Findings

Informal local governance Institutions play an important role in local governance in many developing countries. In poorer countries the state machinery is often less widespread and may not penetrate the local level. In such instances, the relationship between state organizations and citizens is more likely to be mediated by informal local governance institutions. Their authority is accepted by state agencies only in very specific contexts. For instance, while caste and village panchayats in India are not recognized by the state, tribal councils are recognized by the Constitution.

In South Asia, while most informal institutions tend to fall outside the mechanisms of the formal state, some like shalishis in Bangladesh are given limited authority over justice dispensation. The present study shows that in Tamilnadu, the informal institutions collectively work with formal institutions. The findings give a picture of the above statement.

The level of social capital between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions is quantified in the following.

Accountability

People must be enabled to have access to information because if there is no transparency, there will also be no accountability. The indicators used to measure the accountability are:
• Trust
• Reciprocity
• Participation

> 99.3 percent of respondents said that there is trust between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions.

■ 51.3 percent of respondents are of the opinion that there is effective conflict resolving mechanism.
■ 46 percent of respondents said that both institutions are maintaining laws and regulations and provides fair treatment.

Effective conflict resolving mechanism and proper laws, regulations and fair treatment show high level of trust between both institutions in the villages.

> 99.3 percent of respondents are of the opinion that there is reciprocity between formal local government and informal local governance institutions.

■ 47.6 percent of respondents said that villagers perform collective activities with the help of both institutions.
* 21.3 percent of respondents are of the opinion that both institutions manage crisis and disaster.
■ 28.3 percent of respondents said that both institutions perform planning, monitoring and implementation activities.

Performance of villagers in collective activities with the help of institutions, crisis and disaster management and institutions performing planning monitoring and implementing development activities show high level of reciprocity between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions.
99.3 percent of respondents said that there is participation between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions.

- 49.3 percent of respondents are of the opinion that both institutions assist in publicity to increase farmers’ participation in the crop yield competitions by creating congenial and positive competitive spirit among the farmers.

- 48 percent of respondents said that both institutions Participate in decision making, resolving disputes and election process.

Participation in decision making, resolving disputes and election process and also increasing the participation among the villagers shows high level of participation between both institutions.

**Responsiveness**

Responsiveness can be attained when all forms of authority act according to the interest of the people considering their priorities and needs. The indicators for measuring the responsibility are:

- Cohesion

  - Communication

- Integrity

- Social support

- Social networking

  - Cooperation

- Social norms

- Decision making
Cohesion

> Out of the total respondents 98.3 percent are of the opinion that there is social cohesion between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions.

■ 24 percent of the respondents said that both institutions fulfil social order.

■ 17.6 percent of the respondents said that both institutions fulfil basic necessities.

■ 15.6 percent of the respondents are of the opinion that there is positive interaction between both institutions.

■ 15.6 percent of the respondents are of the view that there is scope for social inclusion in both institutions.

■ 30.3 percent of the respondents are of the opinion that social equality is maintained by both institutions.

The fulfilment of social order, fulfilment of basic necessities a way to social progress, positive interaction, participation in social, cultural, political life of the societies and equality of status between both institutions show high level of cohesion.

Communication

> 98.3 percent of respondents are of the view that there is communication between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions.

■ 54.3 percent of respondents are of the opinion that both institutions discuss every development matters.

■ 44 percent of respondents are of the view that both institutions discuss the matters in detail to find out the pros and cons before commencing the meetings.
Integrity

> 98.3 percent of respondents said that there is integrity between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions.

  ■ 46 percent of respondents are of the opinion that there is a sense of honesty between both institutions.
  ■ 52.3 percent of respondents said that there is a sense of truthfulness between both institutions.

Social support

> Out of the total respondents 98.3 percent of respondents are of the view that there is social support between formal local government institution and informal local governance institutions.

  ■ 28.6 percent of respondents said that there exists instrumental social support between both institutions.
  ■ 43 percent of respondents are of the opinion that there exists informational social support between both institutions.
  ■ 26.6 percent of respondents said that there exists emotional social support between both institutions.

Social networking

> 98.3 percent of respondents said that there is social networking between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions.

  ■ 56 percent of respondents said that there is horizontal networking between both institutions.
  ■ 42.3 percent of respondents said that there is vertical networking between both institutions.
Cooperation

> Out of the total respondents 98.3 percent of respondents are of the view that there is cooperation between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions.

Social norms

> 98.3 percent of respondents are of the opinion that there is cooperation between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions.

Decision making

> Out of the total respondents 98.3 percent of respondents are of the view that both formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions together decide the matters.

The level of collective action between formal local government institutions and informal local institutions is the following;

Social collective action

Social collective action can be accomplished only when formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions work collectively for providing social services like education, health and recreation and also provide justice for the socially deprived groups such as scheduled caste, backward classes and women. The indicators for measuring social collective action are;

Social welfare

> Out of the total respondents 97.3 percent are of the opinion that both institutions perform social welfare activities.

■ 28.6 percent the respondents are of the view that both institutions provide material support.
43 percent of the respondents are of the view that both institutions provide special provision for women and children.

26.6 percent of the respondents said that both institutions provide rehabilitation for the needy.

**Chastisement process**

> 97.3 percent of respondents said that both formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions perform the chastisement process smoothly.

**Health and sanitation**

> Out of the total respondents 97.3 percent said that both formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions maintain health and sanitation.

49.3 percent of the respondents are of the opinion that both formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions promote community participation in maintenance of assets.

* 48 percent of the respondents are of the view that both formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions ensure prevention of communicable diseases.

**Mobility**

> 97.3 percent of the respondents are of the opinion that both formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions pave way for chances of mobility.

