



## Stakeholder's Perspective on Poverty Reduction: A Study of Slum Areas in Kathmandu Metropolitan City-14, Nepal

Rahul Aryal<sup>1</sup>, Prashant Shrestha<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Research Assistant at Small World, Kathmandu

Email: [aryalrahul853@gmail.com](mailto:aryalrahul853@gmail.com); <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-1794-8378>

<sup>2</sup>Videographer, Editor and Independent Researcher

Email: [prashant1shrestha11@gmail.com](mailto:prashant1shrestha11@gmail.com)

### Abstract

*This study assesses stakeholders' perspective on poverty reduction in slum areas of Kathmandu metropolitan city through a survey of 120 randomly selected slum dwellers. Using self-administered structured questionnaires, it examines socio-economic backgrounds, health, security, community participation, and program effectiveness. Quantitative analysis with SPSS and Excel provides insights into the impact of current poverty alleviation efforts. The study found that slum residents experience poverty as an interlocking crisis of social, economic, and spatial deprivations. Demographically, a working-age population remains trapped in informal labor with alarmingly low educational attainment. Chronic food insecurity affects 96.7 percent of households, while healthcare services and public infrastructure remain critically inadequate. Despite Nepal's progressive policy landscape, including constitutional mandates and the Local Government Operation Act (2017), a cavernous implementation gap exists between policy intent and ground-level reality. Government and NGO programs are rated as ineffective, characterized by fragmented, short-term interventions lacking community engagement. The study concludes that stakeholders' effort have helped with service delivery and some economic support to the slum dwellers. However, sustainable poverty reduction requires integrated, participatory approaches that address root causes, strengthen local governance accountability, and align strategies with human rights principles. Recommendations include increased investment in education, healthcare, livelihood creation, and stronger coordination between local governments, NGOs, and communities to ensure inclusive and equitable development.*

**Keywords:** - Poverty Reduction, Urban Slums, Stakeholder Perspectives, Rights-Based Approach

### Introduction

Poverty is a complex and persistent global challenge and a condition that define the state where individuals or households lack the resources and assets to meet basic human needs. World Bank (2024) quantifies and determine the extreme and acute poverty using an international threshold and portal of US\$ 3.25 per person per day (2017 prices), yet also highlight the multidimensional nature of poverty, which expands beyond income to surround the

deprivations and hardship in education, health, and living standards. In spite of global progress, poverty remains entrenched and established, exacerbated and aggravate by contemporary crises and mess including the COVID-19 pandemic, armed conflicts, and climate change. With in this context, identifying effective and successful pathways for poverty reduction is critical and analytic. Tourism is recognized and accepts a sector with significant and notable potential to contribute and give to sustainable

development, intersecting and bisect with key points of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) that are SDG 1 (No Poverty), SDG 8 (Decent Work and Economic Growth), and SDG 12 (Responsible Consumption and Production) (Türkmenbaş & Hassan, 2024, UN, 2025). But, realizing and register this potential need for vital roles that requires strategical and planning for the approaches, such as social marketing that is align and set a stakeholder actions and behaviors toward poverty alleviation (Hassan et al., 2024). Policy frameworks and design for poverty alleviation have evolved and develop to adopt localized and limited, multidimensional strategies and plan that are course of action. International organizations and institution like the UNDP, through and down tools like the Multidimensional Poverty Index (MPI), advocate and advise for policies that address and pointout the health, education, and living standards alongside and at the side of income (UNDP, 2021). In context of the Nepal, this is reflected and given back in a succession and series of national plans and constitutional mandates and direction. The Constitution of Nepal (2015) guarantees and promise the rights to marginalized groups and devolves significant and important the responsibility to local governments for inclusive development. Subsequent and succeeding policies, such as the Poverty Alleviation Policy (2019), set ambitious and active targets, aiming and focus to reduce poverty to 5 percent by 2030 through coordinated and shared efforts and improved service and delivery access (PAP, 2019). The Local Government Operation Act (2017) legally and regulation ulempowers and motivate to allow local bodies to identify and recognize poor households, address squatter and low settlements, and formulate by generating localized poverty reduction plans and strategy, thereby institutionalizing and confine decentralized approach (MoFAGA, 2017). The government's fiscal priorities and precedence, such as the FY 2080/81 budget allocations and addressing for youth agriculture startups and education, further demonstrate and shows a

strategic commitment to human capital and rural development (Republica, 2023). In spite of all these robust policies, implementation challenges and impacts, including fragmented programs and coordination gaps, hinder their full effectiveness and efficienceness.

