Chapter-2
Review of Literature

The present chapter attempts to carve-out the detailed review of existing literature on concept of NGO and Social Capital. There have been numerous studies on NGOs and their role in mobilizing masses across social science discipline. It highlights various schools of thought regarding NGO and Social Capital. Some schools of thought focus on synergy of NGOs and Social Capital in furthering development. In their view, NGOs undertake activities for accumulating social capital for further investment in development arena. Therefore, the researcher has dealt with both theoretical and empirical literature for outlining overview of various dimensions of both the concepts. The principal aim of this chapter is to bring light over plurality and interrelatedness surrounded around NGO and Social Capital.

2.1 Review of Studies related to NGO:

The NGOs are quite successful in terms of reaching the poor. They have several innovative approaches through which they serve the marginalized population (Tendler, 1982). They attempt to involve community organization for avoiding potential problems. NGOs can develop a participatory approach to their economic development efforts. Associations can be used not only as channels of distribution of credit and training, but as partners in the development of integral and long-term strategies for the small business sector. They are also able to build existing forms of organization and develop programmes to increase organizational capacity of these associations. NGOs assist in developing collectives of various target groups (Sahley, 1995). They mobilize people for achievement of certain objectives. Being linked with associational life, NGOs work towards promotion of community culture (Sahley, 1995). It is in such associational contexts that the social capital needed for democracy is being formed. These organizations also work across societies, i.e., they help shape norms at the level of society as much as at that of the state. They have had a marked influence on how people in these countries view development (Hyden, 1997). They have helped shape the character of public opinion and public life. The international NGOs tend to focus on the global level at the expense of their potential contribution in fostering associational life at the national level. It is also stated that NGO serves as an alternative to the state. It
encourages people to act autonomously to achieve their goals, thereby contributing to the creation of social capital (Hyden, 1997).

2.2 Categorization of NGO:

NGOs have been classified into various categories based on its nature of functionality. They are stated to be functioning as per their determined state of roles. These classifications are Operational NGO, Advocacy NGO, Campaigning NGO (Senbeta, 2003). The NGOs have strived very hard towards amelioration of underdevelopment and responding to various challenges. These different types of NGOs have worked in this direction through their determined functions. The primary function of Operational NGO is to implement development projects. Their focus is primarily on services delivery. They are providing services to development partners at state, national and international levels. On the other hand, Advocacy NGOs are aimed at fighting for a specific cause. These institutions are adept at raising awareness, knowledge through lobbying among target groups. They advance changes in policy framework of the state moving away from catalytic role of service delivery. According to Green and Matthias, NGOs are split into various categories like service oriented NGO, research NGO, supportive NGO, NGO for policy advocacy, funding NGO and co-ordinating NGO (Senbeta, 2003). The Advocacy NGOs are targeting the institution-building and bringing some systemic change (Senbeta, 2003). In terms of strategies of development, Korten (1990) has emphasized over four types of NGOs like Welfare Organization, Community Development Organization, Sustainable Systems Development Organization and People’s Organization (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/34847/7/07_chapter%202.pdf). On the other hand, Elliot has identified three types of NGOs like Welfare NGO, Developmental NGO and Empowerment NGO (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/103687/11/11_chapter%205.pdf). The Welfare NGO has been quite old which focusses on amelioration of the indicators of poverty and underdevelopment while ignoring the causes. It assists the marginalized community through assistance. On the other hand, Developmental NGOs focus on mobilization of local community. In the words of Korten, the strategies of Developmental NGOs are second generational(http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/34847/7/07_chapter%202.pdf). Similarly, the NGO based on empowerment approach works both on micro and macro factors. It establishes the congenial political and institutional environment. Cernea
argued that NGOs embodied a philosophy which recognizes the centrality of people in development policies (Kumar and Prakash, 2016). Poor people are often found to have been bypassed by existing public services, since many government agencies faced resource shortages and their decision-making processes were often captured by elites (Lewis and Kanji, 2009). There are some schools of thought who classify NGOs on the basis of heterogeneity and homogeneity. According to one school of thought, NGOs constitute a heterogeneous set of institutions, and not just because of the different sectors in which they work: gender, racial/ethnic, development, environment, etc but also by social characteristics of their participants (Senbeta, 2003). They constitute grassroot operations connected with social movements aimed at challenging and transforming unequal social structures (Senbeta, 2003). Some of NGOs are locally funded while others are internationally funded. As a result of need for funding even the international NGOs have been classified into different tiers. Another school of thought suggests NGOs as committed towards grass-root development subsumed under welfare activities. The NGOs are split on the lines of Need and Rights also. While the Need-based NGO seeks to maintain more objectivity in identifying need and in locating resources for solving the same, the Right-based NGO is concentrated more on outcome and process goals (Lewis and Kanji, 2009). This category of NGO is premised on assumption that charity and service-delivery may not annihilate the socio-economic adversity. The existence of Right-based NGOs is based on international statute and covenant. Various international organizations are categorized on the basis of their specialized effort. Some of these organizations are classified into localized, informal, legal entities.

2.3 NGO and Social Movements:

In development discourse, the NGO and the Social movement have been an integral component. NGO and Social movement are relegated to different spaces. Social movements and NGO are two different sub-sets of civil society. NGOs represent a substitution for social movements (Esteves, et. al, 2009). It is also stated that NGOs have those kinds of individuals who are committed to construction of more just and equal society (Esteves, et. al, 2009). In the current phase of globalization, NGO and Social movement have taken their intervention at international level. As compared to NGO, Social movement is a conglomeration of masses in a more organized manner (Esteves,
et. al, 2009). Its principal aim is to transform norms, beliefs to remove social disabilities. It pursues the social ends through various strategies like boycott, marches. The Social movements bring change in the systemic structures and promote change in the current world. McCarthy states that social movements deploy resources necessary for change in the existing system (Edwards and Kane, 2014). It has capability to question the structural issues and carry-out a sustained effort for improved system. Social movements strive to achieve some good measures for the marginalized sections of society (Edwards and Kane, 2014). In other words, they encourage the citizens of the country to fight for their rights. The participation of local masses lead to expansion of expertise and knowledge to tackle the menace. The social movement has potential to resist the multi-national corporations from dominating the state policies. It may be termed as popular face of democratic control. The Social movement also creates the alternatives to neo-liberal state. The social movement has emerged out of need for challenging neo-liberal economic structure. The Social movement has great potential for empowering the marginalized communities and reducing the poverty (Fernando, 2012). It always intends to control resources equitably and question the dominant economic paradigm. Social movement plays an important role in nation-building (Fernando, 2012). They imply an organised citizenry motivated and empowered to mobilise behind and carry on a sustained campaign in defence of their interests and rights (Fernando, 2012). They are active in the area of national policy making and developing multi-actor global governance system. It is also source of early warning on emerging issues since they tend to react to members on the ground (Fernando, 2012). Social movements tend to be unstructured, non-institutional and characterised by more nebulous and uncoordinated cyclical forms of collective action (Fernando, 2012). It consists of mobilization of common people and popular protest surrounding the issues. The Social movement influences the state to formulate the plan for betterment of the masses. At the international stage, the social movement has emerged as force to challenge norms (Fernando, 2012). Sometimes, the power of social movement emerges as change agent for transforming the global order. The Social movement works on the lines of driving force for certain systemic changes (Fernando, 2012). On the other hand, the NGO acts as formal and structured civil society organization. NGOs can be defined very broadly “as all organisations that are not central governments and that were not created by inter-government decision” but the term is more usually used to describe public benefit NGOs– a type of civil society organisation that is formally constituted to provide a
benefit to the general public or the world at large, through advocacy or the provision of services (Fernando, 2012). The Social movement as different from NGO are not homogenous. The Social movement raise the voices of those people who are under-represented in the society. Some scholars term social movement as collective action entailing the pursuit of a common objective by joint action. They are also considered to be lacking stable funding source (Fernando, 2012). The origin of social movement may be relegated to neo-liberal economic structure which has jeopardised the existence of the proletariat. It concurrently challenges the state’s hegemony over masses and supports the voice of the down-trodden community people. The success story of social movement may be relegated to Anti-Apartheid movement of South Africa where it played a very crucial role in organizing the community against racism. In neo-liberal phase, the social movement has been lobbying outside the realm of the state for the purpose of seeking attention at international front (Della Porta and Diani, 2006). Social movement’s protagonists argue that neo-liberalism is indeed reversible and that social movement and civil society seem to lobby differently for catering to interests of their subjects of neo-liberal repression in a different manner (Wikan, 2015). The Social movement justifies the action taken in the interest of the larger public. In contrast to social movement, the NGOs form an epitome of legitimacy for democratic rule. The NGOs leads to conflation of the normative with the empirical. They educate the general masses about systemic elements, structural modifications. The protagonists of the Social movement assert that the NGOs have certain biases towards system which is not applicable in case of social movement. According to Kaldor, civil society is a neo-liberal conception whereas social movements are activist conceptions (Mitrani, 2013). The changes in political opportunity structure signify the success of any movement. It transforms the behaviour of individuals and motivate them for some betterment. Social movement remains restricted towards mobilization of the community for certain drastic changes. Therefore, the source of credibility for social movement lies in grassroot community. In other words, social movement is confrontational in its nature. Several social movement ranging from Kerala Shastra Sahitya Parishad (KSSP), Narmada Bachao Andolan (NBA), Chipko movement are results of unrest surrounded around mainstream development discourse. The Social movements are inclusive in nature and embody heterogeneous feature of accommodating everybody’s interest. These movements never accept the current development paradigm and keep people’s interest at priority. People’s movements are emerging out of peculiar contradictions within societies and cultures in transition (http://www.egyankosh.ac.
They may also arise out of contradictions and weaknesses that appear in the role of the state and in the division of labour resulting from the intervention of transnational capital. The new social movements are also bringing about the horizontal integration of people instead of hierarchical integration.

2.4 NGO and Civil Society:

The notion of Civil Society has emerged from Tocquevillian tradition of celebrating the associational pluralism in the U.S. The Civil Society is said to be conglomeration of liberalism and associationalism. It is conceived to be the domain of social associations which may control the repressive power of the state. The Civil Society organizations assist the democratic regime in flourishing due to its inclination towards people-centric approach. Civil Society provides citizens several opportunities to frame their collective identities and interests through forming voluntary interest groups and organizations. Civil Society spaces seem to provide its members prompts to recovery of social, economic power untenably held by the state and seen as being in the clutches of the state. Therefore, Civil society has various perspectives. One relates it as associated with economy while the other sees it located in the society independent of the state and the economy. Even Karl Marx excerpted that the civil society caters to the needs of the resourceful people. In the words of Antonio Gramsci, civil society is nothing but contributor of cultural and ideological capital for maintaining status quo of capitalism.
It is also a part of ethical life which acts as middle path between the family and the state. Several thinkers have termed the term “Civil Society” as safety valve. It reconciles various differential interests through peaceful means. The Civil Society may be called a process of mediation. The sphere of civil society includes not just economic institutions but social and civic institutions also. In the words of Pelczynski, “Civil Society in this sense is an arena in which modern man legitimately gratifies his self-interest and develops his individuality but also learns the value of group action, social solidarity and the dependence of his welfare on others which educate him for citizenship and prepare him for participation in the political arena of the state (Kumar, 1993).” Civil society has been said to be the creation of communal movement of the burghers of the late Middle Ages (Kumar, 1993). It is more of urbanized nature where the bourgeoisie community resides. Thus, the social structure of civil society is dissolved in its economic base. It strengthens the public sphere and challenges the state. In his book titled “Prison Notebooks”, Gramsci considers civil society as political and cultural hegemony of a social group (Kumar, 1993). Civil Society is not to be associated with economic structure instead, it is concerned with socio-political space. It is the arena of intellectual discourse. Civil Society remains the necessary practico-indicative concept to designate all those institutions and mechanism outside the boundaries of the state (Kumar, 1993). Therefore, Civil Society has a degree of autonomy. The Civil Society requires a unilinear formulation of public sphere. Civil Society seeks to be an alternative society with a weakened state (Kumar, 1993). The expansion of civil society is equated with realm of freedom. The Intellectual community nurtures the civil society in order to resist the repression of the state. The Civil Society protects its freedom from the repression of the state in numerous ways. Civil Society promotes pluralism and diversity in society (Kumar, 1993). The Civil Society connotes those residues which is left behind and creates the space of uncoerced human association. The Civil Society also embraces those associations which are related to social upliftment (Kumar, 1993). A strong civil society is considered to be panacea for eliminating socio-economic disruptions in the community. The engagement of citizens in the civil society promotes an environment of social harmony and reduces the chances of conflict (Cheema, et. al, 2010). The Civil society has been active in mobilizing the marginalized and vulnerable groups in the society. It also advocates for certain democratic changes. In checking the abuse of power by the state, the role of civil society has been quite immense. The power of civil society is also visible in case of advocating
for the rights of citizens in case of emergency (Cheema, et. al, 2010). The civil society serves as vanguard of decentralization, democratization and accountability for the common people. It shapes the public affairs where a common man may articulate his interest, sort-out their differences. The Civil Society also provides an institutional framework where people may exercise their social, economic and political rights. The access to information, freedom of expression in the civil society makes it more important. The civil society promotes creativity and innovation while encouraging pro-poor policies (Cheema, et. al, 2010). It plays the vital roles in national, regional and global governance. It is said to play a critical role in community development, skill enhancement also. The Civil society organizations perform the role of watchdog function also for the sake of improving quality of electoral process (Cheema, et. al, 2010). The civil society initiates the process of engagement of people in various developmental activities. The civil society network transcends the caste and class barrier. The Civil Society organization challenges the existing policy of the state and assist in carrying out task both horizontally and vertically (Cheema, et. al, 2010). The Civil Society assists in terms of identifying areas of reconciliation for the people. It also assists in terms of garnering mass support for any greater mass mobilization. The Civil Society also works on building network with diversified community to bring policy change. The Civil Society also works in the area of policy-oriented research for effective policy formulation. The Civil Society organization forms partnership with various other organizations to bring inter-sectoral coordination (Cheema, et. al, 2010). The Civil Society assumes its significance in the arena of holding accountability for public welfare and remain accountable towards them. The civil society is engaged in dialogue to identify priorities and holds government accountable towards people. The Civil Society Organizations play an important role in undermining the polarization process.