**Morality**

> Out of the total respondents 97.3 percent said that both formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions maintain morality.
Curbing **discrimination** practices

> 97.3 percent of the respondents are of the opinion that both formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions curb discrimination practices.

**Economic collective action**

Economic collective action can be attained only when the formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions work together to increase more output and making changes in the technical and institutional arrangements to increases income and to reduce poverty. The indicators for measuring the economic collective action are given below:

**Involvement in development activities**

> 98 percent of the respondents are of the opinion that both formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions involve in development activities.

**Basic amenities**

> Out of the total respondents 98 percent of the respondents said that both formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions fulfil the basic amenities.

**Selection of beneficiaries**

> 98 percent of the respondents are of the opinion that both formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions together select the beneficiaries.

**Equitable distribution of resources**

> Out of the total respondents 98 percent of the respondents said that both formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions equally distribute the resources.
Common property resource management

> 98 percent of the respondents are of the opinion that both formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions together manage common property resources.

■ 56 percent of the respondents are of the opinion that both institutions protect common property resources for the collective good of the society.

■ 42.3 percent of the respondents are of the view that both institutions assist the people in cleaning the jungle growth and prickly pear.

Political collective action

Political collective action can be achieved only when formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions have the capacity to deal with its own fundamental problems more effectively while responding to the changing political demands of the people. The indicators for measuring political collective action are as follows:

Election process

> Out of the total respondents 97.7 percent of the respondents said that both formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions cany out the election process without any conflict.

Reservation

> 97.7 percent of respondents are of the view that both formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions give due representation to scheduled caste, scheduled tribe and women.
Relationship between social capital and collective action between both institutions

To know about the relationship between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institution correlation measures were used. The result is as here under;

• There is high positive correlation between accountability (variable of social capital) and social collective action (variable of collective action) between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions and the correlation is significant at 0.815

• There is high positive correlation between accountability (variable of social capital) and economic collective action (variable of collective action) between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions and the correlation is significant at 0.840

• There is high positive correlation between accountability (variable of social capital) and political collective action (variable of collective action) between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions and the correlation is significant at 0.827

• There is high positive correlation between responsibility (variable of social capital) and political collective action (variable of collective action) between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions and the correlation is significant at 0.748

• There is high positive correlation between responsibility (variable of social capital) and political collective action (variable of collective action) between formal local government institutions and
informal local governance institutions and the correlation is significant at 0.710

- There is high positive correlation between responsibility (variable of social capital) and political collective action (variable of collective action) between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions and the correlation is significant at 0.729

The above findings show that there is high positive relationship between both institutions. The level of accountability and responsiveness is high. The synergies between these institutions are evaluated in terms of collective action. But the factor behind the scene which influences the collective action is the social capital that both institutions create in the social, economic and political spheres. Unless otherwise social capital is not ensured, the collective action is not practical. The findings from the study fully support this.

Conclusions

Development is a policy objective in large number of developing countries. Achieving it shall require continuous interaction between both institutions. Social capital is useful in creating trust, reciprocity and the like between both institutions to bring about collective action based on 73rd amendment at the local level to achieve local development. The present study depicts a clear understanding of the subject. From this study it is clear that the inclusion of traditional structure in local governance in one form or the other offers a number of opportunities:
• Better inclusion of local population
• Acceptance of policy implementation
• Potential for better responsiveness to local needs
• Traditional authorities as advocates for peace building

An informal institution focuses on everyday life of the society. The main functions of informal institutions are land allocation, natural resource management and dispute settlement. But their oversights are extending beyond these functions when they are allowed to work with formal institutions. Greater mobilization capacity of the informal institutions helps formal institutions to implement policies of a community without bias.

The present study analyses the level of social capital between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions by adopting the social capital theory. Social capital in this study plays an important role in resource conservation. It is the presence of rules of resource use, mechanisms of benefit and cost sharing, conflict resolutions. When supplemented by values like trust and reciprocity that makes the role of social capital effective. All frames of social capital in this study have two components namely social capital and collective action. Social capital helps to bring interaction avoiding conflict between both institutions. The concept of social capital has gained prominence world wide as a way of empowering in the face of globalization. The building of trust and mutuality at local levels is important to overcome alienation, increasing poverty and social disadvantage. The devolution of social welfare programs is one strategy designed to create enhanced social capital at community level. Collective action represents the way to achieve local development.
Good governance requires that the process of local governance and development is responsive, accountable and inclusive. Informal institutions participate actively in the coordinated working of local governance structures. This study outlines the role of informal institutions in local governance and analyses the social capital and collective action between formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions for local development. The findings show that there is a significant high positive relationship between both institutions and it is evident from the fact that informal institutions are becoming modern as they come to engage more with the institutions of formal constitutional government.

Suggestions Further Research

> Taking to in account the problem with decentralization, relying on informal local governing institutions by formal local government institutions could be an attractive option to improve development.

> A related issue which needs more in-depth understanding is the role of human development in this process. An elaborate study can be made in this area.

> The role of formal local government institutions and informal local governance institutions in empowering women at the local level can be analysed.

> Compared to the administration of state, in the formal institutions there is no need to launch an entirely new institutions. Creating new political and administrative institutions on the other hand can be hard and time consuming. If there is a structure already functioning at the local level, it is rational to include them with
formal local government institutions in improving governance at the local level.

> There is a need for more organized engagement of informal institutions as genuine leaders at the village level, particularly in the areas of land tenure, natural resource management, planning and implementing local rural and agricultural development programmes.

> Finally understanding the role of informal institutions reciprocated assistance mechanism in re-distribution of resources and wealth among the poor and between wealthier and poorer sections of society by informal institutions can be explored.
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