure lower than from any other country reported in World Value Survey (Inglehart et al. 2014). Another study on organizational membership in India (with a sample size of 10,000 respondents from all Indian States) reported that 15 percent of Indians belong to at least one formal association (Mitra, 2012). In a Gallup Poll (a public opinion research agency) conducted in 2011, India ranked 48th position in civic engagement index, behind Sri Lanka (8th 62% score), Pakistan (27th, 42% score) and Nepal (40th with 30% score). Indian's score on Civic Engagement index was 28% (in a sample of 6,000 adults in India, aged 15 and older, conducted in 2009 and 2010). Overall, the study found that 28% have donated money, 18% have volunteered time and, 39% have helped strangers (English, 2011).

Apart from these few studies, the available literature on civic engagement in India has adopted a qualitative methodological stance using a case study design (Bhangaokar & Mehta, 2012) primarily. Some authors advocate a move beyond the individual levels to consider collective levels of Civic Engagement. Jones (2006) for example advocates taking an ethnographic approach to Civic Engagement. However, to build an empirical base for studies on Civic Engagement in the Indian context, we need to encourage methodological diversity within studies in the Indian context. Thus, there is a need to develop a measurement scale for civic engagement, adapted to the Indian context, yet provides a measure that can be used for comparative studies across nations and regions.

Given that civic engagement plays a vital role in the improvement of the quality of democracy, gap in availability of contextualized measurement scales needs to be addressed empirically as well as theoretically (Norris, 2002). The kinds of results from International studies on civic engagement are not available for the Indian context, and it is likely that these studies underreport the level of civic engagement (Torney-Purta et al. 2001; Torney-Purta, 2002). While globally quantitative surveys have dominated inquires in civic and political engagement, Indian studies have predominantly adopted qualitative, small sample, interview-based case studies and hence there is a risk of bias due to low sample size (Clark, 2012).

For a significant evidence base on Civic Engagement, it is necessary to complement the standard qualitative narrative data with quantitative ones. A vital challenge to conducting surveys on civic engagement is the development of valid and reliable scales to measure the levels of civic engagement amongst different segments of the population. Such a scale needs to be adapted to the Indian context, while also allowing comparison across nations. This study proposes to fill this gap by developing, testing and validating a scale for civic engagement.

## **LITERATURE REVIEW**

There are many competing definitions of civic engagement. The idea of civic implies citizenship and provides the theoretical context for the study of civic engagement. Levine (2007) defines civic engagement as "any action that affects legitimately public matters (even if it is selfishly motivated) as long as the actor pays appropriate attention to the consequences of his behavior for the underlying political system." Clifford Zukinet (2006) define civic engagement as "organized voluntary activity focused on problem-solving and helped others." While developing a critique of Civic Engagement (Berger 2011) observes that civic engagement is "not the end of political participation, social connectedness, associational membership, voluntarism, community spirit, or cooperative and tolerant moral norms but rather the umbrella term used to encompass all of those topics while clarifying none." There have been several attempts to operationalize these definitions (Adler, R. P and Goggin, J. 2005).

Irrespective of how civic engagement is conceptualized, most understanding of the concept involves few dimensions that cut across definitional lines and hence can be thought of as constituting the semantic space of the term. Civic represents the notion of citizenship or being a member of a city-state (Amadeo, J., Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Husfeldt, V., & Nikolova, R. 2002). For Berger (2011), "The nation-states now define and fix the identity of citizenship. In this sense, the idea of civic has little meaning than suggesting the citizen's duty" (Berger, 2009). However, the more recent elaboration of the concept of

civic is framed within the discourse on democracy, and hence the term has come to represent a specific form of citizenship, that is, democratic nation-state (Fiorina, 1999; O'Flynn, 2006).

On the other hand, the concept of engagement is dynamic and action-oriented. Engagement involves attention and effort (Berger, 2011). "Engagement can also denote an act or a condition, the act of engaging or the condition of being engaged. Without minimal attention and effort on the part of the democratic citizen, it is difficult to conceive of any form of engagement" (Berger, 2011). For Berger (2011), civic engagement refers to our willingness to invest our attention and energy in the democratic process. Hence Civic Engagement refers to the behavior of individual because only at the individual level actions can be initiated for directed social change. Unlike most political constructs measures (Robinson, J. P., Shaver, P. R., & Wrightsman, L. S. Eds. 1999), Civic Engagement can be identified by examining the range of behavior that constitutes the attention and effort that an individual directs to social actions that can be deemed 'civic.'

