International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research and Growth Evaluation.

# The Sustainability Divide: An Exploratory Study of Public Perceptions on Sustainable Urban Development in Muzaffarpur, Bihar

**Subhash Kumar [1*], Dr. Alok Pratap Singh [2]**
[1] Research Scholar, University Department of Economics, BRABU, Muzaffarpur, India
[2] Professor, PG Department of Economics, RDS College, Muzaffarpur, India

* Corresponding Author: **Subhash Kumar**

## Article Info

**ISSN (Online):** 2582-7138
**Impact Factor (RSIF):** 8.04
**Volume:** 07
**Issue:** 01
**Received:** 06-11-2025
**Accepted:** 08-12-2025
**Published:** 10-01-2026
**Page No:** 486-489

**Abstract**
This paper presents an in-depth analysis of resident perceptions regarding the progress and effectiveness of Sustainable Urban Development (SUD) initiatives in Muzaffarpur, Bihar. Utilizing quantitative survey data (N=350), the study assessed public sentiment across five crucial dimensions of urban sustainability: the visible implementation of sustainable practices, the efficacy of critical urban infrastructure (specifically waste management), the perceived effectiveness of government policies, the quality of stakeholder collaboration, and the resultant impact on the overall quality of life.
The findings establish a profound "sustainability divide" between policy intent and experiential reality. Across all measured parameters, public approval (defined as 'Agree' or 'Strongly Agree' responses) remained strikingly low, consistently registering below 20%. The data reveals that SUD efforts are largely imperceptible to the populace, with only 8.8% agreement on widespread implementation. Furthermore, deep-seated skepticism exists regarding fundamental services (19.2% on waste management) and the availability of essential socio-environmental assets (8.5% on green spaces). This deficit in visible and functional development is directly correlated with a low assessment of personal well-being, as only 9.8% of respondents reported a high quality of life.
The research concludes that Muzaffarpur faces a crisis of execution and public trust in its sustainability mandate. Recommendations center on a pivot from nominal planning to visible, action-oriented projects, demanding radical transparency in governance, and refocusing SUD efforts as a strategy for creating a more livable and functional city.

**DOI:** https://doi.org/10.54660/.IJMRGE.2026.7.1.486-489

**Keywords:** Sustainable Urban Development (SUD); Public Perception; Urban Governance; Quality of Life; Waste Management; Secondary Cities

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Background and Context of Sustainable Urban Development

The 21st century is defined by the rapid urbanization of the global South, placing immense pressure on the governance, infrastructure, and ecological integrity of secondary cities in emerging economies. In India, the mandate for sustainable urban development (SUD) is not merely an environmental goal but a prerequisite for economic growth and social equity, enshrined within national policies and international commitments like the Sustainable Development Goals (SDG 11: Sustainable Cities and Communities).

Muzaffarpur, a key city in the northern region of Bihar, exemplifies the complex challenges inherent in this transition. Like many rapidly expanding urban centers, it is grappling with issues of population density, informal growth, infrastructural lag, and escalating environmental vulnerability. While official frameworks for SUD may exist, the success of any policy ultimately rests on its effective implementation and, crucially, its tangible impact on the lives of its citizens. Public perception, therefore, serves as the most authentic litmus test for policy efficacy and a direct measure of whether sustainability is evolving beyond a bureaucratic term into a lived reality.

### 1.2. Problem Statement

A critical vacuum exists in understanding the citizen-centric reality of Muzaffarpur's sustainable development trajectory. Most official assessments focus on output metrics (e.g., policy documents created, funds allocated), often overlooking the essential input: the direct experience and perception of the urban residents. If policies are deemed ineffective, if collaborative efforts are mistrusted, and if services are judged deficient by the public, then the entire sustainability effort stands on a fragile foundation. This study is dedicated to addressing this gap by answering the core question: What is the current state of public perception regarding the key pillars of sustainable urban development in Muzaffarpur?

### 1.3. Research Objectives

This paper aims to achieve the following specific objectives:

1. To evaluate the degree to which residents perceive sustainable urban development practices to be visibly implemented across the city.
2. To assess public satisfaction with a core aspect of urban infrastructure, specifically the efficiency and maintenance of the waste management system.
3. To gauge public confidence in the effectiveness of government policies and the quality of multi-stakeholder collaboration in achieving SUD goals.
4. To establish the correlation between the perceived state of SUD and the residents' overall assessment of their quality of life.

