Analysis of the Living Conditions at eZakheleni Informal Settlement of Durban: Implications for Community Revitalization in South Africa
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Abstract: This study investigated the living conditions of the eZakheleni informal settlement, Durban metropolis of Kwazulu-Natal, South Africa. The utilized data were collected with the use of a well-structured questionnaire through a multistage sampling of 255 households. The descriptive results indicated low levels of educational attainment, large number of female headed households, high unemployment rates, inadequate sources of income, poor security and low government intervention programmes. The results of inferential analysis indicate that factors such as water accessibility, toilet accessibility, years of working experience, food security status, educational status and access to good health were the significant factors that were key to improving the living conditions of the residents in the study area. The study therefore concluded that education, basic housing services (water accessibility, toilet accessibility), food security, working experience, social connectivity and health are key contributors to households’ living condition in the study area and recommended several future research and policy directions which could improve the living conditions of the informal settlement.
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1. Introduction

The living conditions of the residents of the informal settlements around the African continent remain one of the most expressed pervasive human rights violations. It is therefore a fact and a respect of human rights that informal settlements be upgraded or revitalized to meet basic standards of human dignity [1,2]. Recognizing this, and mobilizing all actors within a shared human rights paradigm, can make the 2030 upgrading agenda achievable. An informal settlement is referred to as an unplanned land location which has not been surveyed as residential, consisting mainly of informal structures, i.e., structures that are not approved by the local authority and not intended as a permanent structure [3]. They are unauthorized and are located on land that has not been designated for residential use [4]. Informal settlements are sometimes called “squatter settlements” and “slums” [5,6]. They are characterized by poor dwelling structures, limited government intervention and management, unsuitable environmental and health systems, high population density, poor security, high risk and high crime rates.

Rapid urbanisation has been identified as a main cause of informal settlements in Africa, since cities and states have been unable to effectively create permanent infrastructure for the geometrically increasing populations [1,2,7–9]. In addition, the recent uncontrollable rising cost of living around the world has led to an increase in informal settlements all around the cities of developing countries such as South Africa. Estimates for South Africa suggest that 13.9% of households live in informal settlements, while 5.9% live in traditional
dwellings [10]. In the Kwazulu-Natal province, where this study was carried out, one out of every four individuals, i.e., 25% of the population, lives in informal housing [2]. Urban informal settlements are often settings characterised by high levels of poverty, crime, violence and poor health [11,12]. Despite the commendable effort of the government in the construction of low cost housing, the demand for housing remains far more than the present supply [13,14]. This indicates that a more professional effort for holistic urban development policy needs to be redirected towards this prominent “feature” of many of South Africa’s major urban cities [15].

There has been considerable debate about why urban informal settlements have particularly high levels of violence and ill-health [16]. One line of thought emphasizes the experience of living in the informal settlements as full of stress, hence leading to an inability to control sensitive aspects of value and life, which is a key factor shaping violence in such areas. Another argument is that there is less social cohesion due to poverty and mobility, creating less stable forms of power, in which violence becomes a necessary resource to wield. This study was borne out of the need to fill key gaps in our understanding of informal settlements in South Africa. This was largely because available data from the government, agencies and other data sources do not accurately capture the intricacies and uniqueness of these settlements and recommendations for informal settlement upgrades. This study therefore sought to:

- Determine the socio-economic, infrastructural and environmental characteristics in the study area.
- Assess the security status of the residents of the eZakheleni informal settlement.
- Analyse factors that influence the living conditions of the participants.

2. Literature Review

Bad living environments in the form of a growing number of informal settlements represent one of the most visible manifestations of poverty and inequality in South Africa [17]. They are part of the urban fabric with a particular history, form and function [18–21]. They often represent the first point of arrival and encounter with the city for rural migrants [19]. Residents of informal settlements locate themselves in particular areas for very specific reasons, some of which include access to services, employment opportunities and/or proximity to family and other social networks [17,19]. Informal settlements are complex in terms of their make-up and the particular set of social relationships which operate within them; they are not homogenous [19,22]. However, they are often perceived as disorderly, unsafe and illegal, with their internal layout and organisation well-conceived, functional and supportive of a diversity of informal processes, rules and values [17].

The order and arrangements of an informal settlement supports a multiplicity of livelihood strategies and enables residents to survive and live under extremely precarious conditions with very little support from the state or other sectors of society [22–24]. Misselhorn [19] argues that the “limited understanding of the actual dynamic within informal settlements, the complex social and survival networks that characterise them, and the significant technical and social challenges in effecting housing as well as infrastructural development for them” result in inappropriate interventions. Informal settlement dwellers are also more vulnerable to violence and violent crime; as argued by the UN Habitat, “excluded from the city’s opportunities, physically, politically and economically marginalised, slum dwellers are particularly vulnerable to crime and violence” [17,25].