On the other hand, NGOs initiate the greater coordination mechanism between the state and the people. The NGO intervention in contrast to civil society is an outcome of 20th century. The NGOs are said to be reassessing the appropriate objectives of development. The NGOs challenge the status quo of the people. It reviews several institutional transition also (Bebbington, 1997). These NGOs are sources of alternative ideas about development; alternative actors who might be vehicles for implementing development alternatives; alternative ways of combating poverty and fostering political participation (Bebbington, 1997). NGO projects served as micro-experiments that would generate
strategies that could subsequently be scaled up through the policies and programs of such an alternative state (Bebbington, 1997). The NGO aims to implement more participatory approaches. This participatory approach is extended up to rural and village level development also. The NGOs are effective means of intervention at micro-level which takes its shape even at macro level. The NGOs are important vehicles of realization of policy which commits the poorer parts of the population to a slow but steady demise (Bebbington, 1997). They develop the capacity of common people to resist the repression of the state. The NGOs help strengthen and deliver technical services to both the people and the policy makers. It influences the general public through debates and public discussion. They are also considered to be special interest group. Some authors claim that the argument that NGOs' role is to "accompany" the popular sectors is a sufficient statement of mission (Bebbington, 1997). NGOs traditionally grounded their identity in their conceptions of development alternatives, their links to popular organizations, and their antagonistic relationship with the state (Bebbington, 1997). These NGOs put resistance towards the repressive policy of the state. The area of NGO operation is consultative also which suggests certain periodical changes in public policies. NGOs are those institutions who run social enterprises also. NGOs are increasingly looking to alternative forms of credit and financial services as a central instrument for rural development and poverty alleviation (Bebbington, 1997). NGOs first have to re-establish those social relationships with the sectors in whose cause they first emerged and on that basis build financing strategies and development alternatives (Bebbington, 1997). Non-governmental organizations can serve as alternatives to weak or inadequate democratic institutions, as avenues for more inclusive dialogues, and as conduits for disseminating information on activities and issues within the international system (Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu, 2002). Their role is to support campesino organizations in elaborating development alternatives and in building the capacity of those organizations to carry those alternatives forward (Bebbington, 1997). These NGOs also derive some assistance from external factors. The new forms of NGO participation have altered the nature of policy making at international stage. The NGOs leverage support from various domestic sources. The NGOs find it very easier to get support for mobilization of people. NGOs begin to address problems of institutional legitimacy, identity, sustainability and also the deeper challenge (Bebbington, 1997). NGOs broaden the base of democratic institutions through consensus building among the people. The NGOs focus on dynamic research activities and carve-out innovative ideas for resolving
modern problems. The NGOs strengthen the system of global policy making. The NGOs are instrumental in notifying the public, governments, and international organizations of critical new issues for many years (Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu, 2002). The NGOs enhance the ability to participate in later stages of decision-making (Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu, 2002). Non-governmental organizations are particularly useful in an operational context, as they can provide implementation tailored to specific conditions and can make the impossible as possible by doing what governments cannot or will not do (Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu, 2002). According to Thomas Weiss, “NGOs are capable of making sensitive or politically important information public—something that intergovernmental organizations often are reluctant or loathe to do because of their dependence on member states for resources (Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu, 2002). NGOs in many countries have been extremely effective in highlighting disparities in who bears environmental burdens and who gets the benefits of environmental investments (Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu, 2002).

The existence of civil society is negligible in the absence of NGO intervention. The very legitimacy of civil society depends upon intervention of NGO to ensure connectedness to the publics around the world and substitute for true popular sovereignty, which international bodies, devoid of elected officials, lack (Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu, 2002). Civil society participation requires a significant commitment of time as well as substantial financial resources from governments and intergovernmental bodies (Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu, 2002). Diversity within the global civil society community precludes the reaching of a consensus position that could be easily channeled into intergovernmental negotiations (Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu, 2002). It is imperative that NGOs explore innovative forms of networking through regional coalitions, for example, to help ensure the inclusion of a multitude of voices from developing countries and to make civil society involvement in governance more effective (Gemmill and Bamidele-Izu, 2002). In other words, the NGOs promote the expansion of civil society.

2.5 Features of NGOs in India:

The NGOs in India are involved in multifaceted activities ranging from reform activities to developmental activities. Some of their contributions are evident in case of rural infrastructure development also. In early decades of the 20th century, NGOs have played pro-active role in the fields of education, health, social welfare etc. According to
Chowdhury, “After Independence, leadership in India was provided by social workers who had worked under the leadership of Gandhi (Latha and Prabhakar, 2011).” These NGOs took part in various upgradation activities in shoulder with the contemporary government. During 1970s, the contribution of these NGOs has been witnessed in the area of mobilization of rural poor for various employment related schemes (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28859/8/08_chapter%203.pdf).

During 1980s, the NGOs moved towards providing technical assistance to the rural poor for growth of rural infrastructure. With the initiation of CAPART (Council for the Advancement of People’s Action and Rural Technology), the rural based NGOs got involved in various agri-based developmental activities. They engaged themselves in coordinating manpower in various government projects. They act as brokers of meanings and make excessive use of the language of 'expertise' and emphasised their links with international donors. The NGOs acquire more power and legitimacy for reaching a decision. NGO provides much needed services to their respective communities, and thorough planning during the start-up process is crucial to develop an effective and professional organization that is able to meet the myriad challenges faced by the world today (Rao and Jain, 2011). The NGOs act as pointer for the government. The NGOs have been active in multifarious activities from SHG formation to income generation, marketing and insurance works (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/26768/9/09_chapter%203.pdf). The NGOs can fetch success to attain its entity in the world and surely turn over a new leaf. The NGOs are very much active in assisting the people in availing the benefits of various employment generation schemes. It has also link related to improving the livelihood conditions of people. The NGOs are stated to improve the capacity of the government through various advocacy and social action based approaches (Ulleberg, 2009). These institutions attempt to foster the economic, social and political developments. The NGOs engage in developing civil society. The role of NGO in India is also of catalyst nature. They ensure the sustainability and accountability towards the people. It also works towards legitimizing the public policy (Ulleberg, 2009). Despite government reticence, NGOs can exert a considerable influence on education policy not only through an advocacy role during policy formulation but also at the local level in the implementation phase (Ulleberg, 2009). The contribution of NGO may be witnessed through their participation in various government schemes (Ulleberg, 2009). The NGOs have been quite instrumental in raising the issue of public interest through several public policy mechanism. The government is not only
able to take support of these organizations but also take them as subsidiary unit for assistance (Ulleberg, 2009). The NGOs encourage the formation of civil society which may develop the coordinated mechanism between the state and the people. The contribution of NGO in India in various developmental activities has been immense (Ulleberg, 2009).

### 2.6 NGO and Promotion of Social Cohesiveness:

As per view of Jerry Buckland (1998), NGOs are successful in achieving socio-economic improvement based on participation of people which reduces programme costs. NGOs are committed towards extension of social capital in the form of trust, reciprocity between community and practitioner. Successful NGOs are characteristic of robust social capital. In Bangladesh, NGOs have strived to promote social cohesiveness through various income-generation programmes. The encouragement by these NGOs to general public to participate into management and planning of local development, leads to social bond. NGO programmes do promote social capital among their target population. He further emphasizes that two NGOs like BRAC and Proshika have been able to foster social capital through facilitating cooperation among association members. Proshika and BRAC have enhanced the social capital assets of the landless poor, through intermediating networks with selected rural elite (Buckland, 1998).

In the words of Abdul Hye Mondal (2000), NGO is creating social capital through horizontal alliances among the marginalized groups. He, in his study of two NGOs of Bangladesh namely BRAC and PROSHIKA, has strived to insist on this fact that NGOs contribute to the process of social capital formation by infusing in the target group, the spirit of cooperation and activating the groups in cooperative activities and by inculcating in the group members the core human competencies to enlarge the opportunities for common people (Mondal, 2000). Even promotion of informal relations, recreational activities, group activities lead to strengthening of social capital. They generate common resources through various forms of collective action. NGOs foster social capital through building civil associations. NGOs represent real public interests (Fukuyama, 2000). It represents an excess politicisation of public life. It seeks coordinated action through possessing social networking. It encourages volunteerism through which society gets bound through reciprocal relationship. NGO encourages
social trust and cohesiveness through promoting voluntary associations (Fukuyama, 2000).

NGOs foster democratization process through increasing citizen representation. These organizations strive to enhance the performance of coordinated ventures through advocacy, capacity-building functions (Magno, 2001). They assist in maintaining regular communication between different groups in the community which leads to strong social cohesiveness. These organizations promote sustainable development through sharing of information, resources and expertise (Magno, 2001). NGOs act as intermediary and functional agents of conservation for people’s empowerment. They are relied by even regional government for assisting communities in various phases of training and organization (Magno, 2001). They are normally confronted with the task of mediating conflicts and building social capital to mobilize people for collective action purpose. NGOs facilitate valuable ways of cultivating social norms. It transforms individual norms into social norms (Larance, 2001). It provides the interaction that is essential for building the kind of group identity formation and trust that fosters social capital (Larance, 2001). Involvement with NGOs enables people alter traditional practices and enliven modernity.

In a study conducted by Brian L. Heuser (2005), it is found out that NGOs work as repository of social capital. He elaborates that NGOs foster social capital through acculturation process. It assists further in developing social cohesiveness which culminates into social capital. It is not mere membership in these voluntary organizations that creates social cohesion but it is active participation in these organizations. NGOs perform a variety of services and motivate people to participate at community level. As they are primarily of a philanthropic or ethical character, they operate purposely to the benefit of persons in societies. The ability of NGO to work at grass root level drives them to forge trust among indigenous people (Heuser, 2005).

NGOs facilitate transition. It strengthens social capital which helps in developing loose ties for development of social cohesion. The advocates of social capital argue that interrelationship of families and other networks, trust works more effectively and inclusively (North, 2006).

Anirudh Krishna (2007) in his study of villages expresses that NGO membership is quite associated with creation of social capital. He also states that group coordination through
NGOs leads to development of social cohesiveness. According to him, Self-initiated organizations, internally-developed rules and a particular form of local leadership helped raise social capital levels. He seeks to state that Social Capital is generated through competent leadership of voluntary associations. NGOs are significant for elevating the level of social capital (Krishna, 2007).

2.7 NGO and Mobilization of masses:

According to John Harriss (2001), NGOs being a constituent of civil society, work for strengthening of social capital. They raise awareness and do advocacy for the people. NGOs connect individuals inside community through mutual reciprocity. They play an essential role in enabling communities to become effective agents of livability. He has also argued that NGOs enhance transparency and increase flow of information between government and people. In his view, interpersonal trust is built up through membership in voluntary associations (Harriss, 2001). NGOs enjoy closer relationship with their constituents and as a result, are more likely to engender their trust and participation. They have special ability to work with and strengthen local institutions (Riley, 2002). Voluntary associations tend to engender a sense of shared responsibility for collective endeavours (Encarnación, 2002). As a result, a dense network of voluntary groupings contributes to effective social collaboration of the kind that extends onto the wider polity. NGOs as central to the limitation of state power, the empowerment of minorities, the promotion of democratic values among the citizenry, increased political participation in the new democratic system, and enhanced prospects for economic reform. He also states that NGOs involve citizens acting collectively in a public sphere thereby promoting collective action and solidarity (Encarnación, 2002).

NGOs have brought institutional changes at the grass root level to improve quality of life of people living in rural areas (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/7094/10/10_chapter%202.pdf). It leads to significant impact on poverty alleviation. He also asserted that these NGOs have been quite helpful in terms of removing socio-economic exploitation (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/36042/17/17_chapter%209.pdf). NGOs are concerned with influencing the state policy. They are endowed with various characteristics like volunteerism through which development organizations improve the quality of life of the marginalized communities. NGOs are concentrating on mobilization methodology like lobbying, advocacy,
networking, coalition-building through which social development is done (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/36042/17/17_chapter%209.pdf).