Theoretical understandings and facts of poverty provide and supply a foundation for these policies. Early conceptualizations and opinion, like those of Townsend (1970), Shows the well distinguish between absolute, relative, and subjective poverty. Sen's (1999) capability approach and speak to shifted focus and centre to the deprivation and poverty of freedoms and opportunities, while Lister (2004) highlighted the role of social exclusion and barring. These theories and assumptions inform governance models critical and reproving for implementation. The citizen-centered local government model and fact that emphasizes participatory decentralization and accountability, placing and addressing the citizens at the core and main of service delivery and decision-making to enhance and process of the responsiveness (Matthew & Shah, 2005). The aligns and line up with a rights-based approach to poverty reduction, and making lower which frames access and entrance to basic services as fundamental human rights, requiring and need principles of accountability, non-discrimination, and participation (Schutter, 2022). Furthermore, historical analyses, such as George's (2009) critique and analysis of unequal wealth distribution underscore that economic advancement and progress alone is insufficient where it must be coupled with mechanisms and apparatus for equitable distribution and social justice to genuinely alleviate poverty.

Empirical research underscores and reinforce the critical importance of multi-stakeholder engagement and affiancing in translating policy and theory into effective and successful practice. Studies and finding consistently show and reflect that community-based organizations and local governments, being closest and not far from to the ground, are essential and vital key for identifying needs and ensuring the

relevance of interventions (Chambers, 1997). Non-governmental organizations (NGOs) often fill and pack service delivery gaps and advocate for marginalized groups and people using rights-based frameworks (Brock et al., 2002). The private sector's role and part in job creation and innovation is vital role, though it requires and needed supportive policies to maximize and enhance social impact (Jenkins, 2005). Empirical evidence and proofs also highlights the power and dignity of participatory mechanisms; for instance and example, community monitoring and observing of services in Uganda improved and better health outcomes and accountability (Björkman et al., 2009), while women's self-help groups and class in India enhanced and increase both economic standing and collective political agency and company (Kabeer & Sulaiman, 2015). However, challenges and dare of persist, including tokenistic and superficial stakeholder consultations, political interference and intrusion, and weak institutional capacity and capability, which can undermine and determine collaborative efforts (World Bank, 2004; Bwalya et al., 2004).

In spite of the comprehensive policies and a wealth of theoretical and empirical knowledge, ideas, significant and important research gaps remain, particularly in the Nepali context. First, while the MPI shows and describe the national progress in reducing and lessen multidimensional poverty (from 30.1% in 2014 to 17.4% in 2021), stark geographic disparities and inequality persist, with provinces like Karnali and Sudurpashchim experiencing and observing the much higher rates (UNDP, 2021). This indicates and shows a need for research and studies into the localized barriers preventing equitable and fair poverty reduction. Second, however the role and responsibilities of stakeholders is acknowledged and address, there is limited research and studies in that systematically investigates and research the perspectives, interactions, interplay and power dynamics between all relevant and applicable stakeholders including government bodies, NGOs, community leaders,

and the poor themselves within specific, high-poverty contexts like urban slums. Third, while innovative and inventive approaches and also the well planning like design thinking are being promoted and focuses for their human-centered, collaborative and mutual problem-solving potential (Pira et al., 2024), their practical application and effectiveness in Nepal's poverty alleviation ecosystem are underexplored and undetermine. Finally, the specific potential and likely of sectors like tourism, coupled with behavioral change strategies and Planning like social marketing, to address and label the urban poverty in Nepal remains a nascent or emergent field of inquiry (Hassan et al., 2024).

