Chapter-1
Introduction

Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) are voluntary non-profit institutions which play the role of extending benefits to society. They serve as agents of strengthening existing civil societies and good governance. There are different schools of thought who consider NGOs as a distinct part of society. Frantz (1987) visualizes NGOs as an unconnected to the private sector in the way that they interact with the population and places them in public domain. In other words, they are vast array of associations which perform diverse activities (Frantz, 1987). NGOs appear to offer an acceptable solution to majority of sectors in society. NGOs should not be seen only as a spontaneous phenomenon—a growth in activism and civil participation or as the result of the structural changes but consequence of deliberate developmental policies by governments who see them as instruments for achieving their developmental objectives (Frantz, 1987). Salamon and Anheier (1992) characterize NGO as having various characteristics like formal structure, non-profit provisions, participatory organization etc. Due to its significance, the presence of NGO has increased considerably in the last two decades. They have expanded their influence within democratic societies and created both cooperative and competitive relationship with government for development of public policies (United Nations Research Institute for Social Development, 2013). In other words, it means that a state may seek assistance from NGO regarding implementation of its various projects. Dimaggio and Anheier (1990) state, “NGOs are the protectors of pluralism and of privilege, instruments of democracy and of control, sources of innovation, partner and competitor of the state.” Etzioni sees them as an efficient form of organization which combines the efficiency and the knowledge of business with public interest, responsibility and wide perspective of government. In the words of Serra, NGO is the nervous system of democracy which defines the strength and consistency of civil society. Some schools of thought consider NGO as service delivery mechanism. They claim that NGOs take the role of providing grounds to develop new projects and services. NGOs have apparently become part of the political process in industrialized democracies because they have ability to mobilize political and cognitive resources and translate them into political power (Dalton et al, 2003). NGOs combine social action to promote integration of masses with policy makers. They have very detailed knowledge
of local conditions, experience in community development which assists them in undertaking cooperative activities with members of respective communities. The simple lifestyle of NGO professional leads to coherence with local community in terms of their interaction and consultation on various project activities (Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu n.d). They live with the villagers or the urban poor and share their poverty. Through achievement of emotional support from the poor community, the NGOs inculcate among human beings a sense of belongingness. NGOs are the institutions through which individuals come together to pursue shared goals (Johnson and Prakash, 2007). Even in a developing country like Bangladesh, NGOs have contributed a lot in terms of strengthening democracy through their active participation in public debates, dialogues. They have been active partner not only in policy making process but advocating for the rights of its citizens. Broadly speaking, NGOs contribute to building (or rebuilding) social capacity, and these efforts typically involve a wide range of activities: establishing codes; providing training, resource access, and know-how concerning goods and service delivery; sharing best practices; and creating and supporting institutional settings that promote social welfare (Teegen, et. al. 2004). NGOs also play critical roles in governance and value creation for social ends (Teegen, et. al. 2004). They have long stepped in to serve as critical ‘safety nets’. Their non-profit character translates their action into value-laden approach for society. Many NGOs are adept at providing certain goods and services which makes them closer to common masses and furthermore gain their trust and cooperation. One of the major questions regarding NGO is that whether they can maintain their freedom as third sector and oppose being a mere agent of government (Streeten, 1997). The enormous growth in quantity of NGOs across India has moved them into diversified arena. They invite attention of government bodies into certain developmental activities and help them in policy making. They are advocates of concerns of marginalized sections of society like women, children, and differently-abled people. There are certain traits of NGOs which facilitate its increased role in mobilizing social capital. NGOs are very efficient in mobilizing the poor and remote communities. They are more innovative and effective in handling mass pressures due to their acquaintances (Streeten, 1997). They often involve enlightened top-down approach which leads to percolation of awareness from policy makers to common masses regarding their projects. NGOs are often keener on delivering services, which show tangible and quantifiable results in the short run (Streeten, 1997). They have certain virtues which makes them more sensitive towards local people and fit for responding to
local level challenges which ultimately leads to promotion of self-reliance. Optimistically speaking, NGOs today reach 250 million poor people in developing countries (Streeten, 1997). They are basically aimed at empowering the poor and marginalized sections of society and encourage people to take decisions as per their convenience (Streeten, 1997). NGOs basically work in the area of bringing collectives which leads to congregation of diverse interests. Due to high motivational skill and enthusiasm, common masses rely on them (Streeten, 1997). NGOs are very good in terms of changing attitudes of poor people. Their sensitivity to socio-economic conditions of poor people helps them in coming closer to them. Judith Tendler has pointed out that NGOs often derive their identity by defining themselves in contrast and opposition to government, which is said to be large, rigid, inflexible, bureaucratic, hierarchical, and incapable of reaching the poor (Streeten, 1997). NGOs are involved in various policy dialogues which may be using political pressure to change policies (Streeten, 1997). It is also evident that some NGOs are involved in the process of bringing changes in entire governance system. The Asian Development Bank reported that the need for NGOs began when there came inefficiencies in delivery of goods and services by the state (Islam and Morgan, 2011). According to this study, NGOs have close links with community and have flexibility in responding to their grievances which leads to their advancement in social capital formation (Islam and Morgan, 2011). NGOs are effective in terms of creating social bond between varied social groups and reduce the chances of inter-community tensions. Abom comments that NGOs impinge on social capital depending upon its intervention approaches (Islam and Morgan, 2011). He argues that the aim of NGO is to reduce the sufferings of the poor and marginalized sections of society (Islam and Morgan, 2011). Bodja states that NGOs are accused of hijacking genuinely needed development aid by elites (Islam and Morgan, 2011). NGOs use various communication channels like consultations, face-to-face meetings, interpersonal contacts, training and monitoring for creating social networks (Islam and Morgan, 2011). The participatory approaches of NGOs help in fostering social capital in segregated community. Some case-studies done in Bangladesh shows those income-generating programmes of NGOs have worked like ‘social glue’ and ‘bridge’ between community and NGO (Islam and Morgan, 2011). It also highlighted that local leadership and a chance of building community capacity assisted NGO in building social networks. The knowledge sharing practices of NGO is also very vital in strengthening linking capacity with community members. The NGOs pursue changes and maintain socio-political
system. These NGOs are also capable of contributing towards social capital. In other words, NGOs are organizations associated with promotion of social, political and economic change. These NGOs play the roles of catalysts, implementers and partners in development. They are involved in a range of activities from lobbying to research and policy formulation (Islam and Morgan, 2011).