NGOs, through their awareness raising campaigns, voter education programs and policy advocacy, contribute to establishing the justice. NGOs thus are committed to alleviate poverty, reduce gender imbalance, and safeguard the environment. They have also channelled their resources and designed their strategies to emancipate the poor. It has helped raise awareness about impact of social oppression on human beings. It also prioritizes institutional agenda on human rights. NGOs have capacity to organize the poor people into homogenous groups and raise their concerns. He outlined the role of NGOs in Bangladesh in the area of women and children’s development. These organizations aspire to improve performance of the government and reach the goal of development (Zafarullah and Rahman, 2002). NGO is an important instrument of building social capital in a society as it provides socialization. It promotes collective action (D’ Silva and Pai, 2003).

Alex Demirovic (2003) in his study over functioning of NGOs, has emphasized over its various empirical aspects. NGOs are forms of self-organization with the purpose of articulating particular interests and organizing around particular issues in a wide variety of fields, such as education, women’s rights, food and water supply, environmental protection, health, and transport. They are grass-root organizations working for the interests of marginalized community. NGOs possess specialized, scientific or local knowledge. They belong to broad networks and have many contacts. They are trusted and respected by people at the grass roots. NGOs are internally democratic and do not pursue the vested interests of a particular group. NGOs not only extend the field to include additional interests but they also contribute to the transformation of the state (Demirovic, 2003).

NGOs mobilize various marginalized groups to accumulate a collective opinion (Courville and Piper, 2004). NGOs cooperate with various social movements and address issues of social and political concerns. It also facilitates coordination with various producers’ organizations, merchant groups for larger economic goals. NGO activists typically share a sense of solidarity that has been described by some sociologists as “a long-lasting emotion.” In his study, he found out that the NGOs typically give voice to marginalized people and attempt to construct alternatives. It also creates a form of power. The role of NGO as facilitator of social change sustains the empowerment
process. They engage in empowering through organizing and collective action. Social Capital is an issue of representation and collective identity. It is therefore, evident that these actions can lead to an enabling form of power whereby participation in NGO-created activities can help marginalized people expand their networks, build capacity, and gain new skills (Courville and Piper, 2004).

NGOs are efficient in handling conflict situation through their mobilization skill (Devine, 2006). NGOs are portrayed as democratic, progressive and empowering. NGOs are perceived to reflect the ideological neutrality associated with third sector activity and are expected to support a development process. NGOs are considered to possess emancipatory capability, collectivist tendencies and democratic inclinations, and are, therefore, well equipped to help pluralise society’s institutional arena and increase the possibilities for citizen’s participation. NGOs adopted development strategies to organise poor people into self-reliant groups capable of acting in favour of their own class interests and articulating a politics of class struggle. In his study of political system in Bangladesh, he asserted that NGOs herald the emergence of a political phenomenon previously unknown in Bangladesh, namely, non-party political formations capable of supporting the poor in their struggle for improved rights, entitlements and so forth. He also states that the poor depend on NGOs and the NGOs make good use of that dependence. In other words, it creates a good social networking among those poor people. NGO intervention has led to an appreciation of how these organisations map on to existing networks, mechanisms of reciprocity and support, and structured patterns of obligations and responsibilities (Devine, 2006).

NGOs form local level institutions for creation of social capital. It builds horizontal relationship among the less privileged groups of society. It is equipped with certain expertise in organizing local people through making them as stakeholders of its project (Nath, et al., 2010). NGOs are important agents for improving socio-economic conditions. NGOs are powerful players in the development interventions due to their proximity with community, their concern for human rights, gender empowerment, basic needs and sustainable development. Their flexible structure, functional efficiency, low cost and innovative approach brings them closer to masses. Their low cost in transferring appropriate technologies to fulfil local needs gives them added advantage for growth of social capital (Islam and Morgan, 2011). NGOs impinge over social capital from both its positive and negative perspectives. Through accumulation of social capital, NGOs
attempt to reduce the suffering of the poor based on mass-mobilization, people’s participation in development discourse (Islam and Morgan, 2011). NGOs harp on empowerment approaches and coordinate between the elites and the general masses. The findings of this research confirmed that NGOs worked very hard in the area of creating social capital. The NGOs have implied various strategies like group meetings, consultation, networking and inter-personal contact for strengthening social capital. Through all these respective tactics, they have contributed in the area of creation of mental confidence (Islam and Morgan, 2011). They have the capability to mobilize masses for fruitful channelization of their energy into development of community capacity. The social network seems to be very playful in the area of utilizing social, natural, cultural and human capitals through NGOs (Islam and Morgan, 2011). NGOs’ communication and knowledge-sharing practices strengthened linking capacity with outside agents, and improved critical awareness among the local producers about their needs (Islam and Morgan, 2011). It may assist the common masses to achieve broader community development which may ultimately lead to generation of strong social capital. Therefore, it comes to this conclusion that NGOs may strengthen social capital formation through participatory planning, sharing of values, norms, mutual benefits, provision of collective actions, creation of relation matrix (Islam and Morgan, 2011).

NGOs lead to such incentives and abilities which may organize marginalized sections of society in ways to effect social changes. NGOs tend to be more accountable to beneficiaries and are more focused on social change-oriented advocacy (Chahim and Prakash, 2013). At the highest level of the modern NGO sectors are advocacy networks-umbrella associations of civil society organizations engaged in largely national advocacy efforts. NGOs mobilize the poor and the marginalized and respond to their interests (Chahim and Prakash, 2013). NGOs fill a need to mobilize for a long-term, systemic change that is uncertain and difficult to accomplish. NGOs are guided by principled beliefs and serve as agents of social change (Chahim and Prakash, 2013). In other words, NGOs are drivers of grass-root community mobilization and lead to its inclusive growth.

2.8 NGO and Fostering of Social Network as well as Trust:

The formal social institutions overcome collective action obstacles through various methods like social rules, norms, values which facilitate cooperative behaviour. The members of civil society motivate general public to adhere to normative principles of
society. In this affair, NGOs play a very crucial role through developing trust and norms among people which is backbone of social capital (Fedderke et. al, 1999). The formal networks usually provide their members certain technical assistance. NGOs are very skilled in garnering mass support in running any developmental project. They have potential to even pressurize government for efficient service delivery (Silliman, 1999). NGOs build capability of groups to adjudicate disputes and assist government in policy making. It develops a civic culture and public spiritedness (Pye, 1999). According to Wai-Fung Lam and James L. Perry (2000), NGOs are autonomous domain where individuals freely associate with one another. They are engaged in collective problem solving.

Kenneth Newton (2001), in his study of NGOs asserts this viewpoint that a dense network of NGOs nurtures community relations in order to generate trust and cooperation between citizens and a high level of civic engagement and participation. He specifies further that there is a statistical association between social trust and membership of voluntary associations. He also expresses that social capital is a necessary condition of social integration which restores the efficient bonhomie in the society. Social trust is associated with social variables measuring social and economic success. NGOs form cross-cutting ties and social networks which bind society altogether due to their intermingling nature with different sections of society. NGOs help to create the social conditions for high levels of social capital and a well-developed civil society. They form the organizational basis of a democratic culture and its social networks of communication. In short, they create the bonds of social solidarity which are the basis for civil society and democracy. He also states that there is a statistical relation between social capital and voluntary associations. Social trust is more associated with membership of voluntary association. On the societal level, voluntary associations are said to create the cross-cutting ties and social networks that bind society together by its own internal conflicts. They create social bonds between like-minded people and can build bridges between different social groups wherever there is an overlap. In short, voluntary associations create the bonds of social solidarity. Social trust was high and the country maintained its unusually vibrant associational life, as measured by the rate of formation of new associations, and by organizational membership. A good stock of social capital is prerequisite for an effective political system, which is then able to build up political capital, but high levels of social capital do not necessarily or inevitably
generate high levels of political capital in any particular country at any point (Newton, 2001).

NGO plays a vital role in fostering social capital through developing horizontal cooperation (Abom, 2004). NGOs have been identified as catalyst of social capital because they encourage formation of social networks. NGO support to community and grass root organization within disadvantaged communities is an essential part of social capital building process. According to her, NGO intervention has enhanced community norms and networks. It following intervention strategies based on capacity building, advocacy, and incentives to collective action, has been shown to play a significant role in social capital construction. It has managed to build social capital and trust between themselves and their beneficiaries (Abom, 2004).

Roberts Kabeba Muriisa (2006) in his research study entitled “The AIDS Pandemic in Uganda: Social Capital and the Role of NGO in alleviating impact of HIV/AIDS” states that NGOs are quite instrumental in gathering social network, trust and cooperation. In his study of Ugandan government initiative on prevention of HIV/AIDS, he stresses that education may not produce desired results if such issues as gender inequality, poverty and social environment are not addressed. He further argues that NGOs are catalysts of social capital development. They facilitate interaction between different actors and promote the development of trust relationships. NGOs are seen as channels of participation and increased interaction. He also highlights that participation in voluntary associations like bowling clubs, religious groups, charity organizations are important factors for creation of social capital. In his study on HIV/AIDS, the researcher argues that revival of social capital on these levels may only take place when civil society organizations with support of government are involved in a mutually supportive manner. The researcher, in his study, enumerates the measurement of social capital through associational membership, frequency of interaction and structures of interaction. He states that NGO results in increased trust relations among members. He has presented a hypothetical model on role of civil society in generating social capital which consists of several community initiatives, participatory management, and partnership with community-based organization. In other words, NGOs can generate social capital through following ways:-

- Building structure which would encourage participation.
-Facilitating communication and cooperation.

-Mobilizing local and community initiatives.

-Providing an efficient service delivery system which would improve trust-based relations between service provider and client.

The NGO, through drama activities, asking questions and interactive sessions generate social networks. The informal interaction which takes place between members of drama group and community further facilitates cohesiveness between two groups. He also states that the process of building social capital involve various things like creation of avenues of interaction and participation. He emphasizes that increased interaction between NGO members and clients, inter-organizational networks, community mobilization and training may foster social capital (Muriisa, 2006).

Mohammad Samaun Safa (2006) in his study of NGOs in Bangladesh found out that they are successful in alleviating human misery through community participation. These NGOs practise social forestry activities within a collaborative arrangement with the rural people under a form of co-management at group or individual level. NGOs provide a common forum for the participation of the rural poor and facilitate knowledge sharing, contributing towards sustainable rural development. These organizations also promote social change and have been able to improve management. Their involvement in various types of monitoring, training and technological support leads to cooptation with local people. The NGOs organize the poor, provide them with credit and make optimal use of land. These institutions are actively engaged with developing capacity of the rural poor in order to improve their livelihood. In this process of development, NGOs end up in fostering community based coalition among these communities (Safa, 2006).

NGO tends to be a homogenous organization of like-minded individuals joining for a common cause which promotes bonding social capital (Richey, 2007). He also states that team work promotes better feelings between people and has increased generalized trust. According to him, trust develops with inherent norms of reciprocity (Richey, 2007). Through expansion of networks of grassroot people with the elite ones, there is developed a bridging social capital. The cooperation in heterogeneous projects produces generalized trust (Richey, 2007). NGOs draw on social networks, common purposes and cultural framework and build solidarity through connective structure and collective
identity (Johnson and Prakash, 2007). NGOs follow certain norms of functionality while dealing with community so that there may be created strong network of target groups. They assume a leadership position and corner the fame and publicity (Johnson and Prakash, 2007). They tend to assume that people will come together and somehow manage to coordinate and sustain collective action without implicit or explicit structures. NGOs claim to represent the public interest. They overcome institutional hurdles and resource deficits to achieve advocacy success (Johnson and Prakash, 2007).

NGOs have developed a culture of independence. It decides to focus on new priorities. One of the principal characteristics of NGO is its nature of functioning in a coordinated manner. They work through various committees and associations for the welfare of people (Barber and Bowie, 2008). People participate in voluntary associations like NGOs because it facilitates reciprocity, social trust, networks of social relations as principal components of social capital. As intermediaries between the people and the state, it has been termed as a core contributor to create social capital. The creation and renewal of social capital in modern society is closely tied up with the civil society of huge and diverse range of voluntary organizations like NGOs (Kim, 2008). These organizations provide opportunities to individuals to engage in various social activities (Kim, 2008). He also states that organizing capacity of voluntary associations is primarily social capital since social capital refers to features of voluntary associations, such as trust, norms, reciprocity, networks, among others, that can improve the efficiency of society by facilitating coordinated actions (Kim, 2008).

Hyuk-Rae Kim (2010) has done his study over transition of South Korea in terms of evolution of civil society. He has outlined significance of NGO in development of South Korea as collaborative agent with state. He asserted that NGOs are increasingly penetrating into what had been an almost exclusive domain of the government and are taking up many of the government roles. They become institutional vehicle for exercising developmental agenda. They provide way for citizens to engage in greater social responsibility. They also function to create the networks of civil engagement that produce and enforce communal values and notions of trust necessary for cooperation and civil life in a society. They play an important role in the area of participating in policy formulation and development of citizen’s movement. NGOs work as repositories of diverse, creative and expert human resources with the capacity to present solutions to social issues. They attempt to enlarge the public space of political commons, to create
the networks of civil engagement, to reclaim the sovereignty of citizens. They pursue both professionalism and voluntarism. They play a very important role in implementing programs with wide public impact (Kim, 2010).