Galston (2007) provides a detailed summary of mostly quantitative research on civic engagement (Flanagan, Syvertsen, and Stout, 2007), review the available measurement scales for civic engagement and find that none of the widely-used measures captures most of the hidden dimensions of civic engagement. They advocate developing behavioral measures that are best suited for the conduct of the research (Terkla and O'Leary, 2014).

Several indicators and measurement techniques have been proposed to measure the level of civic engagement (Flanagan, 2003). The conceptual definition determines the criteria of inclusion of indicators -whether the definition distinguishes social capital, political engagement, collective/political efficacy and, associational membership (Sharma, 2008; Teorell, Torcal, and Montero, 2007). Civic Engagement measures need to be distinguished with closely such related measures (Robinson, Shaver and Wrightsman, Eds. 1999).

For example, civic engagement should exclude the conventional forms of political participation such as voting in the election. Political participation can be hypothesized to have a strong association with civic engagement, but they have to be treated as constituting different concepts. Berger (2011) observes that engagement has come to represent "work done" with a purpose that is not clearly articulated. Civic Engagement can be conceptualized as purposeful work done towards achieving democratic goals through volunteerism (Berger, 2011). This definition emphasizes behavior over civic purposes since it is possible that peoples engagement in civic activities can turn detrimental (Fiorina, 1999).

The conceptual approach adopted here is in line with research tradition initiatives by scholars such as who emphasized the idea of engagement over civic Putnam (2000), Several studies on civic engagement have adopted national level secondary data analysis, mainly based on estimates of voter turnout, associational membership, and country level indicators social capital. However, Putnam's conceptualization has been too broad to enable a meaningful distinction between related concepts such as social capital, political participation and social networks (Ekman, J., & Amnå, E. 2012).

Some research has treated civic engagement as an attitude, while others have focused on behavior (Flanagan, Syvertsen and Stout, 2007). Still others have conceptualized civic learning as an experiential phenomenon and accordingly adopted a more subjective and interpretative method (Shiarella et al. 2000). A review of currently used measures of civic engagement indicates that the concept has both objective features and individual features--both amenable to measurement techniques within social and behavioral sciences (Doolittle and Faul, 2013).

A subjective measure of civic engagement will emphasize attitudes, personal meaning, while an objective measure of civic engagement will focus on actions-look for indicators that can demonstrate "work done," consequently the objective measure would underestimate civic engagement, while the subjective measures would over-estimate civic its presence. This is so because of the greater variability of subjective measures of civic engagement and non- standardize criteria of inclusion/exclusion (Narayan-Parker, D. 2002).

For the same reason, objective measure of civic engagement would miss critical, meaningful, idiosyncratic variations because of its standardization choice of relative emphasis of the features of civic engagement. Since the purpose of the scale development is to provide empirical evidence for the central hypothesis in civic engagement literature, a

conservative measure would be more useful (DeVellis, 1991).

During the conceptual analysis, we learned that the difference between civic and political participation is blurred with research adopting items that are interchangeable. However, as we have argued in the literature review, Civic Engagement and political participation have to be treated as a distinctive and albeit related concepts. We identified several concepts that were conceptually related to the Civic Engagement. These terms include a) civic involvement b) civic efficacy c) political participation d) political activities e) political action f) political efficacy (Pahad, 2005).

We decided to develop a measure that captures civic engagement that focuses on actions individuals engage that can characterize 'Civiness' in its intentions. Conceptually civic engagement is a kind of behavior directed towards activities that people consider to be in the spirit of citizenship. Engagement itself can be defined regarding a specific set of activities that people engage in that can be treated as indicators of the underlying phenomenon of interest (Norris, and Krook, 2009).

## **METHOD**

This study carried out through several stages as outlined below.

**Development of Item Pool:** The literature review and a review of several definitions of civic engagement gave a potential list of 100 indicators. We pooled in several of these indicators and through the process of cognitive interviewing and pilot testing attempt to reduce the dataset. For the final measure of civic engagement as a multi-dimensional scale, we expected factor analysis to provide a test of the assumption of multidimensionality. The procedure had ensured that the scale meets the criteria of fundamental psychometric properties such as face validity (expert assessment), Standardization (Translation), Clarity (DeVellis, 1991).