1.1 Definition of NGO:

The acronym ‘NGO’ has been popularised in many parts of the world. The term ‘NGO’ is usually referred to a collective term within the gambit of aid channel separated from state forces and has no profit notion (Senbeta, 2003). NGOs are referred to as not for-profit, non-profit, or voluntary organizations, all generally referring to the same group of institutions (Senbeta, 2003). In other words, NGOs are defined as an independent organization of people acting together on a continuous basis for some common purpose other than making profit and engaged in earning money (Senbeta, 2003). According to Vakil (1997), “NGOs are self-governing, private, not-for-profit organizations that are geared to improving the quality of life for disadvantaged people. (Lewis, 2009)” This definition states that NGO is a third sector away from government based on non-profit character. It is defined to have its own limited resources and neutral structural functions leading towards change in existing socio-economic conditions of society. In other words, they are progressive agents of transformation. Turner and Hulme states that NGOs are generally registered organizations, community groups, professional associations, trade unions, charity organizations whose aim is to improve the well-being of their members and of those areas in which they exist (Lekorwe and Mpabanga, 2007). According to World Bank, “NGOs are private organizations that pursue activities to relieve suffering, promote the interests of the poor, protect the environment, provide basic social services, and/or undertake community development (Lekorwe and Mpabanga, 2007)”. According to Thomas, NGOs are seen as agents of advocacy and contribute immensely to policy dialogue (Lekorwe and Mpabanga, 2007). D. Rajasekhar (2000) states that four characteristics make the NGOs as distinct organizations. These characteristics are voluntary formation, working with non self-serving aims and relative independence. The National Policy on Voluntary Action’ 2007 recognizes all formal and informal groups as community based organizations, non-government development organizations as part of voluntary sector. NGO has been defined by the United Nations
(UN) also. It states that an NGO is any non-profit, voluntary citizen’s group which is organized on a local, national or international level (http://www.ngo.org/ngoinfo/define.html). Task oriented and driven by people with a common interest, NGOs perform a variety of services and humanitarian functions, bring citizens’ concerns to Governments, monitor policies and encourage political participation at the community level (http://www.ngo.org/ngoinfo/define.html). They provide analysis and expertise, serve as early warning mechanisms and help monitor and implement international agreements. Some are organized around specific issues, such as human rights, the environment or health (Yaziji and Doh, 2009). According to Hudson and Bielefeld, NGOs are organizations that provide useful goods or services thereby serving a specified public purpose, are not allowed to distribute profits to persons in their individual capacities, are voluntary in the sense that they are created, maintained, and terminated based on voluntary decision and initiative by members or a board and exhibit value rationality, often based on strong ideological components (Yaziji and Doh, 2009). According to Teegen, “NGOs are private, not-for-profit organizations that aim to serve particular societal interests by focusing advocacy and/or operational efforts on social, political and economic goals including equity, education, health, environmental protection and human rights (Yaziji and Doh, 2009)”. Erica Johnson and Aseem Prakash define NGO as institutions through which individuals come together to pursue shared goals (Johnson and Prakash, 2007). Some NGOs are well resourced and affluent while some are struggling for the lack of funds.

1.2 Evolution of NGO in India and Abroad:

This concept of NGO has evolved globally in a due course of time. Generally, the entity called “NGO” has come into existence in 1945 due to need of the United Nations (UN) to differentiate in its Charter between participation rights for inter-governmental specialized agencies and those for international private organizations (Senbeta, 2003). Before 1945, the voluntary associations were not united under one nomenclature. Some Christian missionaries used the term “Voluntary Association” in 17th century where intervention was restricted to propagation of religious beliefs among the community members (Weiss, 2017). The organized volunteerism got momentum in 1863 with the establishment of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) by Henry Dunant (Bugnion, 2009). At the outset of 20th century, the entire world was divided into two
camps; developed and developing countries. In the wake of growing human needs and privatization, the state started retracting back from its role of welfarism. The state was no longer capable of tackling the menace of human exploitation, exploitation of resource-deficient class. Therefore, several nations decided to evolve a new system of service delivery for the needy people away from the contribution of the state. This effort got integrated under the title of Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) which expanded across all nations by 1980s. The Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) fostered its way across various issues and challenges. The cost-effective and efficiency based institution outpaced the state in ensuring welfare activities to the growing population of the world. Due to its growing popularity, the UN invited some international NGOs in its various conferences ranging from Vienna conference’ 1993, Beijing conference’ 1995, Cairo conference’ 1994 etc (UN-NGLS, 1996). Since then, the NGOs have been flourishing very high on various development indicators while serving the global communities. They have been active in supporting the state also in facilitating various pro-people development activities. NGOs have received greater attention in government and international organization reports and policy documents (Senbeta, 2003).