This study addresses and label these gaps by focusing and sighted on the stakeholder perspectives on poverty reduction initiatives and lead within the slum areas of Kathmandu Metropolitan City Ward No. 14. Urban slums in Nepal represent and shows whole critical and reproving poverty hotspots characterized, indicate, and mark by acute deprivations and poverty in housing, sanitation, water, healthcare, and education, often intensified and boost by rural-urban migration (UN, 2025). The research and study will critically evaluate and judge the effectiveness of existing poverty and deprivation alleviation strategies and planning in this setting. By adopting a qualitative approach and strategies informed by stakeholder theory, it will map and analyze the roles, perceptions, ideas and collaborative dynamics of key actors, including and plus local government units, NGOs, community-based organizations, and slum residents and locals. The study aims and point to move beyond and past a generic and common assessment to provide nuanced and nice, context-specific insights and actionable recommendations and advice for designing more coherent, logical, participatory, and effective multi-stakeholder interventions and arbitration to break and intrusion the cycle of urban poverty in Nepal.

### **Objectives and Methodology**

This study aims to examine the views of different

stakeholders on programs designed to reduce poverty in the slum areas. To achieve this, the research has three specific objectives: first, to understand the socio-economic backgrounds of the respondents; second, to assess health, security and community participation of the respondents; and third, to analyze how effective stakeholders' efforts have been in reducing poverty. The research used quantitative approach and cross-sectional survey methods (Creswell & Creswell, 2023). Required data were collected from 120 slum dwellers selected randomly. The primary tools were structured household surveys, which used a five-point Likert scale, and in-depth interviews. he collected and calm data and then analyzed and examine using statistical software (SPSS and Excel) to calculate frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations, blending and flowing with review insights and intuition.

### Results: Demographic Characteristics

A rights-based approach (RBA) to poverty reduction insists and holds on the recognition of all individuals as rights-holders and the state or duty-bearers as responsible and in charge of guaranteeing these rights and liberty. Within this framework, analyzing demographic indicators and measure becomes a pathway and route for understanding the structural inequalities and unmet needs within marginalized communities and groups (Table 1).

*Table 1. Demographic Characteristics*

Category	Response	Frequency	Percent
Age	11-20	1	0.8
	21-30	30	24.6
	31-40	31	25.4
	41-50	28	23.0
	51-60	17	13.9
	61-70	11	9.0
	71-80	4	3.3
Gender	Female	64	52.5
	Male	58	47.5

Marital status	Married	113	92.6
	Single	6	4.9
	windowed	3	2.5
Caste/ Ethnicity	Other/ Janjati	58	47.5
	Indigenous	32	26.2
	Bishwokarma	15	12.3
	Chhetri	11	9.0
	Brahmin	6	4.9
Religion	Hindu	50	41.0
	Christian	42	34.4
	Bouddha	21	17.2
	Others	4	3.3
	Kirat	3	2.5
	Muslim	2	1.6
Family System	Small/ Nuclear Family	109	89.3
	Joint Family	13	10.7
Total		122	100.00

Looking at the people in this study, most of them fall between 21 and 50 years old, which is about 73 percent. That seems like the main group for work and stuff, so it makes sense to focus on jobs and training to help them out. But then there are the older folks at 12.3 percent, and even a tiny bit of youth at just 0.8 percent. For those, you need things like protection programs, health care, and schooling to make sure they get what they deserve in terms of security. Gender wise, there are a bit more women, 52.5 percent. I think that points to needing policies that really consider what women need day to day, plus ways for them to get involved in decisions. It feels like without that, a lot gets missed. On marriage, almost everyone is married, 92.6 percent. Supporting families is key here, but widows stand out as more vulnerable, so something has to cover that too. The group is pretty mixed in terms of caste and ethnicity, with 47.5 percent from Janjati and other groups that have been left out before. This diversity means affirmative actions are important to break down barriers and let everyone access services equally. Some people might argue it is

not as bad, but the numbers suggest otherwise. Overall, the profile shows how a rights approach can target poverty better, though it is not always straightforward. Religious diversity (Hindu 41%, Christian 34.4%, Bouddha 17.2%) requires and need culturally sensitive, norms and value of non-discriminatory programs. The dominance and power of nuclear families (89.3%) calls for urban policies that ensure adequate housing, childcare, and health services tailored to smaller households.