In the pilot study stage, the aim was to develop a detailed list of item pools representing civic engagement behavior. These items were subjected to test of face validity, understand ability, and clarity (DeVellis, 1991). Initial item pool was developed based on the works of Doolittle and Faul, (2013) and Flanagan, Syvertsen, & Stout, (2007). The item pool was expanded during interviews with prospective respondents and experts (See Annexure 1). The wording of the item was refined along the lines of the World Value Survey (WVS) questionnaire Inglehart (2014). Cognitive Interviewing techniques were used to refine the questionnaire and improve clarity (Willis, G. B2004). Through a series of iteration, the initial forty item pool was reduced to fourteen.

**Cognitive Interviewing:** Cognitive interview-based assessment of the scale provided us a more in-depth and better assessment of how the respondents had understood the questions and the kind of response they were expected to make (Willis, 2004). This ensured that there were standardization and uniformity and hence consistency across how items were administered. The cognitive interviewing technique is a set of techniques for assessing the understandability of the survey questionnaire and has been designed to test and improve the validity of the indicators (Collins, 2014). The cognitive interview has been widely used to pilot standardized test questionnaire, although its scope is much broader than survey testing (ibid). We administered the draft questionnaire to 10 (5 female, five male) students typical of student's population and 10 (5 male and five female) older adults for cognitive questions. With questions such as "What does this term (the substantive focus of the question) mean to them? We especially probed several aspects of Civic Engagement--what actions would you consider civically responsible? What does social responsibility mean? Can you provide us with more examples of behavior you or people you know have engaged in? (Miller, Chepp, Willson and Padilla, 2014). These probes helped to broaden and contextualize the scope of the measure of civic engagement and also to check if there are cross-cultural differences) as compared to international studies.

**Translation and Test of Equivalence:** We prepared two versions of the short-listed item pool-in English and in Tamil. For translation, we followed two steps. Firstly, the main item pool was translated to Tamil from English by two experts. These two versions were compared, and a third consolidated version of the Tamil translation was prepared. The final Tamil version was re-translated into English by a third translator. The final step in translation involved comparing the original English version and the re-translated English version. This ensured that the meaning of the items was not lost during translation. Further, the procedure also ensured equivalence of the English and Tamil Version of the

Civic Engagement Scale. This procedure was consistent with the approach suggested by Behling and Law, (2000).

During the pilot testing, an exploratory analysis was performed to reduce the number of items. The final scale had thirteen items that provided us the necessary variance as well as standardization that we were expecting. One item (Have Been Inactive Member of Voluntary Associations) was discarded as it had many missing values and did not significantly load in any factor yielding a twelve items scale. Factor analysis using the principal component method was performed using these items representing the various facets of civic engagement. The objective was to identify the significant dimension of civic engagement.

**Validation through Survey:** In the next stage the scale, along with demographic variables were included in a survey. Quantitative analysis provides us means to validate the qualitatively and intuitively arrived insights. The survey was conducted in the state of Tamil Nadu in South India on a sample of 691 and included respondents from rural regions (n=260, 37.9%) and urban regions (n=431, 62.1%). The higher number of respondents from the urban region is justified because Tamil Nadu is one of the most urbanized states in India with about 48-50% of the population residing in regions categorized as urban (and peri-urban regions-locations in Kancheepuram and Chengalpet in Tamil Nadu are examples).

The Mean age was 38.61 years (Std. Error=0.751) with a minimum of 17 years and the highest age of 81 (N=683). The age was grouped into two categories representing 17-35 years (54.4%) and 36 years or older (45.6%). The gender difference was also expected in civic and political engagement, and hence gender was included as a variable (62.3% Male) (N=691). Responders were asked to indicate their occupation. Apart from students (47.3% 2%), into Homemakers (14.3% 3), Non-Executives (Clerical and Manual workers (10.4%), Executives, Entrepreneurs and Professionals (28.1%).