The NGOs have been operational in India since a long time. In India, the history of voluntary organization is as old as Vedic period. The concept of charity and philanthropy has been quite old which has served our temples, dharmasalas, anna-satras during ancient period (Cantegreil, et. al. 2013). In ancient and medieval India, charity on a voluntary basis outside the religious channels operated freely and extensively in the fields of education, health, cultural promotion and succour in crises during natural calamities such as floods, famine, droughts and epidemics (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter%202.pdf). In mid-nineteenth century, India started various welfare measures and supported voluntary work. It has a vast history serving the deprived and marginalized communities. The Laissez Faire policy of the British Government in economic, religious and social matters left no other avenue of development open to the natives than resort to the self-help form of voluntarism (http://www.bhojvirtualuniversity.com/slm/bswc14.pdf). During the initial phase, it evolved as pure philanthropic organization. The concept of volunteerism was very popular in case of Non-governmental Organizations (NGOs). During ancient times, the temples, shrines were constructed by these voluntary organizations. The notion of
volunteerism was nothing but charity and philanthropic activities. They were popular in various community development related activities. Furthermore, the medieval period ushered in volunteerism in the area of socio-religious upgradation. The state shrank its hand from developmental activities and invited non-governmental organizations to cooperate (http://www.bhojvirtualuniversity.com/slm/bswc14.pdf). Several social reformers attempted to institutionalize the volunteerism activity with their organizations. The formation of Atmiya Sabha in 1815 by Raja Ram Mohan Roy was one such example; later it became allied with Christian Unitarians and started the Unitarian Committee in 1821 (http://www.bhojvirtualuniversity.com/slm/bswc14.pdf). During this century, numerous organizations emerged as key players in the area of socio-political development in India like Satya Sodhak Samaj (1873), National Council for Women in India (1875), Indian National Conference (1887) (http://www.bhojvirtualuniversity.com/slm/bswc14.pdf). It intervened into awakening process of Islam where economically backward muslims got benefited by Faradi movement of Haji Shariatullah established in 1818 (http://www.bhojvirtualuniversity.com/slm/bswc14.pdf). Some of the Christian missionaries also worked in the socio-political empowerment of tribal communities. In 1834, the Royal Asiatic Society was founded to promote literary manifestations (http://www.bhojvirtualuniversity.com/slm/bswc14.pdf). Apart from literary, these voluntary organizations organized tribals to safeguard their land. The voluntary efforts of the Christian missionaries continued in this phase in greater proportion, in the field of education, health, relief and welfare of the poor and neglected sections of the society (http://www.bhojvirtualuniversity.com/slm/bswc14.pdf). During the first half of 19th century, social reformers like Raja Rammohan Roy, Ramkrishna Paramhansa, Sayyed Ahmad Khan, Swami Vivekananda ventured into voluntary efforts for social awakening for the depressed communities in India (http://www.bhojvirtualuniversity.com/slm/bswc14.pdf). The contribution of Christian missionaries into development discourse may not be neglected. They have been active in the sphere of expanding social services through orphanage, elderly homes etc. During the colonial times, the NGOs have got boost due to their engagement in various religious, social and cultural affairs (http://www.bhojvirtualuniversity.com/slm/bswc14.pdf). During the same period, various Christian missionaries came to India to expand their network of philanthropy. They worked in the areas of education and healthcare services also. Therefore, the conglomeration of reform movements along with charitable organizations initiated an era of volunteerism in India (http://www.bhojvirtualuniversity.com/slm/bswc14.pdf). The
introduction of western ideas also precipitated the emergence of social reform movements in India during the first half of nineteenth century. This emergence of voluntary organizations could not remain isolated from Gandhian philosophy (http://www.bhojvirtualuniversity.com/slm/bswc14.pdf). During 20\textsuperscript{th} century, the efforts of various thinkers led to sustained improvement in literacy, agriculture, health and commerce (http://www.bhojvirtualuniversity.com/slm/bswc14.pdf). Even Gandhijee supported voluntary efforts through his constructive work like Charkha, Khadi, Gramodyog (http://www.bhojvirtualuniversity.com/slm/bswc14.pdf). Gandhijee emphasized over existence of voluntarism in the economic aspect through decentralized mechanism (http://www.bhojvirtualuniversity.com/slm/bswc14.pdf). Various specialized organizations like All India Village Industries’ Association, All India Spinners’ Association ventured into the villages for voluntary works. In post-independence India, the NGOs have assumed an important place in development discourse. These NGOs undertook various social welfare programmes in coordination with government of India. During this period, some prominent voluntary organizations like Kasturaba Gandhi National Memorial Trust, Indian Council of Child Welfare, Youth Hostel Association, Association of Social Health were established (http://www.bhojvirtualuniversity.com/slm/bswc14.pdf). These organizations in later half of 20\textsuperscript{th} century, began to coordinate with community development programmes of Indian government. Even in Uttar Pradesh, another project called ‘Etawah Project’ was launched in 1948 in the area of rural community development (http://www.bhojvirtualuniversity.com/slm/bswc14.pdf). In totality, there were numerous independent voluntary organizations working in sync with state for empowerment of the community. There were done similar experiments for rural development from both government forces and non-state actors in Madras presidency. The Post-independence period also ushered in involvement of NGO in various poverty eradication programmes. The NGOs have been contributing in India’s development at a large scale since 1970s. During 1970s, the government pursued the minimum needs program, emphasizing over removal of basic impediments in the way of improving quality of life of the poor people (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter%202.pdf). In 1969, the government started National Social Service Scheme (NSS). The Nehru Yuva Kendra facilitated the rural youths to promote community services (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter%202.pdf). During the mid-1960s, the voluntary organizations started organizing relief and

Therefore, the economic depression and inter-class conflicts necessitated the participation of non-state actors in economy. A number of NGOs have emerged contributing towards pro-people development in India. Its active role is evident in empowerment of Panchayati Raj institutions in facilitating services for rural communities (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter%202.pdf). These organizations have immense role in bringing social change and development. The major responsibility for organizing social welfare services continues with Non-Governmental Organization. Even the eighth five-year plan also emphasizes over role of NGO in various developmental activities (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter%202.pdf). The NGOs have been considered to be a major player in reaching the poor for reducing the poverty. These organizations have played a crucial role in resolving inter-community conflicts also. In Resettlement and Rehabilitation activity, these NGOs have shown commendable work. In 1980s, the NGOs experienced a new trend towards planning, management and coordination with developmental activities (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter%202.pdf). It experienced the people’s participation in every development paradigm. The third five-year plan had characterized voluntary action as an aspect of public cooperation. It integrated itself with several programmes like Integrated Rural Development Programme (IRDP), Marginal Farmers and Agricultural Labourers Development Agency (MFAL), Small Farmers Development Agency (SFDA) in 1980s (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter%202.pdf). The Seventh Plan Document (1985-90) pronounced a greater involvement of the voluntary sector particularly in the process of rural development (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter%202.pdf). The government provided support to voluntary organizations in successive plan periods in the rural development programmes. The seventh five-year plan has also emphasized over people’s participation and voluntary action in rural development. After establishment of CAPART (Council for Advancement of People’s Action and Rural Technology), the voluntary organizations got
promoted in the area of rural development (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter202.pdf). They are now more diversified with growing professionalism and the sector has been playing a greater role in welfare and development (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter202.pdf). In the eighth five-year plan, the people’s initiative and participation has been considered to be the key elements in development. Even the ninth five-year plan envisaged a major role in organizing and empowering the poor and marginalized sections of society. In India, there are nearly 1.5 million NGOs who are working at national and state levels (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter202.pdf). The survey done by PRIA reveals that 26.5 percent of NGOs are active in religious activities while 21.3 percent of them work for community services (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter202.pdf). Due to their increased participation in development activities, the Government of India enacted the National Policy on Voluntary Sector as the first step to evolve a new working relationship between government and volunteer organizations (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter202.pdf).