NGOs may foster bonding social capital and develop bridging social capital. It also appears that NGOs create social network and extend it across communities. It also facilitates bridging social capital and creation of strong intra-community network. The created collective action may foster social networks (MacMurray and Niens, 2012). NGOs are slotted into the development and involved into mobilization of general masses. They are efficient in handling social tensions in numerous ways. They are capable of negotiating their way in social world through their inter-community linkages and ambivalent practices (Helliker, 2012). Non-Governmental Organizations play a very pivotal role in social capital formation. Das, Sarada Prasanna (2013) in her review of a book entitled “NGOs, Education and Social Capital: A Micro Study of Tribals” states that NGOs garner collective action in tribal communities through notion of social capital. She outlines that NGOs create bridging social capital among fragmented communities through coordination among them (Das, 2013).

Sarbeswar Sahoo (2013) in his study of Indian NGOs states that NGOs are instruments of survival and sustenance of development. NGOs are idealized as organizations which help people for the reason other than profit. NGOs help in promoting reciprocity, interrelated network of trust, cooperation, civic engagement which ultimately influences performance of development. NGOs are those intermediary voluntary associations open to all category of citizens which promote social order and advance the interests of various people transcending lines of caste, creed, class. He has also insisted on World Bank’s proposition that NGOs give voice to the poor, promote public sector transparency and accountability, encourage public-private co-operation and participatory approaches, generate social capital at the community level. NGO has promoted neo-liberal values like self-help and entrepreneurship through various development projects. He has outlined the contribution of an NGO called “Seva Mandir” in strengthening village level committees to empower marginalized sections of society. It thus began to work on issues related to health, natural resource development, women’s empowerment, child development and so on. Through these institutions, Seva Mandir organised the villagers and encouraged their participation in community development, which, it believed, would increase their autonomy in decision-making and deepen the process of empowerment and
democratisation. Seva Mandir has also encouraged women to form self-help groups (SHGs) and initiate income-generating activities. It has organised awareness camps, literacy camps, exposure tours and training sessions for women and helped prevent them being socially exploited and discriminated against. It encourages people to reciprocate through consensus and participation (Sahoo, 2013).

NGOs adopt social capital of poor people for bringing development. They organize poor rural women through various credit-based programmes for inculcating entrepreneurial role among them. NGOs are engaged in mobilizing the poor people through developing collective consciousness against forms of oppression (Sooryamoorthy, 2013). He has focused on role of NGOs like BRAC (Bangladesh Rural Action Committee) in Bangladesh to form women’s SHG (Sooryamoorthy, 2013). It has strived in the direction of forming credit associations of local people in order to fund each other’s enterprises. The institutions providing microcredit adopt divergent strategies that suit their purpose, operation and location. Some of them follow the village bank model (Sooryamoorthy, 2013). It is praiseworthy that NGO-led microcredit programmes such as that of the Grameen Bank have been more successful in reaching the poor than the state-led programme (Sooryamoorthy, 2013). NGOs originate trust and cooperation. The main characteristics of NGO are its collaborative activities. NGOs assist the community through contributing to building social cohesiveness among them (MacIntyre and Waters et al., 2013). NGOs collaborate mutually with communities in an ethical and culturally sensitive manner through community building and organizing. He also insisted on this presumption that NGOs slip into top-down roles. NGO and the community better understand each other as they work together (MacIntyre and Waters et al., 2013).

Voluntary associations unite people of various backgrounds and help in developing mutual trust between its members (Häuuberer, 2014). In fact, different individuals learn civic norms, virtues in voluntary associations. He expresses his view that all these organizations accumulate social capital. Through formation of formal networks, NGOs build very healthy social networks among people. People active in civic associations have greater amounts of social resources at their disposal (Häuuberer, 2014). NGOs through bridging associations embed individuals with high social capital. Participation in bridging and apolitical bonding associations is associated with higher social capital access (Häuuberer, 2014).
Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) foster social capital through various development initiatives (Islam, 2014). NGOs contribute in social welfare. It also assists in formation of social capital through developing social network, social trust and community empowerment among poor deprived people (Islam, 2014). In his view, social capital is quite functional in enabling people to act together more effectively to pursue shared objectives. The norms and reciprocal networks make collective action, which are contingent on an existing foundation of social trust and solidarity (Islam, 2014). Abom stated that social capital is a crucial ingredient in achieving sustainable development for effective governance. He stated that social capital is very essential for building inter-sectoral collaboration to mobilize local resources (Islam, 2014). He quoted Clark’s statement that NGOs develop social capital through promoting information sharing, acting as agents of partnership (Islam, 2014). He also emphasised over Uslaner’s assertion that social capital includes trust which is a very crucial driving force for sustainability (Islam, 2014). He asserted that NGO’s participatory approach creates routes for social capital and improves sharing values, norms and mutual benefits (Islam, 2014). The smooth communication between NGO and grassroots community leads to generation of social capital. In his study of Proshika and Practical Action Bangladesh (PAB), he stated that NGOs target vulnerable people for making a strong social network (Islam, 2014). He asserted that these NGOs helped the Smiths to create such kinds of mutual benefits. These NGOs shared norms, values through interpersonal contact, business networks, consultation and meetings (Islam, 2014). Being based on horizontal type of communication, these NGOs developed a sense of oneness through exchanging information. This study found that social capital is the fabric of society. It is observed that NGOs’ initiatives were convincing in terms of community awareness, increasing problem assessment capacities, encouraging participation, sharing values and norms, introducing new technologies, responding to financial crisis, and mobilising local resources (Islam, 2014).

2.9 NGO and Promotion of Mutual bonding:

NGOs are constituents for creation of social capital (Sundar and Shyam, 2007). It plays an important role in conflict resolution. It mobilizes the social forces and contributes towards organization of social bonding. It forms some associations through which accountability can be generated between the people and the state. NGOs provide various
spaces of cooperation through bringing norms of reciprocity among its members and beneficiaries. NGOs have some defined paths through which they develop civil society based on mutual trust, social cohesiveness and reciprocal relationship (Sundar and Shyam, 2007).

NGOs foster collective social relation where short term conflicts can be resolved (Demirovic, 2009). NGOs disarticulate protest into a wide range of negotiation and implementation processes. NGOs implement political measures at low cost and organize social consensus in the crisis. NGOs do their function of organizing, supporting and protecting the grassroots activities of people. NGOs with their expertise, are included in decision-making processes which are frequently polyarchical. Hierarchical patterns of negotiation and decision-making are replaced by co-operative network-like types of negotiation and bargaining (Demirovic, 2009).

Rita Afsar (2010) in her study of Bangladesh explains that NGO activities are very linked with immediate issues of poverty alleviation. NGOs build social capital with which poor people can marshal social networks and resources. Her research also points out that NGO membership has exerted considerable influence on both structural and cognitive components of social capital. She has cited an example of NGOs’ contribution in formation of women’s group from landless family. She also stated that NGO was found to be more responsive to the needs of their members and they kept closer touch with the public compared to other service providers at the village level. NGOs due to their mass base in the villages have been forerunner for growth of social bonding in their community. NGO has been effective in organising the poor and bringing them under a mutually supportive network (Afsar, 2010).

2.10 NGO and Social Advocacy:

Antonio Rodriguez-Carmona (2007) in his study in Bolivia states that NGOs are capable of fostering social capital. The presence of NGOs has contributed to a broadening of the precious little social capital found in many rural areas. He studied the contribution of an NGO called “CARE” in facilitating environmental awareness in Bolivia. As one of the project’s pillars, the community planning workshops were facilitated and systematised by the CARE team. This strategy invited women members as an active participant in entire development scenario. The creation of a community plan archive in the town hall,
the encouragement of active participation in the health coordination body, the facilitation of thematic workshops on problem identification, the promotion of town observation tours, the promotion of exchange visits among farmers and the facilitation of meetings between women’s groups facilitated the creation of social capital in respective community. The project helped to increase the impact of local networks. It is very evident here that NGOs have assisted in the formation of social capital through adoption of participatory strategies (Rodriguez-Carmona, 2007).

Meena Razvi and Gene Roth (2009) in their study of Indian NGOs have tried to pinpoint contribution of NGO in accumulating social capital of women. They seek to alleviate socio-economic problems of marginalized women. NGOs initiate their efforts with small relief projects that allow women to gain experience, knowledge. NGOs gain the trust of women by working within the cultural contexts while simultaneously pressuring for legal change as opportunities arise. They quote example of SEWA (Self-Employed Women’s Association) which remains neutral in decision-making for women’s development. It promotes an egalitarian ethos and participatory style of functioning. It plays an important role in enhancing women’s empowerment. They also act as an intermediary between community and government agencies. NGOs possess capacities to encourage socio-economic and national human resource development by acting as intermediaries on behalf of poor women in India (Razvi and Roth, 2009).

NGOs have potential to change the mechanism through which state functions. It exerts pressure on political change. NGOs also help in changing the terms of reference for policy discussions. Due to huge repository of social capital, NGOs are capable of achieving a stronger degree of influence over international political and economic change. NGOs can potentially shape how political issues are defined, both through their public campaigning and through their efforts to lobby national policy makers (Broome, 2009).

2.11 Review of Studies on Social Capital:

Social Capital has drawn much attention in social science. Various social scientists have conceptualized this theory in their own way. Although French Sociologist Pierre Bourdieu defined Social Capital quite early, yet it has still been a matter of various contradictions. According to Bourdieu, Social Capital consists of two dimensions (i)
social networks and connections, (ii) sociability (Schaefer-McDaniel, 2004). He emphasized that social networks should be constructed and skilfully maintained in order to utilize their resources. This concept incorporates an understanding of familiarity of a dominant culture and language in society. Similarly, James Coleman recognized two distinct components of social capital like relational construct and providing resources to others through relationship with individuals (Schaefer-McDaniel, 2004). In other words, he states that Social capital is an asset that a person or persons can use as a resource (Schaefer-McDaniel, 2004). He also conceptualizes that social capital is very strong in connected social networks. While this concept tends to strengthen existing social relationship, it fosters new relations also. According to Coleman, increasing social capital has various beneficial outcomes (Schaefer-McDaniel, 2004). On the other hand, Robert Putnam expresses his opinion regarding application of social capital in a general society. His interpretation of social capital has therefore often been referred to as a “collective asset” and a “common good” (Schaefer-McDaniel, 2004). According to Putnam, the notions of trust and reciprocity arise from our social network relationships and thus generate civic virtue or a trusting community where residents not only know each other but are actively involved in each other’s lives and maintain trustful and helpful relations (Schaefer-McDaniel, 2004). It is also very important to note that notions of trust and reciprocity should be mutual among the people (Schaefer-McDaniel, 2004). In his view, collective communities have greater social capital. Therefore, he segregates between bonding, bridging and linking social capital. He regards social capital as a community asset for achievement of a democratic society (Schaefer-McDaniel, 2004). Social capital is considered to be concentrated in general community. A review of the history of network analysis suggests that communities are in fact networks and that “social capital is a network phenomenon (Schaefer-McDaniel, 2004).” But it is found in young generation also. While sense of belonging refers to an individual feeling of belonging after attaching symbolic meaning to a certain environment, psychological sense of community refers to the degree to which individuals feel that they are part of a collective community (Schaefer-McDaniel, 2004).

Therefore, exploration of concept of social capital brings us nearer to its various discourses. It has widely been discussed by development thinkers, policy makers and theoreticians as to what constitutes social capital. It has been in vogue since several
decades when Bourdieu, Coleman and Putnam gave it a concrete shape. Therefore, it is very essential to focus on those views for conceptualizing this idea of social capital.

2.12 Various Perspectives of Social Capital:

There are various perspectives of social capital which have demarcated its conceptualization. According to Durlauf and Fafchamps, social capital is not a concept but praxis, a code word used to federate disparate but interrelated research interests and to facilitate the cross-fertilization of ideas across disciplinary boundaries (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). According to Bourdieu, Social Capital is the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of durable network of more or less institutionalized relationship of mutual acquaintance and recognition- or in other words, to membership in a group which provides each of the members with the backing of collectively owned capital a credential which entitles them to credit (Claridge, 2004). The Social Capital becomes a resource of social struggle which is carried-out in different arenas and fields. Social capital, according to Bourdieu, is a resource that is connected with group membership and social networks. Bourdieu recognizes voluntary associations, trade unions, and political parties as the modern embodiments of social capital (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). The promotion of social capital requires deliberate investment on economic and cultural resources. In his words, Social Capital is a collective phenomenon which creates a sense of solidarity among people. Social Capital is based on mutual recognition and symbolic character (Mukhopadhyay, 2005).