**Educational Status of Parents and Children**

Education is not only a basic human right but also a foundational pillar for achieving other rights, needs and escaping poverty. As outlined and the overview in international human rights frameworks and design such as the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (Article 26) and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG 4), access to inclusive, equitable, and quality education is necessary for individual and community progress. However, the findings and study expose the gaps in realizing and taken in this right among marginalized urban populations (Table 2).

*Table 2: Educational Status of the Respondents and their Children*

Category	Response	Frequency	Percent
Education Status	Illiterate	58	47.5
	Primary	46	37.7
	Secondary	12	9.8
	Higher	6	4.9
Higher Education Subject specifications	Others	63	51.6
	No Facility	45	36.9
	Management	8	6.6
	Sciences and Technology	3	2.5
	Arts and Humanities	2	1.6
	Education	1	0.8

Children Going to Government School	1	35	28.7
	2	52	42.6
	3	25	20.5
	4	6	4.9
	5	1	0.8
	6	1	0.8
Private School	1	111	91.0
	2	7	5.7
	3	3	2.5
	4	1	0.8
Total		122	100.00

Above findings and study reveal a critical deficit and short fall in educational attainment and feat, with nearly half of all respondents (47.5%) being illiterate and 37.7 percent having only primary-level education. Only 14.7 percent had reached and get to secondary or higher education. This widespread and general lack of education constitutes a serious violation and breach of the right to education and fuels the intergenerational and familial cycle of poverty, severely limiting and curb opportunities for skilled employment and meaningful social participation and involvement. For the small minority who accessed and gain higher education, opportunities and chance were severely constrained and unnatural. Over half (51.6%) pursued and go after unspecified "other" subjects, while 36.9 percent cited a complete and fully lack of facilities. Specialized and limited fields like management, sciences, and arts were pursued and followed by less than 11 percent combined. The way things are set up for education really points to some big failures in giving kids real options, like paths that are accessible and actually good quality, diverse enough to make a difference in their lives. Data from the surveys on where children go to school shows how much people depend on these public places that do not have enough resources. About 42.6 percent of the households had at least one kid in a government school. But then, 91 percent did not have any in private ones at all. That is a huge gap, I think it highlights how unequal things

are. Especially for kids living in slum areas, they end up stuck mostly in public schools that are not well kept up, and that takes away their chance at something better, more empowering. It feels like the system just locks them into these underfunded spots without much choice. Some might argue there are ways around it, but from what the numbers say, it does not look that way. The reliance on public institutions is so heavy, and it keeps repeating this cycle of not enough support.

### Economic Situations of the Respondents

The analysis and survey of family occupation, food sufficiency, income, expenditure, and land ownership among slum dwellers reveals and tell a deeply entrenched and fixed pattern of economic vulnerability and systemic exclusion. Within the framework of the Rights-Based Approach (RBA), poverty is understood and realized not merely as a lack of income or material goods but as a denial of fundamental human rights, including the right for work, enough food, housing, and social protection. The findings from the field survey serve to expose how these rights remain unrealized for most respondents, pointing to critical policy gaps and the urgent need for inclusive, people-centered development (Table 3).

*Table 3: Family Occupation, Food Sufficiency, Annual Income/Expenditure and Land Holding*

Category	Response	Frequency	Percent
Family Occupation	Labor work	80	65.56
	Private job	12	9.84
	Business	12	9.84
	Unemployed	9	7.38
	Agriculture	5	4.1
	Enterprises	3	2.46
	Remittance	1	0.82
Food Sufficiency	<3-6 months	4	3.3
	<3 months	118	96.7

Annual Income of the Family	100001-500000	98	80.3
	500001-1000000	14	11.5
	1000001-5000000	10	8.2
Annual Expenditure of the Family	5000-1000	6	4.9
	10000-50000	20	16.4
	50001-100000	10	8.2
	100001-500000	52	42.6
	500001-1000000	19	15.6
	1000001-5000000	15	12.3
Land Holding	1-18 Ropani	7	4.8
	1-10 Aana	4	1.6
	2 Biga	1	0.8
	1-18 Dhur	5	4.0
	1-1.5 Kathha	4	3.2
Total		122	100.00