Through this policy, the government seeks to encourage, enable an independent, creative and effective voluntary sector with diverse form and function (http://capart.nic.in/orgn/strvac.pdf). The principal aim of this policy was to utilize the managerial attributes of these NGOs in upliftment of the state. The NGOs have been proactive in health sector also (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter202.pdf). This policy recognized strategic collaboration and consultation through a formalized process. The National Population Policy’ 2000 insists on active involvement of NGOs in the area of reduction of fertility rate in India. Since 1990s, NGOs have been active at international level (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter202.pdf). With an advancement of society, the problems are also getting complex which require an integrated intervention through the state and the NGOs (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter202.pdf). The Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) are the main proponents of development in India. They have facilitated the state in leveraging between the fragmented communities. The community development programmes with its approach of effective participation of people, provided the voluntary efforts fresh impetus and the voluntary organizations continued, with renewed vigor, their innovative experiments in rural development (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/
Either in the area of resolution of inter-community clashes, amelioration of women, growth of educational and economic conditions, advocating for pro-people policies and laws or political empowerment of people, the NGOs have contributed since time immemorial (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter%202.pdf). This voluntary sector developed the professional etiquette in managing the resources for development. There was witnessed increased people’s participation to carry-out development activities. The social reform based voluntary organizations and Gandhian constructive work organization cooperated with each other. They have raised various issues related to livelihood, education, health issues. The NGOs have facilitated the neo-liberal policy change since long.

On the other hand, Social Capital is a kind of human resource of society in an integrated manner. It has attracted a great deal of attention across the social sciences in recent decades, especially through the pioneering work of Robert Putnam who has linked it and the associated concept of social trust to both variations in regional development and the changing nature of contemporary societies (Johnston, 2010). It is one of the most controversial sociological ideas in the study of social science. It ranges from community spirit, social bonds, civic virtue, community networks, extended friendship, informal and formal networks (Johnston, 2010). It is formed through co-ordinated actions, cohesiveness among individuals, notion of help among members of different community. Social capital offers many benefits to the community. The relationship with kin, neighbours and friends are important safety net. Putnam argues that Social Capital has forceful, even quantifiable effect on our personal lives like better educational achievement, greater levels of income equality, enhanced economic achievement through increased trust and lower transaction cost. The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) defines social capital as ‘networks together with shared norms, values and understandings that facilitate cooperation within or among groups’. It is perceived generally that social capital is something which exists among individuals and organizations (Islam and Morgan, 2011). Social Capital is defined by its functions of actions. As per this framework, individuals may access and use social networks to gain returns in instrumental actions (Burnett, 2006). James Coleman stated that social capital holds benefits for marginalized communities where mutual trust and shared values construct relationship (Burnett, 2006). Fukuyama centralizes the concept of trust by
stating that social capital is ‘a capability that arises from the prevalence of trust in a society or in certain parts of it’ (Burnett, 2006). It is advocated that networks are premised on shared interests and ties that are forged between individuals and collectives for the development of intra-group cohesion (bonding capital), inter-group cooperation (bridging capital) and multi-group collaboration at the community level (linking capital) (Burnett, 2006). The existence of social capital lies in social connections and obligations towards community living. The engagement with voluntary associations reflects availability of social capital in the community. It is also argued that social capital production is grounded on individual, community as unit of analysis (Burnett, 2006). The Social Capital refers to social connections and the attendant trust that enable participants to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives (Javakhishvili, et. al. n.d). Social Capital processes relate to reciprocity, social participation and strengthening of social relationship which ensures group solidarity. The reciprocal activities help in facilitating access to resources at both individual and collective level. It is very well connected with a sense of belongingness and bonding social capital (Javakhishvili, et. al. n.d). Although trust and shared values facilitate networks of bonding, bridging and linking social capital yet, its effect varies with individual to individuals. The clustering of various community clubs may also lead to linking social capital. Social Capital is easily generated when social cleavages are easy to be bridged. It links substantial sectors of the community, socially heterogeneous groups, thus creating new spaces where power, information and communication can be shared (Javakhishvili, et. al. n.d). The concept has also been linked to other ideas currently popular within the social sciences, such as actor–network theory: social capital and trust are built on and in social networks (Johnston, 2010). The Social Capital contributes to economic growth through various investment procedures. Investment in social capital brings benefits to the individual through market returns associated with increased wages or improved employment prospects and non-market returns through improvements in well-being (Leeves, 2012).

1.3 Definition of Social Capital:

The term “Social Capital” has been defined by various thinkers. The writings of Pierre Bourdieu, James Coleman as well as Robert Putnam highlight the problems of defining social capital as the possession of a collectivity such as the population of a place, a region or even a state when networks are comprised of individuals who are the source of
trust (Johnston, 2010). Social capital is a contested concept. It is a concept that has received a great deal of attention from commentators across a broad spectrum of political viewpoints (Healy and Hampshire, 2002). It may be used to enhance the critical and reflective use in social work. Social Capital refers to norms and networks which enable people to work collectively to resolve problems. It ensures the visibility of productivity of social sphere (Healy and Hampshire, 2002). The Empirical research links social capital to improvements in quality of life, such as improved health outcomes for people living in disadvantaged communities, safer communities and access to a range of material and human resources (Healy and Hampshire, 2002).

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) defines Social Capital as “networks together with shared norms, values and understandings that facilitate co-operation within or among groups (Fernando, 2012).” According to Ostrom, “Social Capital is the shared knowledge, understandings, norms, rules and expectations about patterns of interactions that groups of individuals bring to a recurrent activity (Durlauf and Fafchamps, 2005).” On the other hand, Bowles and Gintis states, “Social capital generally refers to trust, concern for one’s associates, a willingness to live by the norms of one’s community and to punish those who do not (Durlauf and Fafchamps, 2005).”

According to Dasgupta, “Social Capital is most usefully viewed as a system of interpersonal networks. If the externalities network formation gives to are “confined”, social capital is an aspect of “human capital”, in the sense economists use the latter term. However, if network externalities are more in the nature of public goods, social capital is a component of what economists call “total factor productivity (Durlauf and Fafchamps, 2005).”

