



INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TRENDS IN EMERGING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF TRENDS IN EMERGING RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

Volume 4; Issue 1; 2026; Page No. 183-195

Received: 12-10-2025
Accepted: 23-12-2025
Published: 25-01-2026

Role of NGOS in Social Capital Formation: Perspective on Social Networks, Community Participation and Socio-Economic Development

¹Ajay Ranjan Mehta and ²Dr. Ajay Kumar Sharma

¹Research Scholar, Sunrise University, Alwar, Rajasthan, India

²Assistant Professor, Sunrise University, Alwar, Rajasthan, India

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.23319996>

Corresponding Author: Ajay Ranjan Mehta

Abstract

Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) have an important place in terms of fostering social capital, establishing social connections, and carrying out economic progress due to popular participation and involvement of institutions in the process. Social capital includes a collection of characteristics including interpersonal trust, reciprocity, mutual norms, social networks, and participation in civic engagement. The current paper deals with the concept of NGOs and social capital and highlights how they are related to each other in terms of supporting community development, social networking, cooperation, and common action. The paper also provides an insight into the definitions, types, and functions of NGOs, along with the history of social capital, its theoretical view, types, and method of measurement. The paper analyzes the types of social capital including bonding, bridging, and linking social capital in terms of providing interpersonal relations and connections between institutions and people. The contribution of NGOs to social capital development remains the core element of this paper due to the fact that this role is fulfilled by voluntary engagement and advocacy. NGOs contribute to social capital development through such activities as promotional efforts, mobilization of resources and community developmental activities. The importance of NGOs stems from the fact that they are the main agents of education, medicine, fight against poverty, nature preservation, women empowerment, and social governance. Moreover, NGOs work as mediators between communities and the government. In addition, the paper emphasizes the concept of social capital as an important tool and its contribution to creation of mutual trust among members of the society. The main idea of the paper is that NGOs are very important for developing social capital in terms of activating cooperation and collective responsibility.

Keywords: Non-Governmental Organizations, Social Capital, Community Development, Social Networks, Mutual Trust, Civic Engagement, Collective Action, Socio-Economic Empowerment

1. Introduction

The role of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in social welfare, community responsibility and socio-economic development, particularly among disadvantaged and deprived communities, is important. Their activities are independent from direct government supervision and aimed at attainment of social, developmental, humanitarian or environmental objectives instead of making profit. The activities of NGOs cover such sectors as education, healthcare, poverty reduction, environmental protection, empowerment of women and protection of human rights. The functions of NGOs include a variety of activities from

providing services and advocacy to social mobilization and capacity building. As a result, the implementation of these activities enables to mobilize people and communities for developmental work and to involve them in solving social and economic problems. What is more, NGOs can connect with local populations, mobilize resources and coordinate efforts of people.

Social capital refers to an important component of social development involving networks, relations, norms, trust and reciprocity that are required for cooperation between individuals and communities. The theory of social capital has been widely discussed by social scientists such as Pierre

Bourdieu, James Coleman and Robert Putnam. The concept of social capital means that it is collective resources present in social relations that improve cooperation and provide access to information. Social capital is divided into three groups i.e. bonding social capital, bridging social capital, and linking social capital. Bonding social capital refers to the social capital that links individuals with similar social characteristics, while bridging social capital creates links between people from different social groups. Linking social capital means that communities can interact with institutions with different authority level. Together these concepts help to create social unity, civic participation, access to resources and create communal societies.

The connection between NGOs and social capital is essential because through NGOs people and different organizations can communicate. Thanks to different social programs, informational campaigns, volunteering and schemas of establishing partnerships, NGOs create a number of interpersonal connections between people. Such procedures require such people who are in marginalized communities to engage in decision making regarding social issues and resources so that people would achieve their goals. Through NGOs a community can contact the governmental institutions which makes it possible for people to communicate and get access to public services.

2. NGO

2.1 Definition of NGO

The acronym 'NGO' has been popularized in many parts of the world. The term 'NGO' is usually referred to a collective term within the gambit of aid channel separated from state forces and has no profit notion (Senbeta, 2003) ^[48]. NGOs are referred to as not for profit, non-profit, or voluntary organizations, all generally referring to the same group of institutions (Senbeta, 2003) ^[48]. In other words, NGOs are defined as an independent organization of people acting together on a continuous basis for some common purpose other than making profit and engaged in earning money (Senbeta, 2003) ^[48]. "NGOs are self-governing, private, not-for-profit organizations that are geared to improving the quality of life for disadvantaged people.

According to World Bank, "NGOs are private organizations that pursue activities to relieve suffering, promote the interests of the poor, protect the environment, provide basic social services, and/or undertake community development.

According to Teegen, "NGOs are private, not-for-profit organizations that aim to serve particular societal interests by focusing advocacy and/or operational efforts on social, political and economic goals including equity, education, health, environmental protection and human rights". Erica Johnson and Aseem Prakash define NGO as institutions through which individuals come together to pursue shared goals (Johnson and Prakash, 2007) ^[49]. Some NGOs are well resourced and affluent while some are struggling for the lack of funds.