The economic data and facts reveal and shows the severe vulnerabilities and sensitivity. Livelihoods are overwhelming and spreading dependent on informal, unskilled labor (65.56%), highlighting and emphasizing a lack of dignified and noble, stable and fixed employment. Other sources and funds like private jobs, business, and agriculture are minimal and least, and 7.38 percent are unemployed, indicating scant and limited economic diversity where a failure and defeat to uphold the right to decent and well good work. Food insecurity is acute and dire, with 96.7 percent of families having sufficient and enough food for less than three months a year, a direct violation and non-observance of the right to food. Income levels and range are critically and desperately low, with 80.3 percent earning NPR 100,001–500,000 annually, which is insufficient and in short supplu for Kathmandu's high cost of living. Expenditure patterns and design suggest families may rely and depend on debt to

cover basic needs. Furthermore, land ownership is negligible and minor, with most residents holding marginal or no land, reflecting profound tenure, insecurity and economic exclusion.

**Health, Security and Community Participation**

The socio-cultural and economic conditions of slum communities are vital and key essentials indicators of inclusion and addition in the development process. The Rights-Based Approach (RBA) asserts and declares state that all individuals inherently possess rights to essentials and necessities such as health, education, clothing, work, safety, and water. These rights and liberty place obligations and duty on the state to ensure equitable and fair access and uphold dignity and nobility through policies, institutional accountability, and citizen participation and engagement. (Table 4).

*Table 4: Items for health, Security and Community Participation*

Item	Min-Max	Mean ( $\bar{X}$ )	Std. Dev. ( $\sigma$ )	Skewness
Basic health-care services	1-5	1.62	0.96	1.94
Good educational facilities	1-5	2.11	1.01	0.45
Neighborhood safety	1-5	1.90	1.04	0.98
Enough income for daily needs	1-5	1.90	1.04	0.98
Adequate job opportunities	1-5	2.14	1.25	0.77
Access to clean drinking water	1-5	2.34	0.99	0.85
Community cultural activities	1-5	3.75	1.45	-0.39

Strong social relationships	1-5	3.46	1.60	-0.19
Local decision-making processes	1-5	2.66	1.47	0.01

The findings and discovery are severe deficits and shortfall in the fulfillment of basic socio-economic rights fair enough. Residents and locals reported the lowest satisfaction and compensation with access to basic healthcare (Mean=1.62) and neighborhood safety and income sufficiency (both Mean=1.90), highlighting more about the critical failures and less amount of the public service delivery and social protection. Poor and unproductive ratings for educational facilities and services (Mean=2.11) and job opportunities (Mean=2.14) further reflect and consider the systemic exclusion and preclusion from quality education and dignified work. Even access and ingress to clean water (Mean=2.34) remains inadequate and insufficient for that area people. Through a rights-based lens, these are not merely and nothing but a service gaps but violations of fundamental entitlements, rights, demanding accountable governance and inclusive policy reform and correction.

In contrast and difference, the community shows and present strong internal cohesion, with active participation and engagement in cultural activities (Mean=3.75) and strong social relationships (Mean=3.46). Moreover, engagement in formal decision-making (Mean=2.66) is weak, indicating and showing a lack of institutional channels for civic influence and preference. The persistently and resolutely low perception of safety (Mean=1.90) further restricts residents and locals especially women and vulnerable groups from exercising and exercise their full social and political rights and reach. Therefore, strengthening and reinforcement participatory local governance and ensuring physical safety are essential and important to translating community resilience into meaningful empowerment and rights-based

development.

### Stakeholders Role in Poverty Reduction

The effectiveness and success of poverty reduction initiatives and ambition in the study area was evaluated and took by surveying residents' perceptions and point of view across key dimensions of development. This assessment and evaluation sought to measure the perceived and noted impact of various interventions and intercessions ranging and roving from healthcare and education to job training, financial aid, and infrastructure on improving living conditions and overall well-being. The following analysis and examination presents stakeholder feedback on whether these programs have successfully addressed core needs and contributed to tangible enhancements in quality of life (Table 5).