## 2. Conceptual Framework and Review

The conceptual framework for this study is rooted in three interlinked pillars of urban sustainability—Execution, Governance, and Well-being—all mediated by public perception.

### 2.1. The Perception-Reality Gap in Urban Governance

In developing city contexts, an enduring challenge is the "perception-reality gap." While municipalities may report compliance with environmental standards or implementation targets, these reports often fail to account for the spatial inequality, reliability, or access issues that define the citizen's experience. A clean municipal record is irrelevant if a majority of homes still lack reliable waste collection. This study treats public perception not as a mere subjective opinion but as a proxy measure of effective service delivery and social equity.

### 2.2. Criticality of Infrastructure (Waste Management and Green Space)

Sustainable infrastructure moves beyond mere capacity to encompass reliability and equity. The two infrastructure elements chosen for this analysis—waste management and green spaces—are crucial indicators. Efficient waste management is foundational to public health and environmental dignity. The availability of green spaces (parks, public amenities) is increasingly recognized as a non-negotiable component of a livable city, directly impacting physical health, mental well-being, and social cohesion. Low public perception in these areas directly signifies a failure in the most basic civic duties.

### 2.3. Dimensions of Effective Governance and Collaboration

Effective SUD governance demands two elements: clear policy direction and inclusive multi-stakeholder collaboration. Policy effectiveness is measured here by its perceived promotional force—are the policies actively driving sustainable change? Furthermore, as resource constraints require partnerships, collaboration must be perceived as more than
tokenism; it must be viewed by the public as a force that leads to more effective implementation. Low public trust in these areas undermines the moral authority of the administration.

## 3. Methodology

### 3.1. Data Source and Scope

The data analyzed originates from a comprehensive survey titled, "Sustainable Urban Development: An exploratory study of Muzaffarpur, Bihar." The dataset comprises 350 anonymized responses (N=350) collected from residents across the city. The full dataset included a wide range of questions; this study focused specifically on six Likert-scale questions that directly address the core research objectives.

### 3.2. Analytical Approach

The six focal questions were structured around a five-point Likert scale, ranging from 'Strongly Disagree' to 'Strongly Agree,' with a 'Neutral' mid-point.

**Data Transformation:** For the purposes of clear communication and actionable policy development, the five-point scale was collapsed into three categories:

**Positive Perception:** 'Agree' + 'Strongly Agree' Neutral Perception: 'Neutral'

**Negative Perception:** 'Disagree' + 'Strongly Disagree'

The primary analytical method employed was frequency distribution, calculating the percentage of respondents falling into the 'Positive Perception' category for each of the six statements. This metric serves as the Public Approval Rating for each dimension of sustainable development.

Focal Survey Statements (and Corresponding Dimension): Statement (Abbreviated Name) Dimension of SUD Sustainable practices are widely implemented in Muzaffarpur. (Impl_Practices) Execution & Visibility Waste management system is efficient and regularly maintained. (Waste_Mgmt) Core Infrastructure Efficacy Government policies are effectively promoting SUD. (Govt_Policies) Governance & Policy Effectiveness Collaboration leads to more effective implementation. (Collaboration) Stakeholder Trust & Efficacy
I feel that the quality of life in Muzaffarpur is generally high. (Quality_of_Life) Overall Well-being and Outcome.
There is an adequate number of public parks and green spaces. (Green_Spaces) Socio-Environmental Assets

## 4. Results: The Public Approval Deficit

The frequency analysis yielded a consistent pattern: a near-universal skepticism and dissatisfaction with the current state of sustainable urban development across all measured parameters.