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) ^[48]. 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 coordinating NGO (Senbeta, 2003) ^[48]. The Advocacy NGOs are targeting the institution-building and bringing some systemic change (Senbeta, 2003) ^[48]. In terms of strategies of development, Korten (1990) ^[50] has emphasized over four types of NGOs like Welfare Organization, Community Development Organization, 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.

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. 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) ^[51]. 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) ^[48]. They constitute grass root operations connected with social movements aimed at challenging and transforming unequal social structures (Senbeta, 2003) ^[48]. 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) ^[51]. 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.

3. Social Capital

The term “Social Capital” has been defined by various thinkers. The writings of Pierre Bourdieu, James Coleman as well as Robert Putnam highlight the problems of defining social capital as the possession of a collectivity such as the population of a place, a region or even a state when networks are comprised of individuals who are the source of trust. Social capital is a contested concept. It is a concept that has received a great deal of attention from commentators across a broad spectrum of political viewpoints (Healy and Hampshire, 2002)^[17]. It may be used to enhance the critical and reflective use in social work. Social Capital refers to norms and networks which enable people to work collectively to resolve problems. It ensures the visibility of productivity of social sphere (Healy and Hampshire, 2002)^[17]. The Empirical research links social capital to improvements in quality of life, such as improved health outcomes for people living in disadvantaged communities, safer communities and access to a range of material and human resources (Healy and Hampshire, 2002)^[17].

The Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) defines Social Capital as “networks together with shared norms, values and understandings that facilitate co-operation within or among groups (Fernando, 2012)^[10].” According to Ostrom, “Social Capital is the shared knowledge, understandings, norms, rules and expectations about patterns of interactions that groups of individuals bring to a recurrent activity (Durlauf and Fafchamps, 2005)^[9].” On the other hand, Bowles and Gintis states, “Social capital generally refers to trust, concern for one’s associates, a willingness to live by the norms of one’s community and to punish those who do not (Durlauf and Fafchamps, 2005)^[9].”

Robison defines social capital as, “a person’s or group’s sympathy towards another person or group that may produce a potential benefit, advantage and preferential treatment for another person beyond that expected in an exchange of relationships (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009)^[3].”

Social capital is a multidimensional construct containing various forms and functions. Encompassing different view, social capital can be regarded as a collective asset in the form of social relations, shared norms, and trust that facilitate cooperation and collective action for mutual benefits (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009)^[3]. It is a capital asset produced through actors’ investment, endowing investors to use as credits by virtue of connections. Social Capital requires enabling conditions such as increased awareness of communities, increase in mutual trust, empowerment in resolving conflicts (Mukherjee and Dasgupta, 2005)^[33]. Social relations are regarded as an asset of an individual- a resource in the form of information and trust that actors can draw once accumulated (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009)^[3]. Specifically, social capital involves informal social relations, memberships in social networks and groups, civic engagements (volunteering), community and organizational participation (volunteering), trust in the people and institutions, and norms of reciprocity (Bhandari

and Yasunobu, 2009)^[3]. It is a collectively-owned resource generated through individuals’ shared norms, values, attitudes and behaviour that produces mainly a positive influence on economic development (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009)^[3].

3.1 Evolution of Social Capital

Although the terminology of social capital is relatively new, the concept refers to well-established ideas in the social sciences. This includes the notion that social connections contribute to quality of life and, further, that these connections are related in a complex way to economic, political and cultural outcomes (Healy and Hampshire, 2002)^[17]. Although the concept of Social Capital is not very old yet, its origin is traced back to sociological foundations. Social reformers in a range of disciplines, including education and urban planning, were among the earliest exponents of this concept (Healy and Hampshire, 2002)^[17]. References to the notion of social capital can be traced back to Karl Marx (1818-1883), Emile Durkheim (1858-1917), Georg Simmel (1858-1918), John Dewey (1859-1952), and Max Weber (1864-1920); all these scholars talk about the part played by culture in economic progress. It is also noted that the very concept of social capital is first mentioned in the book written by Lyda Hanifan in 1916 where social capital is understood as the ability to possess the material culture in the life of human beings as in goodwill, fellowship, sympathy, and social interaction among people and families which constitute a social unit (<https://www.oecd.org/insights/37966934.pdf>). After long disappearance of the concept, the concept of social capital was reinvented by a team of Canadian sociologists while studying urban communities by Homans for a theory of social interactions, by Jacobs while discussing urban life and neighbourliness, and by Loury for studying income distribution (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009)^[3]. This concept can also be witnessed in 1980s and 1990s where thinkers ranging from James Coleman, Pierre Bourdieu and Robert Putnam explicitly described about it. Different authors defined social capital in different ways reflecting their own interest. Coleman associated this capital with supportive family and community bonds. Even in Australia, this concept got popular and a substantial debate emerged in Australia over it. It has influenced over social policy and program development at federal, state and local government levels in Australia (Healy and Hampshire, 2002)^[17]. In the area of Social Capital, the contribution may be attributed to Francis Fukuyama also who offered more specific and significant definition of social capital. He defines social capital as the existence of a certain set of informal values or norms shared among members of a group that permit cooperation among them (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009)^[3]. But in last 20 years, Social Capital has become a subject of renewed interest. The current success of this concept is thus increased by a series of studies associating social capital to phenomena such as the growth tragedy in Africa, the mortality crisis in Russia and the success of grazing land management in Ethiopia (Pöder, 2011)^[37].