Income was measured by asking respondents to provide a relative level of their income using a ten-point ladder scale with one indicating lowest and ten indicating highest household income (Deepa Narayanan). Income ladder measures the self-perceived relative position and could be considered as an indicator of social class. The income ladder was categorized into three class groups - 25% belonging to lower class group (1st, second and third rung), 41.5% belonging to middle-income group (4th, fifth and sixth rung) and 33.4% belonging to high-income group (7th, eighth ninth and 10th rung).

## RESULTS

Twelve questions relating to civic engagement were factor analyzed using principal component analysis with Varimax (orthogonal) rotation. The analysis yielded five factors explaining a total of 64.02% of the variance for the entire set of variables (Table - 1).

The first factor was labelled altruistic engagement due to the high loadings by the following items: 1) Have helped strangers in need of help such as helping people in accidents (0.654), 2) Have spent time helping neighbours address civic amenities by personal sharing resources such as water (0.786) and, 3) Have you helped your neighbours during emergencies such as health and disasters like flooding? (0.735). this first factor explained 17.152% of the variance.

A reliability test was performed on the three, which yielded a Cronbach's alpha of 0.677. This indicated that the scale had moderate to high reliability. Therefore, these items were summed to yield the total score representing the degree of altruistic engagement, with a higher score representing greater engagement. The scale values ranged from a score of 3 to 7 and were skewed in favor of lower scores.

The second factor derived was labelled Symbolic Engagement due to the high loading by the following items: 1) Have dressed or worn symbols to support social problems (0.694) 2) Have displayed preferences, like flags, posters in support of social problem? (0.760). This second factor explained 16.232% of the variance.

A reliability test was performed on the three items, which yielded a Cronbach's alpha of 0.706. This indicated that the scale had high reliability. Therefore, these two items were summed to yield the total score representing the degree of symbolic engagement, with a higher score representing greater engagement. The scale values ranged from a score of 2 to 4 and were skewed in favor of lower symbolic engagement.

The third factor derived was labelled Neighbourhood Engagement due to the high loading by the following items: 1) Have attended local council/local body/Panchayat meetings or

public hearings on social issues (0.493) 2) Have participated in Local Association Meetings—such as Residential/Apartment Associations to discuss civic issues in the neighborhood (0.591) 3) Have signed a Petition/registered complaints with civic authorities on local neighborhood issues (0.444). This third factor explained 11.518% of the variance.

A reliability test was performed on the three item, which yielded a Cronbach's alpha of 0.647. This indicated that the scale had high reliability. Therefore, these three items were summed to yield the total score representing the degree of Local Community and Neighborhood Engagement, with the higher score representing greater involvement. The scale values ranged from the score of 2 to 6 and were skewed in favor of lower Local Community and Neighborhood Engagement.

The fourth factor derived was labelled Voluntary Associational Engagement due to the high loading by the following items: 1) Have been an active member of residential/local associations including being a member of the governing bodies (0.835) and, 2) Have been an active member of voluntary associations such as NGOs (0.815). This fourth factor explained 11.483% of the variance.

A reliability test was performed on the three items, which yielded a Cronbach's alpha of 0.775. This indicated that the scale had high reliability. Therefore, these two items were summed to yield the total score representing the degree of Voluntary Association Membership, with the higher score representing greater involvement in voluntary associations. The scale values range from a score of 2 to 4, and there was no significant skewness in the distribution.

The fifth factor derived was labelled Deliberative Engagement due to the high loading by the following items: 1) Have persuaded someone to take an interest in social civic or political issues affecting/Have debated with someone on local issues or shared information regarding civic problems communities (0.830) 2) and, 2) Have written to local news media or taken leadership in resolving local/civic problems (0.860). This fifth factor explained 7.632% of the variance.

A reliability test was performed on the three items, which yielded a Cronbach's alpha of 0.758. This indicated that the scale had high reliability. Therefore, these two items were summed to yield the total score representing the degree of Deliberative Engagement with the higher score representing greater involvement. The scale values ranged from a score of 2 to 4 and were slightly skewed in favor of lower deliberative engagement.

The KMO and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity both indicates that the set of thirteen variables are adequately related to five factors. This means that we have identified five distinct factors that comprise overall civic engagement. These five tendencies are independent of each other, i.e., not significantly correlated. Therefore, the twelve items were summed up to yield a total score representing the degree of Overall Civic Engagement. A reliability test was performed on all the 13 item Civic Engagement scale which yielded a Cronbach's alpha of 0.836. The scale values ranged from 13 to 26 and were not significantly skewed towards any of the groups.