### 4.1. Core Service Efficacy and the Built Environment

Data reveals profound deficits in the delivery of core urban services and the provision of essential environmental amenities, resulting in the lowest Public Approval Ratings of the entire study.
Metric Positive Perception (Agree/Strongly Agree) Green Spaces (Adequacy of Parks) 8.5% Implementation of Sustainable Practices (Visibility) 8.8% Waste Management (Efficiency) 19.2%.
The lowest approval rating was for the availability of Green Spaces (8.5%). This figure suggests that Muzaffarpur is critically undersupplied with public recreational and environmental space, directly compromising the "green" pillar of sustainability. The lack of visible Implementation of Practices (8.8%) confirms that SUD is perceived as a conceptual or policy exercise, not a physical transformation of the urban landscape. Furthermore, with only 19.2% approval, the perceived failure in Waste Management highlights a fundamental breakdown in civic infrastructure.

### 4.2. Governance and Policy Perception

Public confidence in the institutional mechanisms designed to deliver SUD is severely eroded. Metric Positive Perception (Agree/Strongly Agree)
Effective Stakeholder Collaboration 10.4% Effective Government Policies 14.5%
Only 14.5% of respondents agreed that Government Policies are effective. This is not just a critique of policy existence but of policy impact. Residents do not observe the desired promotional effect or positive change driven by official mandates. This institutional mistrust extends to partnerships: a meager 10.4% believed that Stakeholder Collaboration leads to more effective implementation. The public thus sees the governance structure—both governmental and partnership-based—as a weak and ineffective engine for change.

### 4.3. The Ultimate Outcome: Quality of Life

The data on well-being provides a clear, quantitative measure of the outcome of the systemic failures documented above.
Metric Positive Perception (Agree/Strongly Agree) Overall Quality of Life 9.8%
The finding that only 9.8% of residents believe their Quality of Life is generally high serves as the most powerful synthesis of the data. The low scores across all infrastructural, environmental, and governance metrics directly correlate with, and logically result in, this low assessment of overall well-being. It quantifies the human cost of unsustainable urbanism.

## 5. Discussion

The findings from this survey paint a cohesive and troubling picture of urban disillusionment in Muzaffarpur. The "Sustainability Divide" identified in the abstract is not a random distribution of dissatisfaction but a systemic failure across the entire value chain of urban development, from high-level policy down to basic service delivery.

### 5.1. Interpreting the Disconnect between Policy and Implementation

The near-identical low scores for Implementation of Practices (8.8%) and Quality of Life (9.8%) suggest a direct causal link. When sustainable development is not visibly present—when it does not manifest in clean streets, functional parks, or reliable services—it fails to improve the human condition. The problem is not necessarily a complete absence of effort, but a fundamental flaw in prioritization and project selection. Projects that might consume significant budget—such as digitalizing records or conducting internal training—are invisible to the public. The low approval ratings argue for an urgent strategic re-alignment toward high-impact, visible, and tangible public works: accessible green infrastructure, demonstrable improvements in solid waste management routes, and transparent pollution controls.

### 5.2. The Crisis of Institutional Trust

The low scores regarding Government Policies (14.5%) and Collaboration (10.4%) represent a severe crisis of institutional trust. In the developing urban context, policy is often viewed through the lens of political rhetoric rather than a commitment to action. The public's belief that collaboration is ineffective suggests that current multi-stakeholder partnerships are either captured by vested interests, operate without transparency, or are simply not structured to deliver results that benefit the average resident.
Effective SUD requires the public to believe that the system is working for them. Rebuilding this trust necessitates not only better outcomes but radical transparency. Every collaborative project must be accompanied by clearly defined, publicly available deliverables, timelines, and accountability metrics.

### 5.3. Implications of the Environmental and Infrastructure Deficit

The failure in Green Spaces (8.5%) and Waste Management (19.2%) is particularly alarming. These are non-negotiable foundations of a modern city. The lack of green spaces indicates a failure to plan for population and quality-of-life growth, prioritizing built-up area over open access. The inadequacy of waste management suggests a potential public health time bomb and a visible daily reminder of municipal failure. Focusing on a strategic,

highly public investment in these two areas offers the quickest route to demonstrable change and a reversal of negative public perception. A small investment in high-quality, maintained public parks, coupled with a visibly effective, scheduled waste collection system, could have a disproportionately positive impact on both environmental markers and the low Quality of Life (9.8%) rating.