3.2 Types of Social Capital

The Social Capital has been categorized into three parts; *Bonding Social Capital*, *Bridging Social Capital* and

Linking Social Capital. Apart from it, the Social Capital has been categorized into various other forms like Strong and Weak Social Capital and Horizontal and Vertical Social Capital. The Bonding Social Capital is characterized by dense interactions, collective action within homogenous group of people (Lo, 2010) ^[27]. It is developed based on family and kinship, religious beliefs and same ethnicity, etc. Although bonding social capital strengthens norms of reciprocity, solidarity and trust, it tends to be inward-looking, excluding other social groups with diverse backgrounds (Lo, 2010) ^[27]. The bonding social capital strengthens the micro level interaction among its members. It is more inward-looking, protective, and exercising close membership, and therefore good for under-girding specific reciprocity and mobilizing informal solidarity (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009) ^[3]. Bonding promotes communication and relationships necessary to pursue common goals. Moreover, it influences creation and nurturing of community organizations, like self-help groups and local association (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009) ^[3]. In other words, it is referred to relationship among members of a network who are similar in some form (Hawkins and Maurer, 2012) ^[16].

Bridging Social Capital refers to relationship among people who are dissimilar in their age, socio-economic status, ethnicity and education (Hawkins and Maurer, 2012) ^[16]. It promotes interactions between diverse and heterogeneous groups of people. It is more outward-looking and establishes bridging networks with distant friends, associates and community organizations, and its external effects are likely to be positive (Lo, 2010) ^[27]. Bridging social capital refers to more distant ties of like persons, such as loose friendships and workmates. Often people in bridging networks differ on key personal characteristics. Bridging is more outward-looking, civically engaged, narrows the gap between different communities and exercising open membership, and is, therefore, crucial to organizing solidarity and pursuing common goals (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009) ^[3]. Bridging is crucial for solving community problems through helping people to know each other, building relationships, sharing information, and mobilizing community resources.

On the other hand, Linking Social Capital involves vertical relationship with those in authority whereas bonding and bridging social capitals link groups in horizontal networks (Lo, 2010) ^[27]. In a hierarchy with asymmetric power relations, linking social capital strengthens ties between state and organizations and the communities (Lo, 2010) ^[27]. Apart from providing social credentials and influencing the agents, linking social capital may facilitate the flow of information (Lo, 2010) ^[27]. Businessmen with linking social capital are placed in an advantaged position to obtain privilege and restricted information for business transactions (Lo, 2010) ^[27]. It reaches out to people in dissimilar situations, such as those who are entirely outside of the community (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009) ^[3]. Linking social capital may involve networks and ties of a particular community with states or other agencies (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009) ^[3].

Strong and Weak Social Capital are nothing but strength of social ties. Strong ties refer to close, persistent and binding relationship which exists with families whereas weak ties refer to more casual, temporary and contingent relationship (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009) ^[3]. Weak ties link people to

the broader communities and to a wider range of potential resources (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009) ^[3]. It can serve as channel in mobilizing resources, ideas, and information to promote collective actions in the community (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009) ^[3].

Social Capital has also other forms in terms of horizontal and vertical networks. While Horizontal Social Capital refers to lateral ties between people of homogenous character and status, Vertical Social Capital characterize the ties between people of different hierarchy. While horizontal social capital operates through shared norms and values, vertical social capital operates through formal hierarchical structure (Bhandari and Yasunobu, 2009) ^[3].

In the area of social capital formation, the role of NGO is quite immense. It has started delivering services to people in order to gain their trust and confidence. The NGOs provide people with services in order to fulfil their immediate needs. Some scholars consider NGO as policy entrepreneurs who seek to influence and change policy in innovative ways. The NGOs foster the notion of social capital in order to consolidate the fragmented communities. They are adept at developing cross-cutting and horizontal links in the society which brings cohesiveness among people. The NGOs have been developing the social fabric of wider community through promoting learning among local organizations. These institutions collaborate with local actors. The degree of civic engagement through NGOs leads to development of social capital (Abom, 2004) ^[1]. In the words of Putnam, social capital is produced by the continuous exercise of community norms and organizational culture. Put simply, social capital is the stock of norms of reciprocity, trust, and organizing among a designated group or groups—a battery driving the social organizing and networking process (Abom, 2004) ^[1]. The development protagonists find-out that social capital is strengthened through institutional approaches and incentives for collective action. This strategy, implemented mainly by Northern-led and Northern-funded NGOs, aims to relieve the immediate suffering of the ‘poor’ and meet their short-term visible needs in the hope that the ‘poor’ may get themselves back onto their feet to ‘escape poverty’ (Abom, 2004) ^[1]. Buckland finds that NGO interventions enhanced community norms and networks, but mainly between the NGO practitioner and the participants as opposed to social capital within and among the community of participants (Abom, 2004) ^[1]. Since the late 1980s, more NGOs have become involved in lobbying, mediation, advocacy, and civic education, with the aim of strengthening the capacity of local organizations (Abom, 2004) ^[1]. Grassroots Support Organizations (GRSOs), or what calls ‘intermediary NGOs’, have been shown to foster social capital by working together with people and communities in providing capacity building support to foster collective action and the extension of cooperative bargaining norms and networks (Abom, 2004) ^[1]. Furthermore, NGOs have been identified as catalysts of social capital across the state–society divide by promoting information sharing, exposing government to neglected grassroots perspectives, and acting as agents of partnership (Abom, 2004) ^[1]. The NGOs following intervention strategies based on capacity building, advocacy and incentives to collective action, play a significant role in social capital construction (Abom, 2004) ^[1]. In the words of