According to World Health Organization (WHO), “Social Capital represents the degree of social cohesion which exists in communities. It refers to processes between people which establish networks, norms and social trust and facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2002).” Specifying its significance, Bourdieu stated that “it is in fact impossible to account for the structure and function of the social world unless one re-introduces capital in its forms and not solely in the one recognised by economic theory (Healy and Hampshire, 2002).” Pierre Bourdieu (1986), a French sociologist, who analysed how social and cultural capital is used to
perpetuate and resist relations of inequality (Healy and Hampshire, 2002). On the other hand, Robert Putnam developed an interesting theory of Social Capital where he stated that social capital refers to nature and scale of a wide variety of informal networks and formal civic organizations (Poder, 2011). Robert Putnam with publication of his book titled “Bowling Alone: America’s Declining Social Capital” broadened the vision of social capital. He thus defines Social Capital, “Features of Social Organization such as networks, norms, social trust that facilitate coordination, cooperation for mutual benefit (Poder, 2011).” He believes that social capital is an important ingredient for nurturing the civic virtues. Here civic virtue is characterized by a society in which citizens are well disposed towards trust, solidarity, reciprocity (Poder, 2011). The construction of the notion of civic culture for Putnam is founded on the idea that from associations emerge norms of reciprocity that enable societies to operate well (Poder, 2011). For him, voluntary associations which constitute the essence of what he calls thereafter “networks” are thus the center of a dynamic generating citizenship, cooperation and democratic performance within societies (Poder, 2011). On the other hand, James Coleman defines Social Capital by its function. He states that social capital is not a single entity but a variety of different entities, with two elements in common: they all consist of some aspect of social structures, and they facilitate certain actions of actors whether persons or corporate actors within the structure (Poder, 2011). Social capital is dependent upon existence of trust, norms, networks which over a period of time, tend to be self-reinforcing and cumulative (Sabatini, 2006). Thus, Social Capital appears in forms characterised by trust, norms, values and reciprocal relationship. For Coleman, social capital is created and destroyed by social relationships among individuals. It is neither a public good because it is not in one’s best interest to invest in this type of capital (Poder, 2011). It is no more a club good since individuals do not need to adhere to a club to benefit from it (Poder, 2011). It is owned by anyone who benefit from it. It is an attribute of the social structure in which people are inserted in reciprocal relationship. Coleman considers the social capital as a tool to establish the link between micro and macro sociological phenomena. It is more perceived as an attribute of individuals in a social space defined by their personal networks rather than as a collective good usable by all (Poder, 2011). It is in this stream that the study of the social networks gives place to a conceptualization of social capital (Poder, 2011).
According to Lin, a structure where positions are prioritized on a hierarchical basis according to the resources held by individuals, therefore, the more there will be levels within the structure, the more opportunities will be created (Poder, 2011). According to Lin, Social Capital is ingrained in social resources. It results from the investment of an individual in its relations with others. The Social Capital is governed by both relational resources and structure of relations in the network. On the other hand, Burt’s viewpoint over social capital is different from that of Lin. Social capital is defined here by taking advantage of information that others do not have, to control the actions of others without letting his own actions controlled, so that the others must go through him (Poder, 2011). Similarly, Social Capital has been defined by Pierre Bourdieu also. He has exhibited a contrast picture as compared to Coleman. According to Pierre Bourdieu, the Social Capital is the aggregate of actual and potential resources which are linked to the possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance or recognition; or, in other words, linked to the belonging to a group, and defined as agents who are not only endowed with common properties but are also united by permanent and useful connections (Poder, 2011). He also stated that the existence of a network’s connections is not a natural gift instead the product of a setting up which is essential for producing durable and useful links (Poder, 2011). For Bourdieu, social capital is acquired and is available only to those who provide efforts in this direction. According to Bourdieu, social capital is very much dependent upon person who holds it. He perceives social relations as relations between individuals enrolled in various social groups which allows him to ask the question of the articulation of social capital between these groups (Poder, 2011). In his view, Social Capital differs from other forms of capital viz. economic, cultural and symbolic because it allows distinguishing differences in status and position between groups and may be called capital in the sense that it results from relationships established with a precise aim and that there is an idea of renunciation to actual benefit for a later one (Poder, 2011).

Robison defines social capital as, “a person’s or group’s sympathy towards another person or group that may produce a potential benefit, advantage and preferential treatment for another person beyond that expected in an exchange of relationships (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009).

Quibria reviewed different definitions and comments concluding that social capital is an individual asset that comes from access to networks and social connections, whereas
others view it as a shared asset that resides in a homogenous collective entity such as a community with common interests and shared values (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009).

Social capital is a multidimensional construct containing various forms and functions. Encompassing different view, social capital can be regarded as a collective asset in the form of social relations, shared norms, and trust that facilitate cooperation and collective action for mutual benefits (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009). It is a capital asset produced through actors’ investment, endowing investors to use as credits by virtue of connections. Social Capital requires enabling conditions such as increased awareness of communities, increase in mutual trust, empowerment in resolving conflicts (Mukherjee and Dasgupta, 2005). Social relations are regarded as an asset of an individual- a resource in the form of information and trust that actors can draw once accumulated (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009). Specifically, social capital involves informal social relations, memberships in social networks and groups, civic engagements (volunteering), community and organisational participation (volunteering), trust in the people and institutions, and norms of reciprocity (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009). It is a collectively-owned resource generated through individuals' shared norms, values, attitudes and behaviour that produces mainly a positive influence on economic development (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009).

1.4 Evolution of Social Capital:

Although the terminology of social capital is relatively new, the concept refers to well-established ideas in the social sciences. This includes the notion that social connections contribute to quality of life and, further, that these connections are related in a complex way to economic, political and cultural outcomes (Healy and Hampshire, 2002). Although the concept of Social Capital is not very old yet, its origin is traced back to sociological foundations. Social reformers in a range of disciplines, including education and urban planning, were among the earliest exponents of this concept (Healy and Hampshire, 2002). The intellectual history of the concept of social capital can be traced back to Karl Marx (1818—1883), Emile Durkheim (1858—1917), Georg Simmel(1858—1918), John Dewey (1859—1952), and Max Weber (1864-1920); these scholars emphasise the role of culture in economic development-an implicit use of the idea of social capital (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009). The concept “Social Capital” is traced to its appearance in the book by Lyda Hanifan in 1916 which referred it to those
tangible assets count for most in the daily lives of people: namely goodwill, fellowship, sympathy, and social intercourse among the individuals and families who make up a social unit (https://www.oecd.org/insights/37966934.pdf). After long disappearance of the concept, the concept of social capital was reinvented by a team of Canadian sociologists while studying urban communities by Homans for a theory of social interactions, by Jacobs while discussing urban life and neighbourliness, and by Loury for studying income distribution (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009). This concept can also be witnessed in 1980s and 1990s where thinkers ranging from James Coleman, Pierre Bourdieu and Robert Putnam explicitly described about it. Different authors defined social capital in different ways reflecting their own interest. Coleman associated this capital with supportive family and community bonds. Even in Australia, this concept got popular and a substantial debate emerged in Australia over it. It has influenced over social policy and program development at federal, state and local government levels in Australia (Healy and Hampshire, 2002). In the area of Social Capital, the contribution may be attributed to Francis Fukuyama also who offered more specific and significant definition of social capital. He defines social capital as the existence of a certain set of informal values or norms shared among members of a group that permit cooperation among them (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009). But in last 20 years, Social Capital has become a subject of renewed interest. The current success of this concept is thus increased by a series of studies associating social capital to phenomena such as the growth tragedy in Africa, the mortality crisis in Russia and the success of grazing land management in Ethiopia (Poder, 2011).