On the other hand, the functional approach emphasizes over rational choice theory. According to Coleman, Social capital is defined by its function. It 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 (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). In his view, social capital is productive and assists in achieving certain ends. Coleman argues that social capital inheres in the structure of relations between persons and among persons and that it facilitates actions of persons who are connected by the structure of relations (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). According to Coleman, social capital identifies some aspects of the social structure by their functions (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). Thus, social capital constitutes both an aid in accounting for different outcomes at the level of the individual actor and an aid towards making the micro-macro transitions without elaborating the
social structure details through which this occurs (Hansen and Roll, 2016). This conceptualization of social capital goes in the way of encouraging investment in organizations of this kind. Coleman focusses on formation of social networks. Even Putnam also insists that informal forms of social organization like trust, norms and networks constitute social capital (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). According to Putnam, forms of social capital are general moral resources of the community. The norms and trust are based on formal institutions which constitute social capital. Putnam’s idea of social capital deals with collective values and social integration. Coleman, while defining social capital as consisting of any social structural features or resources that are useful to individuals for specific actions, stresses social capital as a public good (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). These collective assets and features are available to all members of the group, be it a social group or a community and regardless of which members actually promote, sustain or contribute to such resources (Mukhopadhyay, 2005).

Another school of thought who supports the Network Approach, has considered social capital rooted in social networks and social relations and relative to its root (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). This definition of Social Capital consists of some elements like resources embedded in a social structure, access to such social resources by individuals, and use or mobilization of such social resources by individuals in purposive actions (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). According to Portes, Social Capital is the ability to secure benefits through membership in networks and other social structures (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). According to Lin, Social Capital attempts to capture valued resources in social relations, network locations should facilitate, but not necessarily determine, access to better embedded resources (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). The Social Capital is analysed by the amount or variety of such characteristics of others with whom an individual has direct or indirect ties (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). Burt insists over location of individuals in a network as key to social capital.

Therefore, it may be well-understood here that social capital facilitates the social structure enabling social action. Different authors have expressed their opinion over conceptualization of social capital in their manner.
2.13 Components of Social Capital:

The Social Capital has various components both at structural level and cognitive level. These components range from Norms, Reciprocity, Trust, Networks. The term ‘Trust’ is very much associated with Social Capital (Fu, 2004). The Sociological interpretation terms Trust as either the property of individuals, social relationship or social system (Fu, 2004). Another perspective terms trust as valued public good. Trust is a social mechanism that is embodied in structures of social relations (Fu, 2004). Granovetter has stressed that social relations are mainly responsible for the production of trust in economic life (Fu, 2004). He believes that trust is generated when agreements are “embedded” within a larger structure of personal relations and social networks. Coleman contends that a system of mutual trust is an important form of social capital on which future obligations and expectations may be based (Fu, 2004). Putnam also regards trust as an important component of Social Capital which sustains economic dynamism and governmental performance (Fu, 2004). Even Nahapiet and Ghoshal treat trust as a key facet in the relational dimension of social capital. Coleman also suggests that as a rational account of human behavior, trust can only be produced in informal, small, closed and homogeneous communities which are able to enforce normative sanctions (Fu, 2004). According to Fukuyama, Trust is the expectation which arises within a community of regular, honest and cooperative behaviour based on commonly shared norms, on the part of other members of the community (Fu, 2004). He also argues that trust is the characteristics of system and engraved in rules and relations which some men impose and seek to get accepted by others. For many researchers, social capital depends on trust. The relationships, communities, cooperation, and mutual commitment that characterize social capital could not exist without a reasonable level of trust (Fu, 2004). Francois also argues in favour of trust and states that it is very pertinent for existence of society’s culture. Cohen & Fields have argued that this form of trust might be a superior form and can be extended to people from other places and other cultures, and even to people with different ideas (Fu, 2004). Some of the thinkers even consider the trust as pre-condition for social capital. Leana and Van Buren define social capital at the organizational scale as “a resource reflecting the character of social relations within the organization, realized through members’ level of collective goal orientation and shared trust (Fu, 2004). The existence of higher trust in organization also typifies its strength. The alteration in existence of trust may change the nature of social capital. Several
literary manifestations resolve this conception that the higher trust in relationship, the higher social exchange and cooperative attitude. The Trust facilitates the cooperation because it is like a pre-commitment tool (Fu, 2004). Trust can strengthen norms of reciprocity, diminish the amount of energy lost to suspicion, unresolved issues, and associated uncertainty and anxiety that otherwise often results in blame, gossip, resentment, and frustration (Fu, 2004). It also reduces the time spent in the slow, expensive process of defining, monitoring, and guaranteeing compliance—the detailed process of enforcement (Fu, 2004). Trust is correlated with organizational commitment which refers to the psychological attachment that employees have towards their employing organization, including the widespread feeling among employees that they are proud to be members of an organization (Fu, 2004). Watson (2002) argues that the levels of trust perceived by members and employment assurances will directly influence organizational commitment (Fu, 2004). It is also stated that cooperative mechanism within society may not exist without existence of trust within its members which is an important ingredient of society’s social capital. Social Capital is a capability which is based on prevalence of trust in the society. The interest in trust is a part of a contemporary engagement with the collective action problem which has concerned social theorists for so long (Franklin, 2007).

The term ‘Reciprocity’ is also very significant in the arena of Social Capital. Reciprocity and Social Capital are termed as close associates (Diekmann, 2004). Reciprocity is a pattern of mutually contingent exchange. It evokes obligations based on past behaviour of individuals. In other words, it is a multidimensional variable. It may be both positive and negative attribute. Putnam, probably unaware of the theory of indirect reciprocity, emphasized the importance of a “norm of generalized reciprocity (Diekmann, 2004). He also stated that generalized reciprocity is more efficient than a distrustful society, for the same reason that money is more efficient than barter (Diekmann, 2004). Altruistic reciprocity is a key element of the “fair wage/effort hypothesis” based on work from sociological exchange theory and psychological equity theory (Diekmann, 2004). Social networks thrive on a foundation of reciprocity as members of networks build and expand their connections by performing reciprocal actions (Musembwa and Paul, 2012). Trust, interaction and reciprocity are mutually reinforcing, in that trust facilitates knowledge sharing and encourages reciprocal actions (Musembwa and Paul, 2012). Consequently, the global nature of social networks makes the ability to achieve
reciprocity essential to building social networks (Musembwa and Paul, 2012). Attainment of reciprocity exhibits a shared orientation between two interacting members of a group. Consequently, reciprocity strengthens social networks, which leads to the development of social capital (Musembwa and Paul, 2012). Trust and Reciprocity depend upon moral virtues and inherent personal traits. On the other hand, Social Norms characterise morality of actions taken by individuals. The Social Norms are customary rules of behaviour which coordinate our interaction (Blume, et. al, 2010). Norms are nothing but an integrating factor for various diversified elements. Norms can be represented as equilibria of suitably defined games (Blume, et. al, 2010). The main function of Social Norm is to coordinate people’s expectations with multiple factors in society so that they may live integrated. These are “social” phenomena, because they are held in place by shared expectations about the appropriate solution to a given coordination problem (Blume, et. al, 2010). Social norms may take the form of conventions, customs in the society. It is a determining element for ‘what is right’ and ‘what is wrong’. More generally, a norm has economic value if it creates a uniquely salient or focal solution to a coordination problem, thus reducing the risk of coordination failure (Blume, et. al, 2010). Norms that overcome collective action problems and build trust within but not between families, social classes or ethnic groups often impose negative externalities on non-members of these groups (Keefer and Knack, 2008). In societies characterized by wide radius trustworthiness, individuals are not only reliable partners in contractual exchange, whether political or economic, but can also be relied upon to act in the interest of others at some expense to oneself (Keefer and Knack, 2008). Norms of civic cooperation reduce enforcement costs by leading individuals to internalize the value of laws and regulations even when the probability of detection for violation is negligible (Keefer and Knack, 2008). Social norms are especially interesting as a focus of inquiry to the extent that they are a new and different source of trusting and trustworthy behaviour (Keefer and Knack, 2008).

Social Network is sum range of social interaction based on trust and reciprocity. Social networks include different kinds of social capital. Social network leads to a more complex understanding of those kinds of networks that might facilitate trust (Franklin, 2007). Social network is considered to be a personal resource where people garner reciprocity in their relationship. Social networks produce a variety of individual as well
as collective benefits, such as the promotion of individual well-being, the increase of political participation, the amelioration of performance of political/administrative institutions, the development of local economic activities, and increased local security and safety (Ikeda, 2008). Social network contributes towards formation of social identity. Bonding networks often form an in-group and functions as a source of social identity (Ikeda, 2008). Social Network is determining factor for collective output. The vertical social network facilitates variety of routes. Measuring joining and membership in associations is the mainstay of social capital analysis (Patulny, 2004). The Social Network coincides with existence of diffuse network structures (Franklin, 2007). The Social Network helps in mobilizing its members. Bourdieu (1986) gives probably the most critical perspective of social interaction centred upon networks (Patulny, 2004). He notes that social networks are based upon shared habits and cultural understandings (Patulny, 2004). Coleman also emphasizes over influence not of the individual capital holder within the network, but of the trusted intermediaries that facilitate a network, creating specific networks of connections between individuals and institutions, which settle down over time to become social structures (Patulny, 2004).

Social Network leads to trust to volunteering which generate social capital. He notes that social capital exists within a network or group of people. He also notes that occupying different positions within the network grants different degrees of advantage (Patulny, 2004). If the network is closed, and only people within it are trusted –and to varying degrees depending upon the position they occupy within the network– than those members are the owners of the social capital (Patulny, 2004). The macro-level social influences build social capital. Social Capital is best measured as a combination of norms, networks, and practices, relevant to either bridging or bonding dimensions. Social Capital is considered to be embedded in informal networks of people. Therefore, it is very crucial to build social relationship among its members who can provide information and expertise. The Social Network Approach visualizes the end product of social network as resource for Social Capital (Patulny, 2004). The Social Network begins with connectedness among people which fosters social ties. It is very evident that social network and social ties have close relation with social capital. The Social Network and Social Ties take the shape of social capital (Patulny, 2004). They are the consequences of serial social interactions. Social ties reduce the opportunism by imposing social obligation and various restrictions. Social ties create enhanced opportunity for malfeasance (Baker and Faulkner, 2004). It implies that social relationship and
interaction among social members and social norms are all important types of capital which is beneficial for both the individuals and the society (Yandong, 2013). The Social network and Social capital are quite complementary to each other. Social network assists in terms of social relationship perceived to be readily available in case of need (Yandong, 2013).

2.14 Measurement of Social Capital:

The measurement of Social Capital is an important aspect. As Bullen and Onyx (1998) state that “In an economic rationalist world where ideology says ‘if you can’t measure it, you can’t manage it’, the quantification of social capital keeps an important position in social science (Harpham, et. al, 2002).” There are several studies done in social science which attempts to measure the social capital and quantify its various indicators. One measure is institutional measure and the other measure is cognitive measure. Within institutional measure, the membership of informal and formal associations and networks are significant (Woolcock and Narayan, 2000). In developing countries generally, and in rural areas in particular, measures that capture the informal give-and-take through community wide festivals, sporting events, and other traditional methods of fostering social connections are very important indicators of the underlying stocks of social capital (Woolcock and Narayan, 2000). In this institutional measure, the density of association, heterogeneity of membership in association, degree of active participation of its members are crucial components. The strength of social capital may be determined by quality of formal institutions under which members do get opportunity to do activities (Woolcock and Narayan, 2000). In Institutional measure, the frequency of participation of members in their associations is very important. The formal engagement with voluntary associations is often conceptualized as strengthening of social capital. The people having more membership in voluntary associations contribute towards formation of social capital. Therefore, the uneven participation of members in any activity of voluntary associations lead to degradation of social capital in respective community. The membership assists in developing mutual bonding among its members. This membership is also strengthened by volunteering efforts. In a study by Johnston and Jowell in 1997 in Britain, it was found that nearly 87 percent of respondents participated as volunteer or a member of atleast one association (Grenier and Wright, 2003). This study also indicates that membership is increasingly becoming concentrated within people who are engaged
as members (Grenier and Wright, 2003). The volunteering effort assists in developing mutual coordination. Hall, in his study puts focus on face-to-face interaction for fostering strong social capital. Hall also suggests that informal sociability can be a very significant way in which people are engaged in and form social networks (Grenier and Wright, 2003). In terms of “pursuits associated with social capital”, Hall identifies sport, civic duties, social clubs, pubs, and visits to friends (Grenier and Wright, 2003). These activities seem likely to indicate some level of socialising (Grenier and Wright, 2003). In his view, the density of participation, time spent in socializing and trend of socializing across gender, caste and class lines determine the intensity of social capital (Grenier and Wright, 2003). Burt has stated that social capital can be managed like other types of capital. Coleman also emphasized over importance of time spent in interaction and discussion as central to the production of social capital with each member of an individual's network (Lake and Huckfeldt, 1998). This standardized measure of political interaction frequency allows a comparison to be made between respondents that are independent of the size of their networks. Our expectation is that, as the frequency of political interaction with discussants increases, so should the production of politically relevant social capital, thereby enabling the respondent to become more fully engaged in a wider range of political activities (Lake and Huckfeldt, 1998). The production of social capital is facilitated by social structures such as voluntary associations, various membership organizations (Lake and Huckfeldt, 1998). However, our social capital measures produce effects that are independent and separate from the effects of individually defined civic capacity. Another method of measuring social capital is position of individual in social network. After pointing out an individual’s location in social network, the social capital can be measured. Some instances of these measurement models are presented in the studies by Nahapiet and Ghoshal (1998), based on the concept of structural holes, and Arribas and Vila (2010), based on preferential attachment network models (Fornoni et. al, 2012). The measurement of social capital has been principled on three major dimensions; Micro, Meso and Macro approaches (Fornoni, et. al, 2012). The micro-approach which is rooted in rational choice theory and social exchange theory permits to conceive social capital as an appropriable resource (Chiesi, 2007). On the other hand, macro approach is rooted in the classical functional theory and conceives social capital as part of a shared culture (Chiesi, 2007). While Meso approach focuses on collective interest, rigid and closed associational membership, Social exchange is based on reciprocal recognition, and yields trust or loyalty. The
structural aspect of Social Capital emphasizes over institutional aspect. Trust and Reputation are not simple cultural features but the outcome of actors’ strategies at micro-level (Chiesi, 2007). If systemic trust is widespread, actors may not have to build exclusive social relations, while a lack of it may induce them to react to systemic mistrust by organizing social circles in which mutual recognition and social control can give reassurance to both insiders and outsiders (Chiesi, 2007). A vertical division of work, rather than horizontal, is prevailing, which favours cooperation rather than competition (Chiesi, 2007). The analysis of socio-metric interviews is focussed on personal contact of colleagues, employees, consultants which represent the micro-level social capital. The larger membership of an association improves the personal contact between its members. The analysis of Social capital at meso-level has evidenced some advantages in using membership rates, but associations have to be chosen carefully according to the actors involved—i.e. business interests associations in the case of entrepreneurs (Chiesi, 2007). The measurement of social capital which is based on structural and cognitive aspects may be characterised by ‘what people do’ and ‘what people feel’. Lochner states that Social Capital is a feature of the social structure, not of the individual actors within the social structure (Harpham, et. al, 2002). In a quantitative study on Social Capital, Kawachi et. al (1997) has measured social capital through following indicators (Harpham, et. al, 2002):