Carroll, intermediary NGOs foster social capital through working together with people and communities in providing capacity building support (Abom, 2004) ^[1]. The NGOs with support from grassroot people facilitate the development issues in the area. They are considered to be preferred channel for service provision. The NGOs galvanize support and shape, implement, and monitor national and international commitments. They often act as alternative conduits through which external and transnational agencies deliver funds and expertise to local communities (Silliman, 1999) ^[41].

3.3 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) ^[34]. 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) ^[7]. 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) ^[34]. 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) ^[34].

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) ^[34]. 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) ^[34]. According to Coleman, social capital identifies some aspects of the social structure by their functions (Mukhopadhyay, 2005) ^[34]. 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) ^[14]. 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) ^[34]. 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) ^[34]. 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) ^[34].

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) ^[34]. 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) ^[34]. According to Portes, Social Capital is the ability to secure benefits through membership in networks and other social structures (Mukhopadhyay, 2005) ^[34]. 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) ^[34]. The Social Capital is analyzed by the amount or variety of such characteristics of others with whom an individual has direct or indirect ties (Mukhopadhyay, 2005) ^[34]. 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.

3.4 Measurement of Social Capital

The measurement of Social Capital is an important aspect. As Bullen and Onyx (2000) ^[2] 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) ^[15]. 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) ^[46]. 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) ^[46]. 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)^[46]. 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^[53] in Britain, it was found that nearly 87 percent of respondents participated as volunteer or a member of at least one association (Grenier and Wright, 2003)^[13]. This study also indicates that membership is increasingly becoming concentrated within people who are engaged as members (Grenier and Wright, 2003)^[13]. 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)^[13]. In terms of - pursuits associated with social capital, Hall identifies sport, civic duties, social clubs, pubs, and visits to friends (Grenier and Wright, 2003)^[13]. These activities seem likely to indicate some level of socialising (Grenier and Wright, 2003)^[13]. 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)^[13]. 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)^[26]. 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)^[26]. The production of social capital is facilitated by social structures such as voluntary associations, various membership organizations (Lake and Huckfeldt, 1998)^[26]. 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)^[54], based on the concept of structural holes, and Arribas and Vila (2012)^[11], based on preferential attachment network models (Fornoni *et al.* 2012)^[11]. The measurement of social capital has been principled on three major dimensions; Micro, Meso and Macro approaches (Fornoni, *et al.* 2012)^[11]. 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)^[6]. 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)^[6]. 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 microlevel (Chiesi, 2007)^[6]. 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)^[6]. A vertical division of work, rather than horizontal, is prevailing, which favours cooperation rather than competition (Chiesi, 2007)^[6]. The analysis of socio-metric interviews is focused 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)^[6]. The measurement of social capital which is based on structural and cognitive aspects may be characterized 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)^[15]. In a quantitative study on Social Capital, Kawachi *et al.* (1997)^[15] has measured social capital through following indicators (Harpham, *et al.* 2002)^[15]:

- 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 (2000)^[2] where a questionnaire was administered among 1211 respondents (Harpham, *et al.* 2002)^[15]. 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, interracial trust, diversity of friendship, civic leadership,

associational involvement, informal socializing, volunteering etc. (Harpham, *et al.* 2002) ^[15]. Even Putnam in his study of social capital in Italy attempts to utilize several sets of instruments to measure it (Harpham, *et al.* 2002) ^[15]. 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) ^[15]. 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) ^[25]. Leaders seize available opportunities and create new ones (Krishna, 2007) ^[25]. Like other forms of capital, social capital also needs to be maintained and kept in good order (Krishna, 2007) ^[25]. 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) ^[25].

4. Social Capital: It's Role in Public Policy, Trust, Networking and Community Development

4.1 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) ^[31]. 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) ^[31]. 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) ^[31]. 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) ^[31]. 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 favorable or at least tolerant environment is essential to internal stability, and per contra, internal cohesion also defines a limit to external relations (Montgomery, 2000) ^[31]. 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) ^[31]. The regions characterized 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) ^[31]. 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) ^[31]. 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) ^[31]. The network based on ethnicity, religion, neighbourhood acts as critical support for economic activities of its members (Montgomery, 2000) ^[31]. 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) ^[39]. 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) ^[39]. 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) ^[39]. It is also considered to an effective complement to material and financial resource (Ransing, 2015) ^[39]. 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) ^[39]. The formation of social capital as a policy resource has become a big challenge and mainstay for development strategies (Ransing, 2015) ^[39]. 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) ^[39]. 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) ^[39]. 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) ^[38]. 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) ^[38]. 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) ^[38]. 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) ^[38]. 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) ^[38]. 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) ^[38]. 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) ^[22]. 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) ^[22].