---

**Table - 1: Factor Analysis**

		ACE	SCE	NCE	VAM	DCE	Commonalties
1	Have helped strangers in need of help such as helping people in accidents	0.654					.513
2	Have spent time helping neighbors address civic amenities with personal sharing resources such as water?	0.786					.584
3	Have you helped your neighbors during emergencies such as health and disasters like flooding?	0.735					.781
4	Have dressed or worn symbols to support social problems		0.694				.790
5	Have displayed preferences, like flags, posters in support of social problem?		0.760				.655
6	Have attended local council/local body/Panchayat meetings or public hearings on social issues			0.493			.649
7	Have participated in Local Association Meetings—such as Residential/Apartment Associations to discuss civic issues in the neighborhood?			0.591			.534
8	Have signed a Petition/registered complaint with civic authorities on local neighborhood issues?			0.444.			.538
9	Have been an active member of residential/local associations including being a member of the governing bodies?				0.835		.503
10	Have been an active member of voluntary associations such as NGOs?				0.815.		.704
11	Have debated with someone on local issues or shared information regarding civic problems communities?					0.830	.707
12	Have written to local news media or taken leadership in resolving local/civic problems?					0.860	.606
	Eigenvalue	3.822	1.858	1.249	1.053	0.979	
	% of Variance	17.1518	16.232	11.517	11.482	7.631	
Altruistic Civic Engagement(ACE), Symbolic Civic Engagement(SCE), Neighborhood Civic Engagement(NCE) and Voluntary Associational Membership(VAM) and Deliberative Civic Engagement(DCE)							

## DISCUSSION

From the above analysis, we identify five significant dimensions of civic engagement. With this, we develop an operational definition of Civic Engagement as constituting moral, symbolic, neighborhood, deliberative engagement and voluntary association membership. The results are close to the measures used previously but refined for the Indian context. (Terkla & O'Leary, 2014).

Altruistic engagement: Reciprocal altruism is one of the guiding forces behind our moral actions. Civic behavior has a moral arc to it, compelling people to act out of compassion and care rather than commerce and capital. While one might argue that there

are long-term benefits to be derived from Civic Engagement that can justify spending time and effort in here and how, given that such outcomes are the uncertain, unclear and long term, it is significant that people still find motives other than personal gain to engage in community activities. Thus, altruistic engagement can be seen as another dimension of civic engagement. Altruistic engagement represents the altruistic and voluntarist feature of civic engagement. They provide a normative ground, yet in the context of civic engagement, altruistic engagement is a form of behavior requiring attention and effort.

**Symbolic Engagement:** Expressing support for a particular cause or an idea typically involves significant symbolic communication (Singhal, and Greiner, 2008). Often people express their views or their identity through symbolic means. People who explicitly adopt symbols expressing their commitment to an idea or a cause are more likely to be civically engaged. In politics, symbols play a central that structures political communication. At a practical level symbols remains shorthand for reminding people of an idea or an identity. Symbolic Engagement can take many forms of expressions. The role and significance of symbols for political and social action have been subject to sever critical theorizing and research. Symbols have served as critical resources for political mobilization assertion and communicative actions (Jeffres, Jian, & Yoon, 2013). Thus civic engagement has a symbolic dimension that builds in the narratives of local communities into various forms of collective action. Other scholars have also explored the symbolic significance of Civic Engagement in the context of collective action (Bucy & Gregson, 2001; Grisez Kweit & Kweit, 2007).

**Neighborhood Engagement:** Besides, NGOs, there are a large number of informal networks, community cliques, and clubs. These comprise the core of civil society in India and are marked by extreme heterogeneity, complexity, and plurality. Most of these networks depend on volunteerism and serve specific purposes-both instrumental and altruistic. Civic Engagement in these spheres is critical for an understanding of the phenomenon in the Indian context. The third aspect of engagement is involved in local communities and neighborhood activities. These are typically seen as an unproblematic aspect of civic engagement (Jeffres, Atkin and Neuendorf, 2002). After all, to be civically involved at minimal includes caring for your neighbourhood and community in whatever terms that these are defined (Lenzi et al. 2013). The third dimension that we identified was engagements are local community or neighborhood engagement.