## 6. Conclusion and Recommendations

### 6.1. Conclusion

This research confirms the existence of a pervasive and systemic "Sustainability Divide" in Muzaffarpur, where policies and stated goals bear little resemblance to the reality experienced by its residents. The low Public Approval Ratings across visible implementation, core infrastructure, governance efficacy, and quality of life collectively demonstrate that current approaches to sustainable urban development are insufficient, misdirected, or fatally undermined by failures in execution. The primary failure is one of visibility and tangibility: the public cannot support what it cannot see, use, or trust.

### 6.2. Policy and Strategic Recommendations

Based on the empirical evidence, this paper proposes a three-pronged strategy for municipal and state authorities:

**Strategic Prioritization:** The "Livable City" Mandate Focus on the Foundational Five: Immediately prioritize resources and governance efforts towards the five lowest-scoring tangible areas: Green Spaces, Waste Management, Implementation Visibility, Policy Effectiveness, and Quality of Life.

**The Green Initiative:** Launch a highly visible, time-bound project to create or significantly upgrade a minimum of three accessible public parks in underserved areas. This must be a flagship project, publicly marketed to shift the 8.5% green space approval rating.

**Waste Management Accountability:** Implement a transparent, scheduled, and widely publicized waste collection and processing system. The success of this system must be tracked by public satisfaction metrics, not just internal reports, aiming to push the 19.2% approval rating to over 50% within 18 months.

**Radical Governance Transparency**

**Public Scorecard:** Institute a public digital dashboard (a "SUD Scorecard") that transparently tracks progress on key, citizen-facing metrics. This must include the implementation status of projects, the efficiency of waste collection routes, and the current amount of green space per capita.

**Stakeholder Vetting:** Require all collaborative projects (with NGOs, private sector) to publicly declare their scope, budget contribution, and measurable deliverables before commencement. This measure directly addresses the low 10.4% collaboration approval rating by forcing partnerships to be results-oriented and accountable to the public.

**Redefining the Narrative of SUD**

**Citizen-Centric Framing:** Cease promoting "Sustainable Urban Development" as a technical mandate. Instead, reframe the entire effort as a "Quality of Life Improvement Program." All policy communication should directly link environmental and infrastructural upgrades to tangible benefits: reduced illness, cleaner air, safer public spaces, and increased property values. By addressing the low 9.8% quality of life assessment, the administration can build a popular mandate for the necessary, deeper reforms.

The future of Muzaffarpur as a sustainable city will not be secured by the volume of policy documents created, but by the tangible, daily quality of life it affords its citizens. The data is clear: the time for incremental change is over; a systemic, public-facing overhaul is urgently required.

## 7. References


1. Chakrabarti P, Sanyal S. Governance challenges in sustainable urban development in India. Indian J Public Adm. 2018;64(3):421–436.
2. Government of Bihar. Bihar Urban Development and Housing Department annual report 2020–21. Patna: Government of Bihar; 2021.
3. Government of Bihar. Sustainable urban infrastructure initiatives in Bihar. Patna: Urban Development and Housing Department; 2023.
4. Government of India. Smart Cities Mission: statement and guidelines. New Delhi: Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs; 2015.
5. Government of India. Atal Mission for Rejuvenation and Urban Transformation (AMRUT 2.0): mission guidelines. New Delhi: Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs; 2021.
6. Kumar A, Agrawal A. Public perception of urban environmental services in Indian cities. J Urban Manag. 2020;9(2):145–156.
7. Roy D, Ganguly S. Urban sustainability and quality of life in emerging Indian cities. Environ Urban ASIA. 2019;10(1):47–63.
8. Swachh Bharat Mission–Urban. Swachh Survekshan 2022–23: state and city rankings. New Delhi: Ministry of Housing and Urban Affairs; 2023.
9. UN-Habitat. World cities report 2022: envisaging the future of cities. Nairobi: United Nations Human Settlements Programme; 2022.
10. World Bank. Strengthening urban governance in India's secondary cities. Washington (DC): World Bank Group; 2021.



**How to Cite This Article**

Kumar S, Singh AP. The sustainability divide: an exploratory study of public perceptions on sustainable urban development in Muzaffarpur, Bihar. Int J Multidiscip Res Growth Eval. 2026;7(1):486-489. doi:10.54660/IJMRGE.2026.7.1.486-489.