4.2 Social Capital as Trust and Networking

According to George Kolankiewicz (1996) ^[23], 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) ^[23]. Social capital creates local economic prosperity which involves inter-personal trust, civic engagement, organizational capability for growth of community (Wilson, 1997) ^[45]. 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) ^[45]. 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) ^[45]. Social capital not only produces an atmosphere conducive to economic activity, it provides the cultural will to solve community problems collaboratively (Wilson, 1997) ^[45]. 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) ^[45]. He also expressed this view that social capital lays the basis for transition from fear-based to trust-based economy (Wilson, 1997) ^[45]. 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) ^[45]. 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) ^[45]. In other words, it is a critical element of successful democratic process. Leadership and social capital are directly connected to each other (Renshon, 2000) ^[40]. Social Capital binds individuals together and facilitates the working together for a common purpose (Renshon, 2000) ^[40]. 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) ^[40].

In the words of Candland, Christopher (2000) ^[5], 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) ^[5]. 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) ^[5].

Report of Social Analysis and Reporting Division (2001) states that social capital is a putative positive outcome (Office for National Statistics, 2001) ^[36]. 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) ^[36].

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) ^[42]. 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) ^[42]. Dense networks facilitate good behaviour. In his view, bridging social capital improves access to information and leads to improved outcomes (Sobel, 2002) ^[42]. Social Capital is an economic, sociological and political concept. It is created through interactions between individuals (Mohan and Mohan, 2002) ^[30]. 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) ^[30]. 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) ^[30]. 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) ^[30]. 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) ^[30].

Social capital constitutes a potentially valuable collective resource which pertains to conditions under which members of a collective are willing to engage (Kramer, 2006) ^[24]. 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) ^[24]. 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) ^[24]. 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) ^[24]. 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) ^[24]. 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) ^[24]. 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) ^[24]. 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) ^[24]. 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) ^[24]. 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) ^[24].

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) ^[4]. 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) ^[4]. 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) ^[4]. 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) ^[4]. Ted Mouw (2006) ^[32] 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) ^[32].

4.3 Social Capital as Mutual bonding

Sue Kilpatrick *et al.* (2001) ^[21] 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) ^[21].

In the opinion of Christopher Candland (2000) ^[5] Social Capital arises in a variety of manners as a response to perception of common threat. It encourages individuals to trust another individual. 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) ^[5].

Thomas Maak (2007) ^[28] 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) ^[28]. 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) ^[28]. It is also the goodwill available to individuals and groups (Maak, 2007) ^[28]. 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) ^[28]. 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) ^[28]. 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) ^[28]. 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) ^[28]. So, generally it is stated that social networks generate solidarity and good will which promotes social capital (Maak, 2007) ^[28]. 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) ^[12]. 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) ^[12]. The informal institutions encourage trust and solidarity and constrain individual behaviour to favour the interests of group.

Brian D. McKenzie (2008) ^[29] 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) ^[47]. 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) ^[47]. 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) ^[47]. Social capital developed within the civil society sector by people in voluntary and informal groups becomes the glue that maintains social cohesion (Zajdow, 2008) ^[47]. 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) ^[47]. He also quotes Coleman 's viewpoint that social capital is existent in groups where there is high level of social closure (Zajdow, 2008) ^[47]. 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) ^[47]. 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) ^[2]. 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. People with rich social capital ride the ladder of growth very easily. People create value out of this social capital (Baker, 2012) ^[2]. 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. Therefore, social capital is referred to as personal and business networks. Social Capital is a very significant concept.

4.4 Role of Ngo in Social Capital

The Non-Governmental Organization plays a very vital role in the mobilization of communities to build social capital. The organization contributes to social activism by virtue of street campaigns and networking. As a social force, the organization helps in coordinating collective action for mobilizing people to achieve the objectives of the organization (Villi, n.d.) ^[44]. The NGOs use multiple people-centered strategies and build relationships with people to mobilize them for the objectives (Villi, n.d.) ^[44]. The NGOs have a role in making people environmentally conscious and integrating them into developmental processes (Villi, n.d.) ^[44]. The NGOs lend their voice to the cause of marginalized communities through campaigns and social activism. The NGOs have contributed towards the identification of human resources in human rights. In the Indian context, the role of the NGOs in providing services and supervision of workers in different political mobilization is significant.

The NGO staffs are trained to manage substantial monitoring and data evaluation for larger community mobilization. The NGOs are alternative agencies in promoting awareness, change in the society. They have been instrumental in creating awareness and implementing development programmes in agriculture, watershed development, women's empowerment, education, health and family welfare.

The NGO has been quite active in mobilizing the downtrodden community. The NGOs induce shift in the entire development paradigm and incentivize the contributor in development arena. They instil in their members and subjects, habits of cooperation, solidarity, public spiritedness (Degli and Grimalda, 2012) ^[8]. In one of the studies, it has been shown that the NGOs organize even forest dwellers to assert their traditional forest rights. Even the NGOs educate the people about causes of poverty. It assists them through organizing people based on participatory approach. The NGOs ensure that the people participate in economic planning and development process (Suharko, 2007) ^[43]. The NGOs attempt to understand the real base of community mobilization. People trust on NGO more than they do on members of their own community (Islam, 2016) ^[19]. The empowerment of the community especially of the poor people is stated to be the prime goal of NGO. The NGOs function as mediating agency between the people and the state. This volunteerism in India especially in the area of mass mobilization is relegated to Gandhian era where the hegemony of bigger corporations was challenged by the grass root communities.