Existing studies have concluded that interventions that provide physical infrastructure are strategies to improve the socio-economic well-being and health of the informal settlement dwellers. Abbott [26] and Corburn and Sverdlik [27] opined that the objective of upgrading and revitalization projects should be to reduce the vulnerability to poverty and risk for informal settlement dwellers. Meanwhile, there is a clear case for improving the living conditions for dwellers in slums; however, there is still much debate and uncertainty about what exactly constitutes upgrading the settlements, what are the most appropriate methods and approaches to upgrading and what the objectives and desired outcomes of
upgrading interventions ought to be [17,28,29]. Literature mostly points to a lack of common vision amongst public officials in particular regarding how upgrading interventions should impact on the quality of life of informal settlement dwellers [17,22,24,26,30]. They represent different contexts and different approaches to upgrading, which means that care has to be taken in comparison and generalisation. However, they provide very interesting and important insights into what is still a fairly unexplored area of research in South Africa, i.e., the interaction between participants’ socio-economic factors such as safety, security, health, infrastructure and environmental factors in areas such as the eZakheleni informal setting of Durban, South Africa. This study attempts to shed light on the very complex questions by describing and modelling the subject matter for purposeful policy direction and intervention.

3. Methodology

3.1. Study Area

This study was carried out in the eZakheleni informal settlement of Durban, South Africa (Figure 1). Durban is Africa’s busiest port city, located on the eastern seaboard of South Africa within the province of KwaZulu-Natal. Durban has a population of over 3 million and is South Africa’s second largest industrial hub. It provides key trade linkages to Johannesburg, which is South Africa’s largest industrial hub. The major economic sectors are in manufacturing, tourism, finance and transport. Durban is also the key trading gateway, with access to important trading routes to the east and its proximity to the Johannesburg mineral–industrial complex [3,31]. Its population makes it the second largest city in South Africa after the Greater Johannesburg metropolitan area. The gender breakdown of the population is 51% female and 49% male [32]. The current population of the eThekwini Municipal area is estimated at 3,026,974 [32]. The study area was chosen due to its proximity to the university and based on the scarcity of social cohesion due to poverty, food and property insecurity and mobility, thereby creating less stable forms of power, in which violence becomes a necessary resource to wield. The need for this study was largely due to unavailable data from the government, agencies and other data sources, making it difficult to accurately capture the intricacies and uniqueness eZakheleni informal settlement (See Figure 2) as well as to suggest recommendations for the informal settlement’s upgrade.

Figure 1. Map of South Africa showing different provinces and that of the eThekwini metropolitan municipality of Durban, showing Umlazi Township where the eZakheleni informal settlement is located.
3.2. Population, Sampling Procedure, and Sample Size

A multi-stage sampling procedure was adopted for the purposive selection of respondents in the study. The second stage was the selection of households from eZakheleni informal settlement based on the total households’ population; of 300 selected households, 255 properly filled in questionnaires were obtained from household heads at the third stage. The properly filled in questionnaires provided the data that were utilized in this study. The samples size was representative, sufficiently robust and satisfactory to give estimates at the local government and regional level.

Figure 2. Pictures showing the study area. (Source: Authors).
3.3. Ethical Clearance, Method of Data Collection, Validity and Reliability

Ethical clearance was received from Mangosuthu University of Technology with ethic number ME6/18/1. The research was declared risk free, which provided the confidence to proceed with the study. Data were collected by administering a structured questionnaire to respondents in the study areas. To ensure the reliability of the questionnaire, a split-half technique was used to determine the reliability of the instrument. A high reliability coefficient of $r = 0.81$ was derived, which showed that the instrument was consistent and highly reliable. The data collected included information on household demographics, housing conditions, environment-related issues, crime and security, consumption expenditure patterns, cost of food and food composition, nutrition and health questions, grants and interventions. The questions were translated into the local language of the respondents during administration and their responses were recorded in English language.

3.4. Analytical Techniques and Methods

3.4.1. Descriptive Statistics

Percentages, frequency distributions and means were used for descriptive analyses on SPSS version 22 software.

3.4.2. Inferential Model of Factors Contributing to the Households’ Living Conditions

An ordinary least squares regression model was employed to analyze factors that contributed to the households’ living conditions using STATA 11. The ordinary least squares regression model is stated as:

$$Y = f(X_1,X_2,X_3,X_4X_{21}, e_i) \quad (1)$$

where $Y$ is the household’s monthly expenditure variable (proxy for the household’s living condition) while the independent variables were the $X_1$, $X_2$, etc.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1. Socioeconomic Characteristics of the Respondents in the Study Area

The descriptive results of the participants’ socio-economic characteristics (Table 1) indicate that the eZakheleni informal settlement’s households had a high average age ($41 \pm 0.75$ years). This is similar to the assertion of [33–35] who indicated that household heads were old in most informal settlements with a prevalence of poverty. The results also show that $62.40\% \pm 0.49$ of respondents were female headed households, while the highest educational attainment of the respondents was grade $11–12$ with $49.40\%$ of the respondents while others had lesser educational attainments. This shows low levels of education by the residents of the informal settlement. This finding corroborates the finding of [36–38] who indicate that education is a key to wealth and achievements in life and living standards of people and that of educated parents with high incomes have a tendency to provide their children with a conducive home and environment which can encourage access and retention of children. Poor educational attainment could also be a plausible reason why the majority of the participants could live in such an illegal, unauthorized portion of land that had not been previously proclaimed for residential use by the government [5,6,39].