- Per-capita membership in voluntary groups.
- Inter-personal trust.
- Perceived norms of reciprocity.

Generally, the pattern of measurement of social capital is inclusive of both structural and cognitive aspects which include micro, meso and macro levels of social capital. It may be perceived through a study carried out in Australia by Bullen and Onyx (1998) where a questionnaire was administered among 1211 respondents (Harpham, et. al, 2002). This set of questions comprised of elements viz;

- Participation in local community.
- Neighbourhood connections.
- Family and Friends connections.
- Work connections.
- Proactivity in social context.
- Feelings of trust and safety.
- Tolerance of diversity.
- Value of life.

The review of all aforementioned elements showcases that this questionnaire is a set of both structural and cognitive elements. This measurement of social capital is also carried out in another study called Social Capital Community Benchmark Survey administered in the USA which has included various facets of social capital like social trust, inter-racial trust, diversity of friendship, civic leadership, associational involvement, informal socializing, volunteering etc (Harpham, et. al, 2002). Even Putnam in his study of social capital in Italy attempts to utilize several set of instruments to measure it (Harpham, et. al, 2002). The density of membership in formal organization also seeks to carve-out strong social capital. Adding to it, Coleman stresses on attitudes and behaviour associated with social capital rather than a mere membership (Harpham, et. al, 2002). It has also been stated that NGO’s efforts to stimulate local organizational growth also leads to strengthening of social capital. These organizations develop social capital through initiating local level organization, developing rules, norms and leadership among members. Social Capital tends to grow when communities have effective new leaders, who help villagers overcome the collective action dilemma, formulating clear, fair, and widely agreed-upon rules (Krishna, 2007). Leaders seize available opportunities and create new ones (Krishna, 2007). Like other forms of capital, social capital also needs to be maintained and kept in good order (Krishna, 2007). It is internally generated by effective leadership of individuals. The effort of community in rule building and rule development and the nature of leadership available within communities had significant impacts in terms of generating social capital (Krishna, 2007).

2.15 Social Capital as Policy Resource:

The Social Capital may also be utilized as a policy resource. It also serves as a reservoir of potential support for furthering the public policy. They are exploited to serve policy purposes of the state or of other large organizations (Montgomery, 2000). Although
social capital remains a black hole in the astronomy of social science, studying its manifestations as a policy resource will shed light on the strategies and tactics employed in its use (Montgomery, 2000). When people are in cooperative spirit, they attempt to bring reciprocity in their relationship. If these forms of cooperation create a virtuous cycle that becomes frequent or intense, it is not unreasonable to treat this behavior as predictable, hence a form of social capital that can become a useful basis for policy initiatives (Montgomery, 2000). Using social capital as a policy resource is a purposeful act, even though generating it in the first place may have been an inadvertent consequence of casual or ordinary organizational purposes (Montgomery, 2000). Several social networks are coordinated for the purpose of generating social capital. Social capital affects external relations as well as internal affairs, and both are important to the survival and prosperity of an organization. A favourable or at least tolerant environment is essential to internal stability, and per contra, internal cohesion also defines a limit to external relations (Montgomery, 2000). Most states make use of social capital for quite ordinary purposes of government as well. In pluralistic societies, if the leaders need to go beyond separate appeals to organized groups, they can seek to mobilize consent by building on existing relationships among different groups (Montgomery, 2000). The regions characterised by high level of social capital are capable of sustaining the democratic governance. The Social Capital is unpredictable as a policy resource. It also seems to be a neutral resource which can boost morality among individuals (Montgomery, 2000). The informal networks bolster the strength of social capital. Appropriate uses of social capital can enrich the efficiency or effectiveness of a policy and at the same time strengthen the participating organizations' commitment to the values and benefits of the exploiting organization (Montgomery, 2000). The interpretation of social capital can introduce purpose and responsibility into public decisions to give moral coherence to civil society and to impose restraints on capricious or despotic groups (Montgomery, 2000). The network based on ethnicity, religion, neighbourhood acts as critical support for economic activities of its members (Montgomery, 2000).Social capital solves problems in society, promotes economic growth and improves quality of life since it plays a pivotal role in economic development and best studied globally in the context of contribution it makes to sustainable development (Ransing, 2015). The trust, cooperation, shared norms; collective action among the members of the households is the beginning of sense of common ownership and participation (Ransing, 2015). It also promotes the coordination among
different community groups. The social capital infused in development strategies as policy resource yields efficiency and effectiveness in village business (Ransing, 2015). It is also considered to an effective complement to material and financial resource (Ransing, 2015). Social capital also offers a way of conceptualizing the resources of networks, norms and values, trust, reciprocity and mutuality, which shapes the quality of the learning experiences (Ransing, 2015). The formation of social capital as a policy resource has become a big challenge and mainstay for development strategies (Ransing, 2015). The Social Capital helps in terms of supporting various transition and developmental activities. The Social Capital assists in terms of manifesting the cruciality of the program. It is also an instrument for achieving individual benefits. It also produces various social, economic and health output (Ransing, 2015). The Social Capital bonds the community together. The Social Capital plays an important role in socio-political empowerment. The Social Capital provides a lens for examining the correlation of social ties with productive activities (Ransing, 2015). The Social ties play an important role in leveraging different community groups. Social capital lies in its capacity to act as a resource employed for the achievement of broader policy objectives, such as immigrant integration, economic participation, or improved education and health outcomes (Policy Research Initiative, 2005). Under a social capital perspective, however, emphasis is placed on finding the most effective ways in which citizens, service delivery agencies, institutions, and organizations interact and create linkages for developing sustainable changes in the living conditions and well-being of community members (Policy Research Initiative, 2005). Such networks can act as catalysts for sharing and accessing available resources and assets from inside and outside the community, as well as for generating new resources (Policy Research Initiative, 2005). A social capital lens may also simply assist in a better understanding of the interactions between policies and social relationships. This could help to ensure that programs and policies across government do not work at cross-purposes in the ways in which they incorporate or affect social capital (Policy Research Initiative, 2005).

Social capital provides a rich new means for looking at how public intervention and government services can focus on social ties as a potentially important ingredient in individual and societal prosperity (Policy Research Initiative, 2005). The Social Capital focusses on strategic role of social networks in providing access to resources. Collective social capital refers to the benefits that the community derives from associational
dynamics connecting groups and associations. The social capital operates to produce results, including the conditions for network mobilization, the rules of network functioning, the norms that govern the circulation of exchanges within networks, and so on (Policy Research Initiative, 2005). Social Capital as a policy tool solves various social policy challenges. It provides the means for accessing resources. Social capital is a resource in terms of social structure of families and communities and helps actors to achieve their objectives and interests (Kirori, 2015). It originates certain outcome for the purpose of orienting policy. In terms of reduction of poverty, unemployment, social exclusion, the social capital has various positive effects. The Social Capital asset seems to be crucial component for survival (Kirori, 2015).

2.16 Social Capital as Trust and Networking:

According to George Kolankiewicz (1996), Social Capital comprises both the networks as well as assets available for mobilization through network. Social Capital gives rise to status group formation. It allows for cooperation in the community. It also serves as a kind of collateral. Social Capital is like moral trust and moral resource. Social Capital provides the means to control the uses of goods and skills and therefore of the emerging market mechanisms. It bestrides group assets. It mitigates atomizing effect of market (Kolankiewicz, 1996). Social capital creates local economic prosperity which involves inter-personal trust, civic engagement, organizational capability for growth of community (Wilson, 1997). He also added this proposition that social capital is free entity consisting of no natural resources, no materials or labour. It is built in a very humble, piecemeal way through countless decisions of individuals about whether or not to get involved, and once involved how to proceed (Wilson, 1997). Social capital increases a community’s productive potential in several ways. It promotes business networking, shared leads, equipment and services, joint ventures, faster information flows and more agile transactions. The trust and social capital are not a product of utilitarian rational calculation of self-interest (Wilson, 1997). Social capital not only produces an atmosphere conducive to economic activity, it provides the cultural will to solve community problems collaboratively (Wilson, 1997). Social capital is essential for maintaining and enhancing the value of public goods. Social capital not only creates the goodwill to solve tragedy of the commons’ systems, it allows more creative solutions. Productive social capital generates understanding, compassion, trust and an inclusive
concept of community (Wilson, 1997). He also expressed this view that social capital lays the basis for transition from fear-based to trust-based economy (Wilson, 1997). In his view, networking creates linkages within and outside community. The concept of social capital lends legitimacy to the idea of individual-in-community. Social capital will not be built through social engineering by technical experts (Wilson, 1997). By its nature, it is being built (and rebuilt) humbly in small increments by individuals stepping out of isolation, enjoying connectedness and taking responsibility for their public lives (Wilson, 1997). In other words, it is a critical element of successful democratic process. Leadership and social capital are directly connected to each other (Renshon, 2000). Social Capital binds individuals together and facilitates the working together for a common purpose (Renshon, 2000). It is also a by-product of relationship between leadership capital and citizenship capital. Social trust provides the means to find common ground and undertake common purpose. He attributes it to an emphasis on pragmatism rather than values in making personal decisions (Renshon, 2000).

In the words of Candland, Christopher (2000), Social Capital generates higher levels of social opportunity in the community. He also states that application of religious norms is quite effective in building social capital (Candland, 2000). He says that faith can be a form of social capital. A community of believers repeats face-to-face interactions to place trust in each other. It stimulates social capital for social development. Religious institutions and tenets are best employed for social change in a political arena (Candland, 2000).

Report of Social Analysis and Reporting Division (2001) states that social capital is a putative positive outcome (Office for National Statistics, 2001). Social capital has forceful even quantifiable effect on many aspects of lives. Social capital is considered an attribute of community where connections among individuals refer to norms of reciprocity. Social capital takes on three forms, firstly; obligations and expectations which depend on trustworthiness of social environment, secondly; the capacity of information to flow through social structure in order to provide a basis for action and thirdly; presence of norms accompanied by effective sanctions. Trust is considered to be an outcome of social capital. According to him, bonding social capital refers to relations amongst homogenous groups. Whereas bridging social capital refers to social relations with distant friends. Social capital is also considered to be the property of group rather than an individual. Social capital is supposed to have a significant impact over economic
growth. Social capital has a well-established relationship with outcome policy (Office for National Statistics, 2001).