**Voluntary Associational Membership:** Membership in voluntary organizations has been recognized as having a unique role in society and the political life of India (Mitra, S2007). Many citizens join voluntary associations to serve people on the margins of society: those who are not in the mainstream of society and mainly need the services provided by these organizations (Hyman, 2002). Hence membership in voluntary association civic engagement is necessary for voluntary organizations survival and continued existence. Membership in civil society organization can be considered to be a key predictor of civic engagement. Research on social capital and grassroots organizations have provided the basis for considering membership in voluntary association as a critical facet of civic engagement (Norris, 2002; Putnam, 1995; Hyman, 2002).

**Deliberative Engagement:** From a deliberative democracy theoretical perspective, one could argue that engaging in an interpersonal talk on civic issues would be a form of civic engagement (Karpowitz, Raphae and Hammond, 2009). When people engage in conversations about the neighborhood, their local communities, when they try to persuade others to participate in civic or political issues when they discuss and share ideas, civic engagement is enriched. Thus greater deliberative talk can be expected to be associated with a higher degree of civic engagement (McCoy and Scully, 2002). The relationship should be expected to be strong enough that deliberation can be seen as a constituent of civic engagement itself. Civic engagement is likely to involve a minimum level of deliberation as to what issues to pay attention to and which ones require effort. Therefore we could argue that deliberative talks are a dimension of civic engagement that has the potential to bring greater accountability to civic institutions (Wells, 2007; Malik and Waglé, 2002). The fifth facet of civic engagement is deliberative involvement which includes a deliberative talk and communicative actions that constitutes civic engagement.

These five dimensions (altruistic, symbolic, neighborhood and voluntary associational membership and deliberative engagement) were derived from factor analysis and hence indicate the various facets of civic engagement in the Indian context.



## CONCLUSION

In this study, civic engagement is conceived as a multi-dimensional concept that relates to a range of behavioural indicators. Since engagement involves attention and effort, it is form of social action whose markers would be observable and hence can be treated as measuring objective aspects of people's actions. Attention and effort can best be captured by focusing on explicit behaviour of the people. Since civic engagement is conceived as a form of public action, visibility is a significant aspect of the phenomenon. Civic engagement is not a private behaviour, although there are valid reasons for considering the attitudes, perceptions and knowledge and experiences that lead to Civic Engagement,

We considered the operationalisation of civic engagement scale along behavioural dimension. We developed five subscales of civic engagement and also construct a twelve-item cumulative scale to measure overall extent of civic engagement. We have reported on the psychometric properties of the scale with Cronbach alpha for reliability and content validity using previous survey items. These items have been widely tested and found to be a reliable measure of civic engagement. We can use this scale to test the existence of a significant difference in socio-economic factors. The idea of a mixed methodological and triangulation is not ventured for want of resources.

The study is limited to measuring civic engagement regarding well-established measures along the behavioral dimension. While this has the advantage of consistency and standardization, the measure could have been complemented with newer measures that claim to incorporate new forms of civic engagement such as using social media. Additional independent surveys are required to validate the findings of this study. The critical contribution of this study is to provide a benchmark for similar studies. Studies on civic engagement in India would greatly benefit from empirical evidence of the kind generated by quantitative techniques.