*Table 5: Poverty Reduction through livelihood Services Programs*

Items	Min-Max	$\bar{x}$	$\sigma'$	Skewness
Improve living conditions.	1-5	2.41	1.45	0.39
Benefit healthcare services.	1-5	2.70	1.38	0.79
Improved access to education.	1-5	2.54	1.15	1.03
Job training programs	1-5	2.31	1.26	1.02
Improved our living standards.	1-5	2.61	1.20	1.18
Received financial aid schemes.	1-5	2.75	1.21	0.95
Support policies for businesses.	1-5	2.78	1.21	0.71
Provide essential services	1-5	2.72	1.28	1.04

Impact on children education	1-5	1.89	1.39	1.18
Received healthcare support	1-5	2.17	1.17	0.31
Community infrastructure initiatives	1-5	1.99	1.22	0.65
Improved quality of life	1-5	2.17	1.13	1.21

The assessment of poverty reduction programs and events shows mixed results and outcomes. While respondents reported and noted the moderate improvements in areas like healthcare access (Mean=2.70), living standards (Mean=2.61), and financial aid (Mean=2.75), significantly and considerably lower scores were given to the impact and collision on children's education (Mean=1.89) and community infrastructure initiatives (Mean=1.99). This indicates and shows that while basic support and hola is being provided as long as, critical long-term and structural interventions are lacking and having low insufficient. From a rights-based perspective and theroy, these uneven and rough outcomes further more reflected and returned in positive skewness across most items and stuff reveal that entitlements and rights to education, infrastructure, and an adequate standard in living are not being equitably and fairly realized. To ensure all rights and need must be fulfilled and comfortable delighted, interventions and actions must become more and more inclusive, participatory, and targeted, with strengthened and reinforced accountability between governments, NGOs, and the community.

### Discussions of Findings

The results show that slum residents experience deep poverty in many ways. This is not merely a lack of income but a deep, interlocking crisis where social, economic, and spatial deprivations reinforce one another in a relentless cycle. Demographically, a reservoir of potential

labor the majority population in their prime working years remains tragically untapped, trapped in informal work and crippled by an "alarmingly low" educational foundation where illiteracy is the norm. This stark reality embodies Amartya Sen's (1999) capability approach in its most negative form: these communities are systematically deprived of the fundamental freedoms and opportunities to be nourished, educated, and healthy that define true development. The chronic food insecurity reported by 96.7% of households and the dismal satisfaction with crumbling healthcare services are not just statistics; they are direct indictments of a system failing to convert human potential into well-being, confirming the World Bank's (2024) emphasis on poverty's multidimensional nature.

This lived deprivation wants and need poverty exists in jarring contrast to the progressive and well-managed policy landscape of Nepal, exposing and revealing a cavernous implementation gap and break. In spite of, a constitutional mandate and order to ruling for rights and the devolved powers granted and indeed to local governments by the Local Government Operation Act (2017), the study and findings reveals a state apparatus and tools are unable to fulfill its most basic obligations and tasks. The right to education, enshrined and elevated in law, remains a phantom promise and pledge in under-resourced government schools. The right to adequate and acceptable food and health, as framed and mounted by a rights-based approach and plans (Schutter, 2018), is breached daily or day by day. This chasm and void between policy intent and ground-level failure and loss underscores a breakdown or segregates in the citizen-centered local governance model (Andrews et al., 2006), where accountability and responsiveness are absent and unavailable. Government and NGO programs are rated as ineffective, vain the reflecting the "fragmented, short-term" interventions and actions the study and findings are notes a far cry from the coordinated, localized

strategy and planning of envisioned by national plans like the Poverty Alleviation Policy (2019). In addition, the findings and Study reveal a poignant social paradox strong internal bonds and relationship of community cohesion and unity exist alongside profound official political and civic exclusion factoring out of ruling. While cultural ties and binds provide a fragile buffer and error sometime, residents and locals of the areas feel entirely sidelined from the decision-making processes and policies that shape their lives. This illustrates and confirms the concept of social exclusion articulated and spoken by Lister (2004), where poverty is not just about material and substance lack but about being shut out and bar from the levers of power and recognition. These disconnects and separates highlight why conventional poverty programs fail, they operate and work in a top-down vacuum, ignoring and oversight the very social capital and participatory potential that approaches and strategies like design thinking seek to harness (Pira et al., 2024). The near-total dependence and addiction on precarious and insecure informal labor, with minimal entrepreneurial or skilled work, points to another missing link the private sector's and institution's role in generating inclusive and overall growth, a challenge noted by Jenkins (2005).