The NGOs play the crucial role of main tributary to community development. The NGOs play a significant role in socio-economic upgradation of the society. The NGOs improve the access of people to the services provided by the state (Suharko, 2007) ^[43]. They influence various policy decisions for growth of poor people. Clark states that NGOs assist citizens in finding out activities of the government which might affect them (Suharko, 2007) ^[43]. They use advocacy and political influence to hold local officials accountable for activities promoting the people's interest.

The NGOs play the pivotal role in complementing the state in some crucial areas like service-delivery, advocacy and democratic governance. They also assist in developing strategies for funding for local people and various not-for-profit making activities. NGOs seek resources in order to bridge societal gaps. In a survey done in Cambodia in 2012, it was found that over 52,650 local staff are employed with NGOs across the country, which has contributed to the national socio-economic and human resource development significantly (Khieng, 2014) ^[20]. The NGOs have contributed in the area of various vocational training, income generation programmes in the state. The NGOs benefit the communities through sociopolitical and economic development. The NGOs play the role in counteracting the hurdles in garnering mass support also (Heinrich, 2001) ^[18]. The democratic procedure within the NGO leads to development of cohesiveness among members which also percolate among its beneficiaries. NGOs can play a crucial role in providing effective channels of interest representation for the marginalized sections of the population thereby assisting in integrating them into the democratic political system (Heinrich, 2001) ^[18]. They also establish certain level of opportunity for the common people characterized by mutual reciprocity, cohesiveness and trust among them. The NGOs are more cooperative and institutionalized towards garnering mass support (Heinrich, 2001) ^[18]. They promote the civil society through a network of networks. The NGOs promote the formal and informal power distribution among the people (Heinrich, 2001) ^[18]. NGOs make use of other formal democratic procedures including annual general meetings, regular board meetings, and consultations with staff and members for generating internal cohesiveness among its members (Heinrich, 2001) ^[18]. In a study of Anti-Apartheid movement in South Africa, it was found that NGOs bring people from various social backgrounds together on a constant and voluntary basis while mitigating racial cleavages among the community members (Heinrich, 2001) ^[18]. It removes the racial cleavages through coordinating with people across the lines of various social hierarchy. As a result, NGOs have an opportunity to actively participate in creating cross-cutting memberships thus mitigating the significance of the racial divide (Heinrich, 2001) ^[18]. Furthermore, they have gained an increasing awareness of the possible divisive consequence of racial identity (Heinrich, 2001) ^[18]. The state appears unable to implement an effective pro-poor policy as a result of the introduction of neoliberal fiscal policies and the existing influence of the officials from the former apartheid era (Heinrich, 2001) ^[18]. Thus, it may be deciphered that the NGOs are not only able to perform the role of mitigating societal differences but mobilizing the state forces for executing pro-people policies. These efforts create a sense of belongingness towards the state and get mobilized very well. The Carnegie Commission on the Prevention of Deadly Conflict pointed out in its 1997 report, "Non-governmental organizations at their best provide a vast array of human services unmatched by either government or the market, and they are self-designated advocates for action on virtually all matters of public concern (Nelson, 2007) ^[35]." The NGOs play the voice for common people through advocacy and awareness raising programs. It also acts as mediator and facilitator. NGOs also

influence the emergence of new business models, new corporate accountability mechanisms and institutional structures, non-traditional cross-sector alliances, and changes in the public policy environments or framework conditions under which certain industries operate (Nelson, 2007) ^[35]. The NGOs have become an active voice in civic society. The NGOs focus on addressing various conditions of governance through multi-lateral points of view. NGOs have played a major role in shaping public expectations of the extractive sector and influencing both corporate and government actions through all four modes of engagement (Nelson, 2007) ^[35]. In community organization, they have established public advocacy campaigns, facilitated lawsuits, supported local community organizations and indigenous peoples' groups by providing them with training, funds and networks, and engaged in governmental and inter-governmental consultation processes (Nelson, 2007) ^[35]. Many NGOs have pro-actively worked in the area of raising public awareness regarding socio-economic and environmental conditions of various companies across globe. NGOs have often played a crucial role in 'shining the spotlight' on some of the most egregious of these cases, and in agitating, demonstrating for the people's cause (Nelson, 2007) ^[35]. The NGOs influence the state in various aspects through bringing accountability and transparency in its functionality. The NGOs seek to create the legitimacy and support it needs to survive. The NGOs protect the rights of common people and ensure that their interests are not subjugated by any third party (Nelson, 2007) ^[35]. These NGOs contribute in the sphere of social mobilization through various social auditing activities also. The NGOs ensure the individual as well as collective responsibility for better governance. The NGOs constructively work together to enhance each other's learning and performance, explore innovative and shared solutions to complex socio-economic or environmental challenges, and to strengthen public sector governance (Nelson, 2007) ^[35]. The NGOs improve both the public sector and private sector accountability towards people which also signify their mobilization. In one of studies done in Kenya and Bangladesh, it is found out that the NGOs are contributing towards social mobilization of women through holding political and social empowerment programs, holding them mobile in various facets of life. The NGOs exert influence over community through developing informal relations (Nelson, 2007) ^[35].