## REFERENCES

- Adler, R. P., Goggin, J. (2005). What Do We Mean By "Civic Engagement"? *Journal of Transformative Education* 3 (3), 236-253.
- Amadeo, J., Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Husfeldt, V., & Nikolova, R. (2002). Civic knowledge and engagement: An IEA study of upper secondary students in sixteen
- Armony, A. (2004). *The Dubious Link: Civic Engagement and Democratization* (First Edition). Stanford, Calif: Stanford University Press.
- Behling, O., & Law, K. S. (2000). *Translating Questionnaires and Other Research Instruments: Problems and Solutions*. SAGE.
- Berger, B. (2009). Political Theory, Political Science, and the End of Civic Engagement, *Perspectives on Politics* 7 (2), 335-350.
- Berger, B. (2011). *Attention Deficit Democracy: The Paradox of Civic Engagement*. Princeton University Press.
- Bhangaokar, R., & Mehta, D. (2012). Youth Civic Engagement in India: A Case in Point. *Psychology & Developing Societies*, 24(1), 35-59, <http://doi.org/10.1177/097133361102400102>
- Bucy, E. P., & Gregson, K. S. (2001). Media Participation: A Legitimizing Mechanism of Mass Democracy. *New Media & Society*, 3(3), 357-380. <http://doi.org/10.1177/1461444801003003006>
- Chhibber, P. K. (1999). *Democracy Without Associations: Transformation of the Party System and Social Cleavages in India*. University of Michigan Press.
- Clark, J. D. (2012). *Globalizing Civic Engagement: Civil Society and Transnational Action* Routledge.
- Collins, D. (2014). *Cognitive Interviewing Practice*. SAGE.
- DeVellis, R. F. (1991). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (Applied Social Research Methods Series, No. 26). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Doolittle, A., & Faul, A. C. (2013). Civic Engagement Scale: A Validation Study. *SAGE Open*, 3(3), 2158244013495542. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244013495542>
- Ekman, J., & Amnå, E. (2012). Political participation and civic engagement: Towards a new typology. *Human Affairs*, 22(3), 283-300. <https://doi.org/10.2478/s13374-012-0024-1>
- English, Cynthia (2011). Civic engagement High in Developed Countries People likely to volunteer time than donate money, help strangers, Gallup Poll.

- <https://news.gallup.com/poll/145589/civic-engagement-highest-developed-countries.aspx>
- Fiorina, M. P. (1999). Extreme voices: A dark side of civic engagement. *Civic Engagement in American Democracy*, 395, 405–413.
- Flanagan, C., & Faison, N. (2001). Youth civic development: Implications of research for social policy and programs. *Social Policy Report*, 15(1), 3–14.
- Flanagan, C. (2003). Developmental roots of political engagement. *PS: Political Science & Politics*, 36, 257–261.
- Flanagan, C. (2009). Young People ' s Civic Engagement and Political Development. *International Handbook of Youth and Young Adulthood: New Perspectives and Agendas*, (00), 0–8.
- Flanagan, C. A., Syvertsen, A. K., & Stout, M. D. (2007). Civic Measurement Models: Tapping Adolescents' Civic Engagement. CIRCLE Working Paper 55. Center for Information and Research on Civic Learning and Engagement (CIRCLE).
- Galston, W. A. (2007). Civic Knowledge, Civic Education, and Civic Engagement: A Summary of Recent Research. *International Journal of Public Administration*, 30(6-7), 623–642. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01900690701215888>
- Grisez Kweit, M., & Kweit, R. W. (2007). Participation, Perception of Participation, and Citizen Support. *American Politics Research*, 35(3), 407–425.
- Hyman, J. B. (2002). Exploring social capital and civic engagement to create a framework for community building. *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(4), 196–202.
- Inglehart, R., C. Haerper, A. Moreno, C. Welzel, K. Kizilova, J. Diez-Medrano, M. Lagos, P. Norris, E. Ponarin & B. Puranen et al. (eds.). 2014. *World Values Survey: All Rounds - Country-Pooled Datafile Version*: <http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSDocumentationWVL.jsp>. Madrid: JD Systems Institute.
- Jeffres, L. W., Atkin, D., & Neuendorf, K. A. (2002). A Model Linking Community Activity and Communication With Political Attitudes and Involvement in Neighborhoods. *Political Communication*, 19(4), 387–421. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01957470290055574>
- Jeffres, L. W., Jian, G., & Yoon, S. (2013). Conceptualizing Communication Capital for a Changing Environment. *Communication Quarterly*, 61(5), 539–563.
- Karpowitz, C. F., Raphael, C., & Hammond, A. S. (2009). Deliberative Democracy and Inequality: Two Cheers for Enclave Deliberation among the Disempowered. *Politics & Society*, 37(4), 576–615. (<http://doi.org/10.1177/0032329209349226>)
- Lenzi, M., Vieno, A., Pastore, M., & Santinello, M. (2013). Neighborhood social connectedness and adolescent civic engagement: An integrative model. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 34©, 45–54. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2012.12.003>
- Levine, Peter. 2007. *The Future of Democracy: Developing the Next Generation of American Citizens*. Medford, MA: Tufts University Press.
- Malik, K. and Waglé, S., (2002) Civic engagement and development: Introducing the issues in Fukuda-Parr, Lopes, and Malik (Eds) (2002) *Capacity for development: new solutions to old problems*. London: Earthscan.
- McCoy, M. L., & Scully, P. (2002). Deliberative Dialogue to Expand Civic Engagement: What Kind of Talk Does Democracy Need?, 91(2), 117–135. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ncr.91202>
- Miller, K., Chepp, V., Willson, S., & Padilla, J. L. (2014). *Cognitive Interviewing Methodology*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Mitra, S. K. (2007). *The Puzzle of India's Governance: Culture, Context, and Comparative Theory*. Routledge.
- Mitra, S. K. (2012). *Politics in India: Structure, Process, and Policy*. Routledge.
- Mooney-Melvin, P. (2014). Engaging the Neighborhood. *Journal of Urban History*, 40(3), 462–478. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0096144213516076>
- Narayan-Parker, D. (2002). *Empowerment and Poverty Reduction: A Sourcebook*. World Bank.
- Narayan-Parker, D. (2005). *Measuring Empowerment: Cross-disciplinary Perspectives*, World Bank Publications.
- Norris, P. (2002). *Making Democracies Work: Social Capital and Civic Engagement in 47 Societies*.