Report of UNESCO (2002) explores the role of social capital in reducing poverty. Social capital is considered to be a very important political tool for reducing poverty and bringing reciprocity in relations. The notion of social capital is based on this assumption that formal and informal structures strengthen networks (UNESCO, 2002). Social capital leads to awareness of the poor people towards development discourse. Social Capital leads to informal support networks, respond to little perceived needs (UNESCO, 2002). Social capital is understood as the forms of social interaction and connectedness generated by the links between individuals who share attitudes of mutual trust, community belonging, solidarity and reciprocity (UNESCO, 2002). The basic idea of social capital is that one’s family members, friends, associates constitute an important asset (Woolcock, 2000). Social capital resides in social relationship (UNESCO, 2002). It refers to relations between family members, close friends, and neighbours. Social capital’s greatest quality, however, is that it helps to transcend the imperialism. It has been appropriated by scholars across political spectrum. Social capital has wide social networks around it. Social Capital is mainstreamed towards capturing local idiosyncratic realities (UNESCO, 2002). The meagre stock of bridging social capital circulates information and ideas among groups and follows broader socio-economic forces. He also insists on this thing that social capital is an important risk management strategy during time of economic distress (UNESCO, 2002). Social capital increases openness and interaction among people from different walks of life. It is also considered to bring collective action and in-group cohesion. According to Arrow “the essence of social networks is that they are built up for reasons other than their economic value.” He also expresses that membership of voluntary associations strengthen creation of social capital (UNESCO, 2002). Social capital is considered a bundle of concepts rather than a single entity. Social capital assists the poor to escape poverty also. Social Capital is an attempt to gain conviction from a bad analogy (UNESCO, 2002). Joel Sobel (2002) quotes Solow’s view that Social Capital is useful in so far as it draws attention to those institutions which serves economic life. He also says that social capital directly enhances factor productivity (Sobel, 2002). Social capital depends upon kinds of social network structure. Dense social networks make enforcement of group cooperative behaviour more effective. It increases the quality and reliability of third party monitoring needed to
enforce cooperative dynamic equilibrium (Sobel, 2002). Dense networks facilitate good behaviour. In his view, bridging social capital improves access to information and leads to improved outcomes (Sobel, 2002). Social Capital is an economic, sociological and political concept. It is created through interactions between individuals (Mohan and Mohan, 2002). He also suggests that networks of civic engagement foster norms of generalized reciprocity and coordination. Social capital has beneficial effect on both individual as well as community (Mohan and Mohan, 2002). In other words, social capital is to be found in any form of social relation that provides a resource for action. Social capital should be regarded as outcome of associational activity. Social capital increases trust and reduces the transaction cost (Mohan and Mohan, 2002). It is also argued that declining levels of social trust and civic participation leads to decline of social capital. Social capital is considered to be an important instrument for development (Mohan and Mohan, 2002). It leads to local development. It entails horizontal and vertical associations which promote social cohesion on one hand and prevent parochialism on the other. Social capital has come to be privileged over material inequalities. It is independent of material circumstances (Mohan and Mohan, 2002).

Frane Adam and Borut Roncevic (2003) in their study of Social capital state that social capital is the ability to secure benefits through membership in networks and other social structures. Like other capital, it is also productive achieving certain ends which may not have been possible without its assistance. Social capital is defined by virtue of institutions or social networks in which it is embedded. It emerges from social infrastructure which facilitates individual and collective action of many kinds. Social Capital refers to features of social organization such as trust, networks which can improve the efficiency of society through facilitating coordinated action. Social Capital is a capability which arises from prevalence of trust in society. The most influential work has been done by Ronald Burt who measures social capital in terms of network constraint. According to him, social capital has four sources like value introjection, bounded solidarity, consummatory norms and reciprocity exchanges. He states that trust is a source of social capital. Social capital exerts an influence on socio-economic effectiveness. He also stated that social capital is the catalyst for more effective cooperation and social organization. He quoted Putnam’s view that social capital is generated on the basis of self-interest and entrepreneurship of individual actors. It has also been considered as facilitator for intermediary institutions. Therefore, social capital
is responsible for many positive outcomes seeing it as the cure all for maladies of community (Adam and Roncevic, 2003).

Ji-Young kim (2005) in his study of social capital states that social capital theory focuses over two principal components, one is: social network is created by associational activity and another is: it is fostered through reciprocal norms and trust between citizens. Social capital focuses on broad spectrum of social groups (Kim, 2005). These social networks create reciprocal norms and trust in people which is core element of effective governance (Kim, 2005). Social capital transforms social trust into political trust. He also states that social capital is shaped by cultural norms, values and remedies the decline in political trust (Kim, 2005). Social capital leads to enhancement of political capital and associational participants trust their neighbours, attach themselves to the community (Kim, 2005). Social Capital has been widely applied. In other words, Social Capital is underlying social relationship from which these institutional arrangements emerge (Suarez, et. al, 2005). Social Capital has got developed into an elixir that scholars use to solve the problems. It is a more powerful and positive concept which allows social scientists to make normative claims. In addition, Social capital has tried to simplify complex concept of civil society (Suarez, et. al, 2005). Social Capital is able to reinforce democratic civic engagement. It constitutes the force which helps to bind society together by transforming individuals from self-seeking into members of community with shared interests (Liao, 2005). He emphasizes over Putnam’s viewpoint that social capital is a kind of resource or public good which benefits society as a whole. According to him, trust, norms and social networks are critical elements of social capital which regulates people’s behaviour (Liao, 2005). He also states that social capital formation not only becomes a mechanism to ensure public-private partnership possible but also plays a role of public policy agent (Liao, 2005).

Social capital constitutes a potentially valuable collective resource which pertains to conditions under which members of a collective are willing to engage (Kramer, 2006). Social Capital constitutes a potentially valuable collective resource. Social Capital is created when individuals are willing to contribute to the creation of networks that produce and help sustain various forms of public goods (Kramer, 2006). Social Capital is associated with more productive exchange relations, reduces transaction costs, contributes to civic engagement, enhances social coordination, and fosters social stability (Kramer, 2006). He states that social capital refers to connections among individuals—
social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them (Kramer, 2006). If social capital constitutes a potentially valuable collective resource, then an important question in social capital theory pertains to the conditions under which members of a collective are willing to engage in those behaviors that help create and sustain the reservoir of social capital available to them (Kramer, 2006). Within larger social aggregates, such as societies or nation-states, social capital is created when individuals are willing to contribute to the creation of networks that produce and help sustain various forms of public goods (Kramer, 2006). He quoted Putnam’s views that social capital is a complex construct, constituting simultaneously a private and public good, insofar as ‗‗some of the benefit from an investment in social capital goes to bystanders, while some of the benefit rebounds to the immediate interest of the person making the investment (Kramer, 2006). He also quoted this statement of Putnam that bridging social capital has the potential to ‗‗generate broader identities and reciprocity, whereas bonding social capital bolsters our narrower selves. In his view, Social Capital, however, does not emerge as a bolt from the blue or simply fall from the sky (Kramer, 2006). As with any form of collective resource, it must be created and nurtured. He also argues that Social Capital constitutes an important dimension of relationship between trust and coordination (Kramer, 2006). He also asserted that social capital begets collective identification. The positive consequence of social capital is mutual support, cooperation, trust, institutional effectiveness. A social psychological framework might suggest other fruitful approaches to generating and maintaining social capital in complex social systems (Kramer, 2006).

It is a function of actions pursued by individuals within a social structure. Social capital becomes operational through social connections and obligations that are constructed through investment strategies oriented to the institutionalization of group relations (Burnett, 2006). Reciprocal acts mainly facilitate access to resources at an individual and collective level. Social Capital produces utility and economic returns for its community members (Burnett, 2006). It has also potential for breaking down of the segmented and social hierarchical structuring of the community based on gender, ability versus inability and relative access to resources (Burnett, 2006). Hence, the generation of social capital in this context is highly related to the change in existing relations where the social distance is relatively easy to bridge (Burnett, 2006). Ted Mouw (2006) in his analysis of causal effects of social capital states that it is the ability of actors to secure benefits by
virtue of their membership in social networks. He expresses his opinion that social capital is likely to use contacts to find the work. The evidences suggest that social capital effects are modest and provide a useful individual outcome (Mouw, 2006).

Social Capital is an attractive and useful concept. It attempts to explain the spaces and processes between the micro level and the macro level (McGonigal et. al, 2007). Social Capital is intrinsic to relational network. It exists within a pattern of relationship. Social capital is a form of power, a form of energy and concerned with how social relations of groups are reproduced (McGonigal et. al, 2007). It facilitates certain actions and used to pursue shared objectives. Social Capital is a means of access through social connections and networks. Social capital exists as a resource to action, emerging in engagement (McGonigal et. al, 2007). Social capital is the set of resources that inhere in family relations and in community social organisation and that are useful for the cognitive or social development of a child or young person (McGonigal et. al, 2007). Social capital is viewed as a stock of resources out of which other collective action may be taken to attain mutually beneficial ends. He also quotes Coleman’s view point that social capital is the existence of 'closure', the consistency or concordance of view supplied by sufficient ties among members of a group to ensure the observance of that group’s norms (McGonigal et. al, 2007). He also quotes Putnam’s view that, social trust and altruistic action (with attendant economic or political outcomes) are fostered by norms of reciprocity: a confidence that working for and with others will bring a future reward (McGonigal et. al, 2007). He also states that bonding social capital involves connections between people with similar characteristics (McGonigal et. al, 2007). The notion of social capital shifts the focus of analysis from individuals to patterns of relations. Social Capital enables staffs to explore implications of change at relational level (McGonigal et. al, 2007).

2.17 Social Capital as Mutual bonding:

Sue Kilpatrick et. al (2001) argues that social capital is a resource based on relationship among people. It is a product of social interactions with potential to contribute to the social, civic, economic well-being of community. Social capital counters the uncertainties of market and balance rigidity of hierarchy. It increases people’s confidence for the benefit of community. It recognizes the resources possessed by the excluded groups and maintain internal and external ties. Bonding networks are very essential elements of social capital (Kilpatrick, et. al, 2001).
In the opinion of Christopher Candland (2000) Social Capital arises in a variety of manners as a response to perception of common threat. It encourages individuals to trust another individuals. It is grounded in beliefs, customs, habits. He emphasizes over Amartya Sen’s views that human development is possible only through public action based on mutual support (Candland, 2000).

Thomas Maak (2007) in his study of Social capital expresses that social capital helps in creating network map of complex relationship of an organization and its stakeholders. It is a feature which enables people to act collectively (Maak, 2007). Being premised over Bourdieu’s concept that social capital is an aggregate of actual or potential resources, it is explicitly stated that social networks are constructed through investment strategy in group relations of mutual exchange (Maak, 2007). It is also the goodwill available to individuals and groups (Maak, 2007). Social capital consists of social structures and resources which are inherent to more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual recognition, both internal and external to the organization, which allow facilitation of mutually beneficial, responsible action (https://www.socialcapitalresearch.com/literature/definition/). Its source lies in the structure and content of the actor's social relations (Maak, 2007). He also stated that social capital is owned jointly by parties to a relationship with no exclusive ownership rights for individuals and increases with its continued use (Maak, 2007). Social capital is just commonly shared resources that may be mobilized for mutually beneficial responsible action. Social Capital is embedded in network of stakeholder’s relations enabling rational exchange and sustaining trustful stakeholder relationship (Maak, 2007). On one hand, it strengthens the network ties among people to create bonding social capital, on the other hand, it encourages people to strengthen their own ties (Maak, 2007). So, generally it is stated that social networks generate solidarity and good will which promotes social capital (Maak, 2007). It increases the efficiency of action and reduces the transaction cost. Social capital enables people to act collectively and shapes many desirable socio-economic outcomes (Godoy, et. al 2007). He states that people invest in social capital because it yields tangible private returns. In modern economies, group level effects play a very important role in accumulating social capital (Godoy, et. al 2007). The informal institutions encourage trust and solidarity and constrain individual behaviour to favour the interests of group.

Brian D. Mc Kenzie (2008) states that bridging social relations promote inclusive patterns of civic engagement. In his study of Afro-American community members, he
says that social capital may be effective in tackling problems within black communities. His study demonstrates how group-specific associations exert bridging and bonding effects on society.

Furthermore, research indicates that beneficial social networks, communal bonding experiences, civic training and cooperative norms are fostered in black religious institutions and voluntary groups (Zajdow, 2008). He also asserted Putnam’s views that there is no reliable, comprehensive, nationwide measures of social capital that neatly distinguish "bridgingness" and "bondingness” (Zajdow, 2008). Social Capital refers to those features of social organization such as networks, norms and social trust that facilitate coordination and cooperation for mutual benefit (Zajdow, 2008). Social capital developed within the civil society sector by people in voluntary and informal groups becomes the glue that maintains social cohesion (Zajdow, 2008). Through the connection of people in all forms of groups in society, social capital is raised by widening the amount of trust and mutual reciprocity people have with others outside their immediate family (Zajdow, 2008). He also quotes Coleman’s viewpoint that social capital is existent in groups where there is high level of social closure (Zajdow, 2008). Social capital refers to the resources that are based on connections and group membership. It bridges the gap between civil society and reality of people’s everyday experience (Zajdow, 2008).