5. Conclusion

The paper examines the impact of NGOs in building social capital in the context of community involvement, interpersonal relations, social connections and cooperation. It analyses the concept of bonding, bridging and linking social capital in relation to social cohesion and community development. Bonding capital enables the community to support its members in achieving solidarity, bridging capital boosts relationships and cooperation between different social groups, while linking capital is responsible for connection with authorities. The paper also examines the role of NGOs in social capital building through mobilization of public participation, awareness of social problems, specific resources and joint activities. The NGOs are involved in solving such problems as education, health care, poverty, ecology and women's empowerment which creates

an opportunity for improving the well-being of the communities. The paper outlines the basic components of social capital, such as trust, reciprocity, common values and civic engagement which help boost cooperation. The interactions of NGOs and the community are presented as mediators of marginalized groups who need government support through obtaining access to resources, enabling public engagement and participatory governance.

The conclusion drawn in this paper is that NGOs are crucial instruments for promoting social capital and achieving inclusive socio-economic development. Social capital enables cooperation, trust, community engagement, and collective action, whereas NGOs contribute to the creation of these features via community-based programs and partnerships. The paper points out that increasing different types of social capital can contribute to social stability, accessibility of resources, and empowerment of communities. The function of NGOs is much wider than just providing welfare services; they promote civic engagement, advocacy and build relationships between social community and public institutions. For effective social capital development, it is important to ensure that communities engage in processes and that accountability, transparency, and cooperation among stakeholders are present. Further research could cover the role of NGOs in formation of social capital among communities in both rural and urban areas, especially disadvantaged economically and socially ones. Comparative research could be carried out to study the differences in networking, trust, volunteering, and institutional relationships in various types of NGOs as well as regions. Besides, longitudinal research can facilitate better analysis of the relationship between NGO involvement, creation of social capital, and NGOs impact on community sustainable development. Further emphasis should be laid on community ownership and stakeholders' cooperation and collaboration in order to help NGOs have a greater impact on social welfare and long-term socio-economic development.

6. References

1. Abom B. Social capital, NGOs, and development: a Guatemalan case study. *Development in Practice*. 2004;14(3):342-353.
2. Baker WE. *Achieving Success through Social Capital: Tapping the Hidden Resources in Your Personal and Business Networks*. Wiley; c2012.
3. Bhandari H, Yasunobu K. What is social capital? A comprehensive review of the concept. *Asian Journal of Social Science*. 2009;37(3):480-510.
4. Burnett C. Building social capital through an "active community club". *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*. 2006;41(3-4):283-294. doi:10.1177/1012690207078381.
5. Candland C. Faith as social capital: religion and community development in Southern Asia. *Policy Sciences*. 2000;33:355-374.
6. Chiesi AM. Measuring social capital and its effectiveness: the case of small entrepreneurs in Italy. *European Sociological Review*. 2007;23(4):437-453.
7. Claridge T. *Social Capital and Natural Resource Management: An Important Role for Social Capital*. Master's thesis. University of Queensland; c2004.
8. Degli Antoni G, Grimalda G. *The Value of Real Voluntary Associations*. Working Paper No. 37. Milan: Università degli Studi di Milano-Bicocca; c2012.
9. Durlauf SN, Fafchamps M. Social capital. In: Aghion P, Durlauf SN, editors. *Handbook of Economic Growth*. London: Elsevier; c2005. p. 1639-1699.
10. Fernando P. *Working with Social Movements*. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD); c2012. Available from: <https://www.oecd.org/dac/povertyreduction/50157985.pdf>
11. Fornoni M, Arribas I, Vila JE. An entrepreneur's social capital and performance: the role of access to information in the Argentinean case. *Journal of Organizational Change Management*. 2012;25(5):682-698.
12. Godoy R, *et al*. The role of community and individuals in the formation of social capital. *Human Ecology*. 2007;35(6):709-721.
13. Grenier P, Wright K. *Social Capital in Britain: An Update and Critique of Hall's Analysis*. CCS International Working Paper No. 14. London: Centre for Civil Society, London School of Economics and Political Science; c2003.
14. Hansen M, Roll K. *Mutuality in Business*. Working Paper No. 2. Oxford: Saïd Business School; c2016.
15. Harpham T, Grant E, Thomas E. Measuring social capital within health surveys: key issues. *Health Policy and Planning*. 2002;17(1):106-111.
16. Hawkins RL, Maurer K. Unravelling social capital: disentangling a concept for social work. *British Journal of Social Work*. 2012;42:353-370.
17. Healy K, Hampshire A. Social capital: a useful concept for social work? *Australian Social Work*. 2002;55(3):227-238.
18. Heinrich VF. The role of NGOs in strengthening the foundations of South African democracy. *Voluntas*. 2001;12(1):1-15.
19. Islam MR. *NGOs, Social Capital and Community Empowerment in Bangladesh*. Palgrave Macmillan; c2016.
20. Khieng S. Funding mobilization strategies of nongovernmental organizations in Cambodia. *Voluntas*. 2014;25:1441-1464.
21. Kilpatrick S, *et al*. *Social Capital: An Analytical Tool for Exploring Lifelong Learning and Community Development*. Discussion Paper D13/2001. CRLRA; c2001.
22. Kirori GN. *Social Capital as a Strategy for Promoting Rural Livelihoods: Case for Kenya*. Progressive Academic Publishing Press; c2015.
23. Kolankiewicz G. Social capital and social change. *The British Journal of Sociology*. 1996;47(3):427-441.
24. Kramer RM. Social identity and social capital: the collective self at work. *International Public Management Journal*. 2006;9(1):25-45.
25. Krishna A. How does social capital grow? A seven-year study of villages in India. *The Journal of Politics*. 2007;69(4):941-956.
26. Lake RL, Huckfeldt R. Social capital, social networks, and political participation. *Political Psychology*. 1998;19(3):567-584.