All in all, the description and total explanation underscores that the path and way forward must be as multifaceted and versatile as the problem itself. The study's and findings empirical evidence and a well proof that strengthens the call for moving beyond fragmented and uneven projects toward integrated and equal approaches and planning. This could involve leveraging and taking advantage of innovative, human-centered methods and ways to design interventions and involvements with communities, not for them, and strategically harnessing and utilizing sectors like tourism through social marketing (Hassan et al., 2024) to create and made a decent work. The challenge and dare invitation is to bridge the huge and high gap between robust policy and barren

reality of the slum areas, transforming the strong social fabric and cloth of these communities in a foundation and base for economic inclusion and political voice, ensuring that progress and advance is both equitable and real.

### Conclusion and Policy Implication

The study concludes and desists deeply rooted in structural inequality and difference among the urban slum dwellers in Kathmandu Metropolitan city. Despite being home to a significant and importance proportion of Nepal's urban labor force, these communities lack and gap in the access to essential and needed rights and services. Low educational attainment, presence in the classroom, food insecurity, informal employment, and inadequate public infrastructure continue and keep to undermine their development potential and likely. Although however both government and non-governmental organizations have implemented and prepared a well poverty reduction programs and planned policies, their effectiveness is limited by poor coordination or cooperation, lack of community engagement and participation, and failure to address root causes of deprivation and destitution. A rights-based perspective on poverty reduction highlights and shows that these shortcomings and short results are not simply developmental inefficiencies and inappropriate but violations of basic human rights and needs. For instance, poor access to education, healthcare, and safe housing in the slum areas constitutes a breach and gap of citizens' rights to dignity, equality, equity, engagement and participation. The limited and less impact of job training, livelihood support, provide of materails, goods and welfare schemes further emphasizes and shows that many programs are not tailored and customised to the actual needs and capacities of marginalized groups in the slum areas. These programs and policies often fall short and less impact due to weak implementation, a top-down approach, and insufficient investment and less helpful program in long-term capacity building. To achieve and get the well and proper sustainable

poverty reduction, the study and research calls for an inclusive and participatory model of development and run the government well in the related country. This includes and shows more increased investment in public education, healthcare, job opportunity creation, and urban infrastructure, empowerment of women and minority groups, and stronger collaboration and coordination between local governments, NGOs, and communities. Policies and well programs must be designed and created based on local needs and ensure the active involvement and participation of stakeholders at every stage from strategic planning and implementation to monitoring and evaluation. Only by aligning poverty alleviation strategies and planning with the principles and facts of human rights, equity, and accountability can Kathmandu's urban slum communities and a group of marginalized people be meaningfully integrated and inclusive into Nepal's broader development agenda.

### References

- Bjorkman, M., & Svensson, J. (2009). Power to the people: Evidence from a randomized field experiment on community-based monitoring in Uganda. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 124(2), 735–769. <https://doi.org/10.1162/qjec.2009.124.2.735>
- Brock, K., Cornwall, A., & Gaventa, J. (2002). *Power, knowledge and political spaces in the framing of poverty policy*. Institute of Development Studies. <https://opendocs.ids.ac.uk/opendocs/handle/20.500.12413/2372>
- Bwalya, E., Rakner, L., Svåsand, L., Tostensen, A., & Tsoka, M. (2004). *Poverty reduction strategy processes in Malawi and Zambia*. CMI Report. <https://www.cmi.no/publications/2004/poverty-reduction-strategy-processes>
- Chambers, R. (1997). *Whose Reality Counts? Putting the first last*. Practical Action Publishing. <https://doi.org/10.3362/9781780440453>