Social capital like human capital is productive. It enables us to create value, get things done, achieve our goals, fulfil our missions in life and make our contributions to the world (Baker, 2012). In his view, social capital is an essential part of achieving personal success and satisfying life. The concept of social capital has a long intellectual history (Baker, 2012). People with rich social capital ride the ladder of growth very easily. People create value out of this social capital (Baker, 2012). It also influences use, performance and success of strategic alliances. Developing social network leads to happiness and meaningful life. The ethics of social capital requires that we all recognize our moral duty to consciously manage relationships (Baker, 2012). Therefore, social capital is referred to as personal and business networks. Social Capital is a very significant concept.
2.18 Social Capital as Civic Virtue:

Akbar Valadbigi et. al (2011) in his study of social capital in the Middle East states that social capital deals with civic engagement and social trust. He also asserts that social capital is closely related to civic virtue. Civic virtue is very powerful when embedded in a dense network of reciprocal social relations. It is related to community spirit and cohesion. It encourages policy makers to consider how social capital may be created. Social capital assumes more active social and political citizens. It is linked to norms of civility. He quotes Fukuyama’s presumption that weak social capital may lead to a number of dysfunctions in civil society. It assists in development of civil society (Valadbigi, et. al, 2011).

Social capital exists alongside with economic and cultural capital. Social Capital measures are focussed on mobilization of participation by community residents in undertaking development activities (Bhuiyan, 2011). He quotes Pye’s views on how social networks tend to form around kinship, common origin and patron-client relationship (Bhuiyan, 2011). He considers culture as a system of attitude, values and knowledge which is transmitted from generation to generation (Bhuiyan, 2011). In his view, communities sometimes do those things which even government fails to do. Social capital is a useful resource which facilitates social interaction, promotes mutual support and ensures feasibility of community development (Bhuiyan, 2011).

2.19 Social Capital as integration of community:

The Social Capital is called an important risk management strategy during the stressful period. It bridges the gap between groups affected by various circumstantial shocks (Woolcock, 2000). At a time, when the administrative lacunae obstruct growth of various communities in the state, the social capital smoothens the policy making procedure. The local networks of people advise the state in facilitating the development. A social capital perspective seeks to go beyond primordial “cultural explanations” for these different response strategies, to look instead for structural and relational features (Woolcock, 2000). The social network removes the barriers in the way of social capital development. It is basically a bunch of relationship between various actors. It is a very sufficient condition for an organization to manage their business through forging small networks. It creates vertical and bridging ties as enabling policy for disintegrated community (Woolcock, 2000). The Social Integration is one of the important components of social
cohesiveness. The Social cohesion and social outcome are interrelated with each other. The Social Capital contributes to social cohesion. Social integration, as one of these policy problems, requires not only a sensitivity to context but also a clear sense of what interventions are most needed and appropriate in that context (Jeannote, 2008). Coleman also excerpted that social capital is very essential for creating human capital and develop coordination. The Social Capital within ethnic communities is essential for reducing deficiencies. Material and social resources are in the form of social capital and are embedded in the social relations of the community (Giorgas, 2000). The Social Capital invites attention of scholars towards estimating role of informal relations in building a strong community. It uncaps the potential of an individual to foster social groups. The Social capital enhances the understanding of social support and social networks and the by-product of their interaction. The Social Capital promotes socio-economic mobility for individuals and community (Hawkins and Maurer, 2012). Understanding the generative capacity of social relationships is a valuable addition for social work with individuals, families and communities. Social capital captures the complexities embedded in social relationships (Hawkins and Maurer, 2012). The concept of social capital has had great appeal in some communities as a tool for understanding how to reduce the constraints on capital (economic, human and social) acquisition for historically under-resourced networks and communities (Hawkins and Maurer, 2012). The Social Capital assists in elevating a family’s social standing within the community. Thus, individuals have a responsibility not only to themselves but also to the family and to the community itself (Giorgas, 2000). Social capital within an ethnic community exists in the social relations among parents, between parents and their children, in their relationship with the institutions of the community, and is promoted through the closure exhibited by this structure of relations (Giorgas, 2000). Social capital, in turn, enables members of a community to utilise alternative social and economic resources not available elsewhere in society (Giorgas, 2000). The Social Capital creates the downward-leveling pressure for mainstreaming the ethnic communities. The Social Capital passes on the skills and high tech methods among people to develop local alliances (Giorgas, 2000). The Social Capital enhances the local community governance through institution-building and policy making. The Social Capital produces the cross-cutting networks and seen as very beneficial instrument for functioning of democratic values (Giorgas, 2000). The Social Capital leads to formation of strong social bond between different ethnic groups in society. The Social Capital fosters not only capacity building of the people but
establilishes contacts with trustful people also. It reduces the animosity created between conflicting groups within society. The Social Capital is valuable not only in facilitating certain action but aggregating divergent groups also (Giorgas, 2000). The Social Capital inheres in the structure of relations between actors and among actors. The Social Capital promotes economic well-being thus reducing regional inequality. It also assists in bringing economic prosperity (Giorgas, 2000). The Social Capital is a set of networks which brings associational relationship among people. Social capital is significant because it affects a rural community’s capacity to organize for development (Giorgas, 2000). Tasks such as planning, evaluating, mobilizing resources, coordinating activities, and resolving conflicts are more manageable in a community that is well connected both internally and externally (Freuchte, 2011). The Social Capital is having community building efforts. It is very crucial for developing solidarity and reciprocity among members of community. It is also called a source of personal and organizational network (Freuchte, 2011). The role of Social Capital in community economic development may not be forgot. It generates some form of community organizing through leveraging organizational networks (Freuchte, 2011). It also blends various developmental resources in order to provide benefit to various communities. The poor communities suffer from various types of deficit and disintegration which may be resolved through identifying community social assets created among people. The most effective way of fostering community development is through a holistic approach which draws on social capital assets of communities like informal groups, local organizations, social networks (Gittell and Thompson, 2001). The Social Capital aids in the process of economic empowerment also. It promotes those kinds of community values which may organize various social groups and determine their trends (Gittell and Thompson, 2001). Its significance may be realized through its contribution in capacity building of community-based organizations, local institutions (Gittell and Thompson, 2001). The Social Capital develops the process of communal harmony due to trend of inter-personal interaction. It may also be called a key link for actualization of one’s potential (Gittell and Thompson, 2001). It also helps in the process of overcoming social disconnection in the society. It also bridges the gaps among low income community groups so that they may mingle with outside people (Gittell and Thompson, 2001). The Social Capital garners external resources for the benefit of broader community. In other words, Social Capital may narrow down the focus of community organizing on micro-level networks. It may work in concert with various critical community development assets to serve the interests of both businesses
and low-income communities (Gittell and Thompson, 2001). Social Capital due to its heterogeneous nature enshrined in its diverse objectives and prejudices, aims at strengthening a unity of coordinated action (Gittell and Thompson, 2001). It brings cohesiveness among various groups through integrating their community. It organizes people of varied interest groups into one so that a common goal may be achieved (Gittell and Thompson, 2001). Thus, the role of social capital in integrating sub-groups and diverse communities into one is immense. The goal of community development both in its socio-economic sphere may be achieved through strong bonding among them (Gittell and Thompson, 2001). It fights against external aggression and aftershocks of any external changes into the existing community structure. The Social Capital provides a more systematic way of enforcing trust and reciprocity among members of community (Gittell and Thompson, 2001). It also acts as mediating force for integrating diverse forces. The Social Capital puts its influence over socio-economic effectiveness also (Gittell and Thompson, 2001). The social capital also acts as a glue for cooperative structure and removes individualism in work. Some social scientists assert that there is a notion of complementarity between social embeddedness and formation of civic culture within community (Gittell and Thompson, 2001). It facilitates the intermediary institutions so that the voice of regional people may be heard. Therefore, Social Capital is an innovative concept in sociology which tries to facilitate human relations and developmental networks so that socio-cultural harmony among varied communities may be maintained.

The Social Capital is considered to be quite helpful in improving social exchange. The Social Networks guard against market failure which is caused by asymmetric information. Narayan and Pritchett describe five mechanisms through which social capital affects outcomes (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). One is that they improve society's ability to monitor the performance of government, either because government officials are more embedded in the social network or because monitoring the public provision of services is a public good (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). Two, it increases possibilities for cooperative action in solving problems with a local common property element (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). Three, it facilitates the diffusion of innovations by increasing inter-linkages among individuals (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). Four, it reduces information imperfections and expands the range of enforcement mechanisms, thereby increasing transactions in output, credit, land and labour markets (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). Finally, it provides informal insurance (or informal safety nets) between households, thereby
allowing households to pursue higher returns, but more risky, activities and production techniques (Mukhopadhyay, 2005). The formal institutions and inter-personal relations help to improve the social exchange. The literature on social capital not only emphasizes over trust, norms, social networks for enhancing cooperation but points-out potential externalities on others (Gupta, 2006). The social capital is constituent of cognitive components like trust, norms and values as well as structural components like voluntary associations, social networks (Gupta, 2006). These cognitive aspects of social capital affect community members’ will to participate in collective action. The features of social organization which enhance the trust and cooperation also increase society’s well-being by making government institutions more democratic (Gupta, 2006). The Social Capital functions as a public good within the group which generate externalities for society at large. The Social Capital may be termed mortar of civic engagement and community involvement. It enhances the relationship among members of communities (Gupta, 2006). The bonding social capital connects individuals and brings cohesiveness among them. Kolankiewicz asserts that social capital comprised both the network and assets available for mobilization through network (Gupta, 2006).

A study of some NGOs in Australia has stated that NGOs are resourceful in facilitating generation of social capital through community based ventures (Burnett, 2006). The participation in needs-based programmes mobilizes social capital through network functioning and individual empowerment (Burnett, 2006). Building social cohesion is a key element in formation of social capital. The bonding social capital inhibits wider social networks across various communities which produces bridging social capital (McMurray and Niens, 2012). It is argued that NGOs may serve to foster bonding social capital in the context of societies with traditional community divisions (McMurray and Niens, 2012). It is evident that social networks which extend across communities, generate bridging social capital (McMurray and Niens, 2012). In the contemporary period, the NGOs are associated with influencing policies of the state. These Non-governmental organizations have certain attributes in its nature which makes them an important agent of development. They play a crucial role in nation-building and national development. Their nature is as follows:-

- The NGOs do service for the marginalized and deprived people with utmost dedication.
- Being a staunch supporter of people’s development, they support the participatory method.

- The inter-personal relationship with people within these organizations, garners collective notions.

- Due to less hierarchical and less rigid culture, they are able to implement the projects in a smooth manner.

- Voluntary action is more rapid and cost-effective in reducing administrative costs and minimizing the wastage of the limited resources.

- The NGOs believe in development based on social justice, equity and equality.

- The NGOs are links between the people and the government and helps in stabilizing the government.

The NGOs in India, have witnessed changing roles. The voluntary activities of these NGOs have changed the focus from traditional relief and rehabilitation to developmental activities. There has been shift in emphasis in the voluntary sector from care, charity to empowerment and development (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter%202.pdf). They are now more concerned about capacity building, consciousness raising, conscientising, awakening and developing human resources (http://shodhganga.inflibnet.ac.in/bitstream/10603/28127/4/04_chapter%202.pdf). The core functional areas of these NGOs are; Relief and Rehabilitation, Social Welfare, Service delivery, Education, advocacy and development. They are also engaged in activities like networking and alliance-building, evaluation and monitoring, information-dissemination and documentation. In contemporary society, the NGOs have bright future to contribute. They are facilitators of sound governance which refers to incapacitating citizens over policy issues. They are also promoting awareness and educating masses on various broader issues. They have become a global phenomenon because they represent a flexible form of organization. They show the dual character. The NGOs are people-centred organizations propagating gender equality and social justice (Lewis and Kanji, 2009). The NGOs have become important sources of alternative development practice which has challenged the government-centred orthodoxies of time (Lewis and Kanji, 2009). NGOs are considered to be flexible tool for maintaining and extending the power (Lewis and Kanji, 2009).
In a nutshell, the review of relevant literature on respective research topic brings this point that associational membership fosters the process of formation of social capital. It is found in the above-mentioned reviews that NGOs are equipped to bring collective action among people through integrating them through collectives. The existing literature states that NGOs promote social capital in the community. They have capacity to cultivate the social norms among people. It has also been highlighted through relevant literature that NGOs because of their close relationship with people, engender their trust and participation. They are incapacitated to handle conflict situation through their skills of mass mobilization. The review of literature emphasizes that NGOs are skilled in garnering mass support. They form cross-cutting ties in order to bind the fragmented community together. In one of the literature, it has been excerpted that NGOs work as repository of social capital. They develop horizontal cooperation among people. They draw on social networks, common purposes so that solidarity may be built among people. The NGOs create social network along with expanding across communities. It has also been found that NGOs assist in bringing social cohesiveness. Their intervention is in the area of community-building. Thus, there is developed a close relationship between NGOs and community.

After having examined all these viewpoints, the researcher has found some gaps in the respective literature. One of the gaps is that all these views are conceptual in nature. There has not been done an empirical study to outline responsible factors assisting NGOs in mobilizing social capital in heterogeneous community. The existing literature is even lacking clarity over contribution of structural and cognitive factors for strengthening social capital through NGO. Another gap found is that there is no specific research study on role of NGOs in mobilizing social capital in communities like tribal and non-tribal altogether in Indian context. It could have helped in bringing this notion that social capital formation by NGOs is universally applicable among both homogenous and heterogeneous communities. Therefore, the present study, based on these gaps, attempts to address these issues through empirical investigation.
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