27. Lo TW. Beyond social capital: triad organized crime in Hong Kong and China. *The British Journal of Criminology*. 2010;50:851-872.
28. Maak T. Responsible leadership, stakeholder engagement, and the emergence of social capital. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 2007;74(4):329-343.
29. McKenzie BD. Reconsidering the effects of bonding social capital: a closer look at Black civil society institutions in America. *Political Behavior*. 2008;30(1):25-45.
30. Mohan G, Mohan J. Placing social capital. *Progress in Human Geography*. 2002;26(2):191-210.
31. Montgomery JD. Social capital as a policy resource. *Policy Sciences*. 2000;33(3-4):227-243.
32. Mouw T. Estimating the causal effect of social capital: a review of recent research. *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2006;32:79-102.
33. Mukherjee N, Dasgupta R. *Learning to Share: Experiences and Reflections on Participatory Approaches*. New Delhi: Concept Publications; c2005.
34. Mukhopadhyay I. *Social Capital and Health Inequality: A Preliminary Enquiry*. MPhil dissertation. New Delhi: School of Social Sciences, Jawaharlal Nehru University; c2005.
35. Nelson J. *The Operation of Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) in a World of Corporate and Other Codes of Conduct*. Corporate Social Responsibility Initiative Working Paper No. 34. Cambridge, MA: John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University; c2007.
36. Office for National Statistics. *Social Capital: A Review of the Literature*. Social Analysis and Reporting Division; c2001.
37. Pöder TG. What is really social capital? A critical review. *American Sociology*. 2011;42:341-367.
38. Policy Research Initiative. *Social Capital as a Public Policy Tool: Project Report*. Canada; c2005.
39. Ransing RA. Social capital as a policy resource for development of villages: case study of Ukhrul district in Manipur. *International Journal of Applied Services Marketing Perspectives*. 2015;4(3):1812-1817.
40. Renshon SA. Political leadership as social capital: governing in a divided national culture. *Political Psychology*. 2000;21(1):199-226.
41. Silliman J. Expanding civil society: shrinking political spaces-the case of women's nongovernmental organizations. *Social Politics*. 1999;6(1):23-53.
42. Sobel J. Can we trust social capital? *Journal of Economic Literature*. 2002;40:139-154.
43. Suharko. *The Roles of NGOs in Rural Poverty Reduction: The Case of Indonesia and India*. Discussion Paper No. 160. Graduate School of International Development; c2007.
44. Villi C. *A Study on the Role of NGOs in Social Mobilizations in the Context of SGSY* [Internet]. Available from: <http://www.sird.tn.nic.in/pdf/social%20mobilisation%20research.pdf>
45. Wilson PA. Building social capital: a learning agenda for the twenty-first century. *Urban Studies*. 1997;34(5-6):745-760.
46. Woolcock M, Narayan D. Social capital: implications for development theory, research and policy. *The World Bank Research Observer*. 2000;15(2):225-249.
47. Zajdow G. Civil society, social capital and the Twelve Step group. *Community, Work & Family*. 2008;1(1):79-89.
48. Senbeta AH. Non-governmental organizations and development with reference to the Benelux countries. *Université catholique de Louvain, Département des sciences de la population et du développement*; c2003 Nov.
49. Johnson E, Prakash A. NGO research program: A collective action perspective. *Policy Sciences*. 2007;40(3):221-240.
50. Korten DC. *Getting to the 21st century: Voluntary action and the global agenda*; c1990.
51. Lewis D, Kanji N. *Voucher proofs Not for distribution*; c2009.
52. Onyx J, Bullen P. Measuring social capital in five communities. *The journal of applied behavioral science*. 2000;36(1):23-42.
53. Johnston RJ, Pattie CJ, Rossiter DJ. Sleaze, constituency and dissent: voting on Nolan in the House of Commons. *Area*. 1997;29(1):20-33.
54. Nahapiet J, Ghoshal S. Social capital, intellectual capital, and the organizational advantage. *Academy of management review*. 1998;23(2):242-266.

Creative Commons (CC) License

This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY 4.0) license. This license permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.