- Constitution of Nepal. (2015). *Constitution of Nepal 2015*. Government of Nepal. [https://www.constitution.org/np/constitution\\_of\\_nepal\\_2015.pdf](https://www.constitution.org/np/constitution_of_nepal_2015.pdf)
- Creswell, J.W. & Creswell, J.D. (2023) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Sage Publications Ltd.
- George, H. (2009). *Progress and Poverty: An Inquiry into the Cause of Industrial Depressions and of Increase of Want with Increase of Wealth; The Remedy* (1st ed.). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511693687>
- Hassan, A., Türkmenbaş, T. (2024). *A stakeholder perspective on poverty reduction through the implementation of social marketing in the context of tourism*. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1304952. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1304952>
- Jenkins, B. (2005). *Business linkages: Lessons, opportunities and challenges*. *International Business Leaders Forum*. [https://www.hks.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/centers/mrcbg/files/report\\_20\\_businesslinkages.pdf](https://www.hks.harvard.edu/sites/default/files/centers/mrcbg/files/report_20_businesslinkages.pdf)
- Kabeer, N., & Sulaiman, M. (2015). Assessing the impact of social mobilization: Nijera Kori and the construction of collective capabilities in rural Bangladesh. *Journal of Human Development and Capabilities*, 16(1), 47–68. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19452829.2014.956707>
- Lister, R. (2004). *Poverty*. Polity Press. [https://www.politybooks.com/bookdetail?book\\_slug=poverty-2nd-edition--9780745645964](https://www.politybooks.com/bookdetail?book_slug=poverty-2nd-edition--9780745645964)
- Matthew, A. & Anwar Shah, A. (2005) ‘Citizen-Centered Governance: A new approach to public sector reform’, in Anwar Shah (ed.) *Public Expenditure Analysis*, World Bank. (PDF) *Citizen-centred Local Governance: Strategies to combat democratic deficits*. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/5219804\\_Citizen-centred\\_Local\\_Governance\\_Strategies\\_to\\_combat\\_democratic\\_deficits](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/5219804_Citizen-centred_Local_Governance_Strategies_to_combat_democratic_deficits)
- MoFAGA (Ministry of Federal Affairs and Local Governance). (2017). *Local Government Operation Act (2017)*
- Poverty Alleviation Policy. (2019). *Poverty Alleviation Policy 2019*. Government of Nepal. <https://kms.pri.gov.np/dams/pages/view>.
- Republica. (2023). *The Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock Development receives record-high budget allocation*. <https://myrepublica.nagariknetwork.com/news/ministry-of-agriculture-and-livestock-development-receives-record-high-budget-allocation>
- Schutter, O. D. (2022). ‘A Human Rights-Based Approach to Measuring Poverty’ as chapter 1 in Martha F. Davis and Morten Kjaerum (Eds), *Research Handbook on Human Rights and Poverty*, Edward Elgar Publ., 2021, pp. 2-20.
- Sen, A. (1999). *Development as freedom*. Oxford University Press. <https://global.oup.com/academic/product/development-as-freedom-9780198297581>
- Townsend, P. (1970). *The concept of poverty*. Heinemann.
- Townsend, P. (2024). *Poverty in the United Kingdom: A Survey of Household Resources and Standards of Living*. University of California Press. [UC Press Amazon+2 University of California Press+2 poverty.ac.uk+2](https://www.amazon.com/University-California-Press/poverty-ac.uk+2)
- Türkmenbaş, T., & Hassan, A. (2024). *A stakeholder perspective on poverty reduction through the implementation of social marketing in the context of tourism*. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 14, 1304952. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2023.1304952>
- UN (2025). *Sustainable development*

*goals report 2025*. <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2025/The-Sustainable-Development-Goals-Report-2025.pdf>

United Nations Development Programme. (2021). *Multidimensional Poverty Index – Nepal*. <https://hdr.undp.org/en/content/multidimensional-poverty-index-mpi>

World Bank (2004) *The poverty reduction strategy initiative: An independent*

*evaluation of the World Bank's support through 2003*. <https://openknowledge.worldbank.org/handle/10986/14905>

World Bank. (2024). *Poverty and Shared Prosperity 2024: Ending Extreme Poverty in a Changing World*. <https://www.worldbank.org/en/publication/poverty-and-shared-prosperity>