1.5 Types of Social Capital:

The Social Capital has been categorised into three parts; Bonding Social Capital, Bridging Social Capital and Linking Social Capital. Apart from it, the Social Capital has been categorised into various other forms like Strong and Weak Social Capital and Horizontal and Vertical Social Capital. The Bonding Social Capital is characterised by dense interactions, collective action within homogenous group of people (Lo, 2010). It is developed based on family and kinship, religious beliefs and same ethnicity, etc. Although bonding social capital strengthens norms of reciprocity, solidarity and trust, it tends to be inward-looking, excluding other social groups with diverse backgrounds (Lo, 2010). The bonding social capital strengthens the micro level interaction among its
members. It is more inward-looking, protective, and exercising close membership, and therefore good for under-girding specific reciprocity and mobilising informal solidarity (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009). Bonding promotes communication and relationships necessary to pursue common goals. Moreover, it influences creation and nurturing of community organisations, like self-help groups and local association (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009). In other words, it is referred to relationship among members of a network who are similar in some form (Hawkins and Maurer, 2012).

Bridging Social Capital refers to relationship among people who are dissimilar in their age, socio-economic status, ethnicity and education (Hawkins and Maurer, 2012). It promotes interactions between diverse and heterogeneous groups of people. It is more outward-looking and establishes bridging networks with distant friends, associates and community organizations, and its external effects are likely to be positive (Lo, 2010). Bridging social capital refers to more distant ties of like persons, such as loose friendships and workmates. Often people in bridging networks differ on key personal characteristics. Bridging is more outward-looking, civically engaged, narrows the gap between different communities and exercising open membership, and is, therefore, crucial to organising solidarity and pursuing common goals (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009). Bridging is crucial for solving community problems through helping people to know each other, building relationships, sharing information, and mobilising community resources.

On the other hand, Linking Social Capital involves vertical relationship with those in authority whereas bonding and bridging social capitals link groups in horizontal networks (Lo, 2010). In a hierarchy with asymmetric power relations, linking social capital strengthens ties between state and organizations and the communities (Lo, 2010). Apart from providing social credentials and influencing the agents, linking social capital may facilitate the flow of information (Lo, 2010). Businessmen with linking social capital are placed in an advantaged position to obtain privilege and restricted information for business transactions (Lo, 2010). It reaches out to people in dissimilar situations, such as those who are entirely outside of the community (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009). Linking social capital may involve networks and ties of a particular community with states or other agencies (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009).
Strong and Weak Social Capital are nothing but strength of social ties. Strong ties refer to close, persistent and binding relationship which exists with families whereas weak ties refer to more casual, temporary and contingent relationship (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009). Weak ties link people to the broader communities and to a wider range of potential resources (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009). It can serve as channel in mobilising resources, ideas, and information to promote collective actions in the community (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009).

Social Capital has also other forms in terms of horizontal and vertical networks. While Horizontal Social Capital refers to lateral ties between people of homogenous character and status, Vertical Social Capital characterize the ties between people of different hierarchy. While horizontal social capital operates through shared norms and values, vertical social capital operates through formal hierarchical structure (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009).

In the area of social capital formation, the role of NGO is quite immense. It has started delivering services to people in order to gain their trust and confidence. The NGOs provide people with services in order to fulfil their immediate needs. Some scholars consider NGO as policy entrepreneurs who seek to influence and change policy in innovative ways. The NGOs foster the notion of social capital in order to consolidate the fragmented communities. They are adept at developing cross-cutting and horizontal links in the society which brings cohesiveness among people. The NGOs have been developing the social fabric of wider community through promoting learning among local organizations. These institutions collaborate with local actors. The degree of civic engagement through NGOs leads to development of social capital (Abom, 2004). In the words of Putnam, social capital is produced by the continuous exercise of community norms and organisational culture. Put simply, social capital is the stock of norms of reciprocity, trust, and organising among a designated group or groups—a battery driving the social organising and networking process (Abom, 2004). The development protagonists find-out that social capital is strengthened through institutional approaches and incentives for collective action. This strategy, implemented mainly by Northern-led and Northern-funded NGOs, aims to relieve the immediate suffering of the ‘poor’ and meet their short-term visible needs in the hope that the ‘poor’ may get themselves back onto their feet to ‘escape poverty’ (Abom, 2004). Buckland finds that NGO interventions enhanced community norms and networks, but mainly between the NGO practitioner and
the participants as opposed to social capital within and among the community of participants (Abom, 2004). Since the late 1980s, more NGOs have become involved in lobbying, mediation, advocacy, and civic education, with the aim of strengthening the capacity of local organisations (Abom, 2004). Grassroots Support Organisations (GRSOs), or what Carroll (1992) calls ‘intermediary NGOs’, have been shown to foster social capital by working together with people and communities in providing capacity-building support to foster collective action and the extension of cooperative bargaining norms and networks (Abom, 2004). Furthermore, NGOs have been identified as catalysts of social capital across the state–society divide by promoting information sharing, exposing government to neglected grassroots perspectives, and acting as agents of partnership (Abom, 2004). The NGOs following intervention strategies based on capacity building, advocacy and incentives to collective action, play a significant role in social capital construction (Abom, 2004). In the words of Carroll, intermediary NGOs foster social capital through working together with people and communities in providing capacity building support (Abom, 2004). The NGOs with support from grassroots people facilitate the development issues in the area. They are considered to be preferred channel for service provision. The NGOs galvanize support and shape, implement, and monitor national and international commitments. They often act as alternative conduits through which external and transnational agencies deliver funds and expertise to local communities (Silliman, 1999).