- Norris, P., & Krook, M. L. (2009). One of Us: Multilevel Models Examining the Impact of Descriptive Representation on Civic Engagement (SSRN Scholarly Paper No. ID 1451149). Rochester, NY: Social Science Research Network.
- O'Flynn, I. (2006). *Deliberative Democracy and Divided Societies*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Pahad, E. (2005). Political Participation and Civic Engagement. *Progressive Politics*, 4(2), 21-26.
- Putnam, R. D. (1995). Bowling alone: America's declining social capital. *Journal of Democracy*, 6(1), 65-78.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*, New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.
- Robinson, J. P., Shaver, P. R., & Wrightsman, L. S. (Eds.). (1999). *Measures of Political Attitudes (Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes) (Measures of Social Psychological Attitudes, Vol 2) (1st edition)*. Emerald Group Pub Ltd.
- Sharma, B. (2008). Voice, Accountability and Civic Engagement - A Conceptual Overview, (August), 1-33.
- Sherrod, L. R., Torney-Purta, J., & Flanagan, C. A. (2010). Handbook of research on civic engagement in youth, 277-305.
- Shiarella, A. H., McCarthy, A. M., & Tucker, M. L. (2000). Development and construct validity of scores on the Community Service Attitudes Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 60, 286-300.
- Singhal, A., & Greiner, K. (2008). Performance activism and civic engagement through symbolic and playful actions. *The Journal of Development Communication*, 19(2), 43-53.
- Teorell, J., Torcal, M., Montero, J. R. (2007). Political Participation: Mapping the Terrain. In J. W. van Deth, J. R. Montero, A. Westholm (Eds.). *Citizenship and Involvement in European Democracies: A Comparative Analysis*, pp. 334-357. London & New York: Routledge.
- Terkla, D. G., & O'Leary, L. S. (2014). *Assessing Civic Engagement: New Directions for Institutional Research*, Number 162. John Wiley & Sons.
- Torney-Purta, J. (2002). Patterns in the Civic Knowledge, Engagement, and Attitudes of European Adolescents: The IEA Civic Education Study. *European Journal of Education*, 37(2), 129-141. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-3435.00098>
- Torney-Purta, J. (2002). The school's role in developing civic engagement: A study of adolescents in twenty-eight countries. *Applied Developmental Science*, 6(4), 203-212.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries*. Amsterdam: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement.
- Wells, A. (2007) Civic engagement and accountability. ODI Opinion Piece. London: ODI.
- Willis, G. B. (2004). *Cognitive Interviewing: A Tool for Improving Questionnaire Design*, SAGE Publications
- Zukin, Cliff, Scott Keeter, Molly Andolina, Krista Jenkins, and Michael X. Delli Carpini. 2006. *A New Engagement? Political Participation, Civic Life, and the Changing American Citizen*. New York: Oxford University Press.



T. R. Gopalakrishnan

Assistant Professor, Department of Journalism and Communication, University of Madras, Chennai, Tamil Nadu.