1.6 Role of NGO in Social Capital:

The Non-Governmental Organization is quite instrumental in mobilizing the community for fostering of social capital. It contributes towards social activism through street campaigns, network building. The NGO as a social force facilitates collective action and people’s mobilization for the purpose of achieving the desired objectives (Villi, n.d). The NGOs are deploying various people-oriented as well as people-centered strategies, and these organizations build rapport with the people and mobilize them (Villi, n.d). The NGOs play in making the people environmentally aware and sensitive to take part in the development process (Villi, n.d). These institutions raise voice of the marginalized communities through campaigns, advocacy programs, social action. The contribution of NGO may be witnessed for locating human resources in the area of development discourse, human rights protection across globe (http://shodhganga.
inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/7094/10/10_chapter%202.pdf). In India, the NGOs have played a very crucial role in providing services and monitoring the groups involved in various political mobilizations. The NGO demonstrates a participatory alternative to traditional government programs in which a government agency delivered services to farmers without any community involvement (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/7094/10/10_chapter%202.pdf). The NGO staffs are trained to manage substantial monitoring and data evaluation for larger community mobilization (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/7094/10/10_chapter%202.pdf). The NGOs are alternative agencies in promoting awareness, change in the society. They have been instrumental in creating awareness and implementing development programmes in agriculture, watershed development, women’s empowerment, education, health and family welfare (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/7094/10/10_chapter%202.pdf). The NGO has been quite active in mobilizing the downtrodden community. The NGOs induce shift in the entire development paradigm and incentivize the contributor in development arena. They instil in their members and subjects, habits of cooperation, solidarity, public spiritedness (Degli and Grimalda, 2012). In one of the studies, it has been shown that the NGOs organize even forest dwellers to assert their traditional forest rights. Even the NGOs educate the people about causes of poverty. It assists them through organizing people based on participatory approach. The NGOs ensure that the people participate in economic planning and development process (Suharko, 2007). The NGOs attempt to understand the real base of community mobilization. People trust on NGO more than they do on members of their own community (Islam, 2016). The empowerment of the community especially of the poor people is stated to be the prime goal of NGO. The NGOs function as mediating agency between the people and the state. This volunteerism in India especially in the area of mass mobilization is relegated to Gandhian era where the hegemony of bigger corporations was challenged by the grass root communities (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/7094/10/10_chapter%202.pdf). The NGOs play the crucial role of main tributary to community development. The NGOs play a significant role in socio-economic upgradation of the society. The NGOs improve the access of people to the services provided by the state (Suharko, 2007). They influence various policy decisions for growth of poor people. Clark states that NGOs assist citizens in finding out activities of the government which might affect them (Suharko, 2007). They use advocacy and political influence to hold local officials...
accountable for activities promoting the people’s interest. The NGOs play the pivotal role in complementing the state in some crucial areas like service-delivery, advocacy and democratic governance. They also assist in developing strategies for funding for local people and various not-for-profit making activities. NGOs seek resources in order to bridge societal gaps. In a survey done in Cambodia in 2012, it was found that over 52,650 local staff are employed with NGOs across the country, which has contributed to the national socio-economic and human resource development significantly (Khieng, 2014). The NGOs have contributed in the area of various vocational training, income generation programmes in the state. The NGOs benefit the communities through socio-political and economic development. The NGOs play the role in counteracting the hurdles in garnering mass support also (Heinrich, 2001). The democratic procedure within the NGO leads to development of cohesiveness among members which also percolate among its beneficiaries. NGOs can play a crucial role in providing effective channels of interest representation for the marginalized sections of the population thereby assisting in integrating them into the democratic political system (Heinrich, 2001). They also establish certain level of opportunity for the common people characterised by mutual reciprocity, cohesiveness and trust among them. The NGOs are more cooperative and institutionalised towards garnering mass support (Heinrich, 2001). They promote the civil society through a network of networks. The NGOs promote the formal and informal power distribution among the people (Heinrich, 2001). NGOs make use of other formal democratic procedures including annual general meetings, regular board meetings, and consultations with staff and members for generating internal cohesiveness among its members (Heinrich, 2001). In a study of Anti-Apartheid movement in South Africa, it was found that NGOs bring people from various social backgrounds together on a constant and voluntary basis while mitigating racial cleavages among the community members (Heinrich, 2001). It removes the racial cleavages through coordinating with people across the lines of various social hierarchy. NGOs are therefore able to play a role in providing cross-cutting memberships, thereby diminishing the saliency of the racial cleavage (Heinrich, 2001). They have also become increasingly aware of the potentially divisive impact of racial identities (Heinrich, 2001). Because of the implementation of neoliberal fiscal policies and the prevailing power of civil servants aligned to forces of the former apartheid regime, the state seems unable to put an effective pro-poor policy into practice (Heinrich, 2001). Thus, it may be deciphered that the NGOs are not only able to perform the role of mitigating
societal differences but mobilizing the state forces for executing pro-people policies. These efforts create a sense of belongingness towards the state and get mobilized very well. The Carnegie Commission on the Prevention of Deadly Conflict pointed out in its 1997 report, "Non-governmental organizations at their best provide a vast array of human services unmatched by either government or the market, and they are self-designated advocates for action on virtually all matters of public concern (Nelson, 2007)." The NGOs play the voice for common people through advocacy and awareness raising programs. It also acts as mediator and facilitator. NGOs also influence the emergence of new business models, new corporate accountability mechanisms and institutional structures, non-traditional cross-sector alliances, and changes in the public policy environments or framework conditions under which certain industries operate (Nelson, 2007). The NGOs have become an active voice in civic society. The NGOs focus on addressing various conditions of governance through multi-lateral points of view. NGOs have played a major role in shaping public expectations of the extractive sector and influencing both corporate and government actions through all four modes of engagement (Nelson, 2007). In community organization, they have established public advocacy campaigns, facilitated lawsuits, supported local community organizations and indigenous peoples’ groups by providing them with training, funds and networks, and engaged in governmental and inter-governmental consultation processes (Nelson, 2007). Many NGOs have pro-actively worked in the area of raising public awareness regarding socio-economic and environmental conditions of various companies across globe. NGOs have often played a crucial role in ‘shining the spotlight’ on some of the most egregious of these cases, and in agitating, demonstrating for the people’s cause (Nelson, 2007). The NGOs influence the state in various aspects through bringing accountability and transparency in its functionality. The NGOs seek to create the legitimacy and support it needs to survive. The NGOs protect the rights of common people and ensure that their interests are not subjugated by any third party (Nelson, 2007). These NGOs contribute in the sphere of social mobilization through various social auditing activities also. The NGOs ensure the individual as well as collective responsibility for better governance. The NGOs constructively work together to enhance each others’ learning and performance, explore innovative and shared solutions to complex socio-economic or environmental challenges, and to strengthen public sector governance (Nelson, 2007). The NGOs improve both the public sector and private sector accountability towards people which also signify their mobilization. In one of studies done in Kenya and
Bangladesh, it is found out that the NGOs are contributing towards social mobilization of women through holding political and social empowerment programs, holding them mobile in various facets of life. The NGOs exert influence over community through developing informal relations (Nelson, 2007).

1.7 Statement of the Problem:

The Research Study is an attempt to highlight the contribution of NGOs in mobilizing social capital. The NGOs have been involved in various development programmes through coordination of people. In order to accumulate collective opinion, NGOs mobilize marginalized groups through creation of micro-level institutions. In one of studies by Courville and Piper (2004), it is found-out that NGOs typically give voice to marginalized people and attempt to construct alternatives. Their engagement is in organizing people and bringing their support towards their development programmes. The NGOs are known for collectivist tendencies and facilitate people’s participation in any activity. Even in case of conflict situation, the role of NGO is immense. Through strengthening of a robust social network, they empower the poor and marginalized sections of society. NGOs are considered to be propagator of grass-root people’s development. Due to fostering of robust social network among fragmented people, the NGOs are very adept at augmenting collective support towards an issue in the society. They create the bonds of solidarity among people which overcomes internal strife also.

In another study by Mohammad Samaun Safa (2006) in Bangladesh, it is elucidated that NGOs are successful in alleviating human misery through community participation. It is also excerpted in the given study that NGOs end up in fostering community based coalition among these communities. They also help in advancing the interests of various people irrespective of their caste and class affiliation. The participatory approach of NGOs paves the way for generation of social capital. They reduce uncertainty, support collective action and structure social interaction in particular ways. They establish coordinated effort at micro level in the community in order to mobilize mass support towards an issue.

But all these studies surrounding NGO and Social Capital are inconclusive towards role of NGOs in mobilizing social capital in heterogeneous communities. They have not outlined the contribution of NGOs in augmenting mass support in diverse communities on various lines. According to Montgomery (2000), NGO tends to be homogenous
organizations of like-minded individuals joining for a common cause which promotes bonding social capital. But the role of NGOs lies in conciliating diverse interests also as expressed by different sections of society. In all these affairs, the augmentation of mass support remains a challenge.

Therefore, the present Research study seeks to carve-out various factors through which NGOs are able to integrate heterogeneous communities in the society. This study is able to pin-point a centre of equilibrium where divergent interests of heterogeneous communities may be conciliated. The structural and cognitive factors of social capital have been clearly mentioned in the study. The study has focussed on key instrument like community-based collectives as supportive element towards mobilization of social capital. These collectives have helped the respective NGOs in developing an environment based on mutual bonding, trust, cooperation, solidarity in the society. They have also assisted in reducing differences and uniting people on common developmental issues. Thus, the respective research study has attempted to elucidate over these factors.

1.8 Organization of the Research Study:

The entire Research Study is divided into seven chapters. The Introduction chapter deals with broad outline of the subject as well as objectives of this Research study. It specifies the theoretical construct of the subject along with statement of the Research Problem. It also focusses on field of the study and a brief over methodology used for this research.

The Second chapter deals with review of existing literature on NGO and Social Capital. It depicts various schools of thought with reference to NGO and Social Capital. It focusses on various studies done in the area of mobilizational role of NGO. It has highlighted over vital role of NGO in fostering social capital. In addition, this chapter has brought light over components of social capital and its significance. It has attempted to carve-out the association between NGO and social capital.

The third chapter is dealing with methodological aspects of this Research Study. It has explained the Rationale of the Study, Aim, Objectives, Research design, Universe, Sampling, Tools of data collection, its Process, Analysis of data, Operational definition, Ethical issues and Limitations of the Research Study. It has also dealt with field of the Study which consists that of the state and respective districts. This chapter has provided operational definition for some key terms in the Research study. This chapter has shown
various steps taken in data collection phase. The elaborate description of methodology of this study has shown direction of research.

The fourth chapter has explained the Profiles of NGOs and respondents. It has depicted the characteristics of respective NGOs. Apart from it, this chapter has depicted age, gender, religion, caste, income status and occupation of the respondents.

The fifth chapter has brought light over programmes and approaches of respective four NGOs in both the districts. In Deoghar district, it has covered programmes and activities of two NGOs namely ASSEFA (Association for Serva Seva Farms) and NEEDS (Network for Enterprise Enhancement and Development Support). Similarly, in Dumka district, the intervention activities of NGOs namely PRADAN (Professional Assistance for Development Action) and BADLAO Foundation have been studied. The chapter has highlighted the mobilization strategies of these four NGOs. It has elaborated over formation of community-based collectives by these NGOs for successful implementation of their programmes. It has showcased the formation of collectives and various advocacy activities for garnering mass support. At the programmes and intervention level, the mass mobilization strategy of these NGOs is explicit.

Furthermore, the sixth chapter has focussed on empirical study regarding this phenomena. It has highlighted over factors responsible for mobilization of social capital. Through in-depth data collection, the role of NGOs in mobilizing social capital is well-depicted. Through frequency method, it has showcased the majority of responses regarding people’s participation in collectives, their attachment with various social networks, strategies of NGOs in formation of community-based collectives. It has also highlighted the leadership role of these NGOs in bringing solidarity among people. The interchange of ideas, norms and values between NGO and community-based collectives due to participatory approach, is also depicted in this chapter. It has been qualitatively analysed also through Focus Group Discussion (FGD) and Case Study.

Finally, the seventh chapter has attempted to discuss over its findings of the research and conclude. It has elaborated over both theoretical reviews and empirical findings. It has brought key highlights over empirical findings. It has also depicted relevance of social capital for professional social work. At the end of this chapter, the Researcher has suggested some views regarding the same. It has recommended improvement in functions of NGOs for their better performance. The scope for further research has also been drawn.
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