On the other hand, about $94.90\% \pm 0.22$ of the dwellers reported that they were born in the settlement under study. This indicates that the settlement had been in existence for a long time and that it calls for an upgrade. In addition, $61.60\%$ of the respondents were unemployed with $88.20\% \pm 0.50$ of them living in separation from their spouses. This stands to say that the majority of the respondents have possibly been in marriage and left, implying that marriage institutions in the South Africa need to be revisited for better family structure, communities and nation. Furthermore, being an unemployed single mother, as reflected in this study, brings a serious burden on the female household heads in the informal settlement. This also shows the level of poverty experienced by the residents of the study area. A majority ($45.10\% \pm 1.12$) of the respondents had monthly income
that averaged at R1750, which is quite low, although it is above the poverty line of R547 per month. This could be a key reason for high poverty, poor health and crime rates that characterize informal settlements. This observation has been previously mentioned by some researchers that poor income can increase poverty and poor health of people [40–43].

Table 1. Socio-economic profile of the respondents.

| Variables                      | Frequency | Percentage | S.D.  | Mean |
|--------------------------------|-----------|------------|-------|------|
| **Age**                        |           |            |       |      |
| <18                            | 6.00      | 2.40       |       |      |
| 18–35                          | 75.00     | 29.40      |       |      |
| 36–55                          | 148.00    | 58.00      | 0.75223 | 41  |
| 56–75                          | 22.00     | 8.60       |       |      |
| >75                            | 4.00      | 1.60       |       |      |
| **Gender**                     |           |            |       |      |
| Male                           | 9.00      | 37.60      | 0.48545 |     |
| Female                         | 159.00    | 62.40      |       |      |
| **Educational level**          |           |            |       |      |
| Non-formal education           | 18.00     | 7.10       |       |      |
| Grade 1–6                      | 20.00     | 7.80       | 0.98765 | 11  |
| Grade 7–10                     | 74.00     | 29.00      |       |      |
| Grade 11–12                    | 126.00    | 49.40      |       |      |
| Post-matric                    | 17.00     | 6.34       |       |      |
| **Place of birth**             |           |            |       |      |
| KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) province   | 242.00    | 94.90      | 0.22039 |     |
| Outside KwaZulu-Natal (KZN) province | 13.00 | 5.10      |       |      |
| **Occupational status**        |           |            |       |      |
| Employed                       | 56.00     | 22.00      |       |      |
| Unemployed                     | 157.00    | 61.60      |       |      |
| Student                        | 30.00     | 11.80      | 1.10248 |     |
| Pensioner                      | 4.00      | 1.60       |       |      |
| Business                       | 5.00      | 2.00       |       |      |
| Others                         | 3.00      | 1.20       |       |      |
| **Marital status**             |           |            |       |      |
| Single                         | 1.00      | 0.40       |       |      |
| Married                        | 25.00     | 9.80       |       |      |
| Divorced                       | 3.00      | 1.20       | 0.50601 |     |
| Widowed                        | 1.00      | 0.40       |       |      |
| Separated                      | 225.00    | 88.20      |       |      |
| **Household head**             |           |            |       |      |
| Yes                            | 129.00    | 50.60      | 0.50095 |     |
| No                             | 126.00    | 49.40      |       |      |
| **Ethnic group of respondent** |           |            |       |      |
| Xhosa                          | 10.00     | 3.93       |       |      |
| Zulu                           | 245.00    | 96.07      | 0.20508 |     |
| **Main source of income**      |           |            |       |      |
| Employment                     | 126.00    | 49.40      |       |      |
| Grants                         | 72.00     | 28.20      |       |      |
| Gift-remittances               | 10.00     | 3.90       | 1.59007 |     |
| Business                       | 9.00      | 3.50       |       |      |
| Others                         | 38.00     | 15.00      |       |      |
| **Monthly income of respondents (Rand)** |     |            |       |      |
| <1000                          | 74.00     | 29.00      |       |      |
| 1000–2500                      | 115.00    | 45.10      |       |      |
| 2501–5000                      | 50.00     | 19.60      | 1.11622 | R1750 |
| 5001–10000                     | 16.00     | 6.30       |       |      |
Table 1. Cont.

| Variables                          | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| **Household size**                 |           |            |
| 3                                  | 70.00     | 27.50      |
| 4                                  | 62.00     | 24.30      |
| 5                                  | 26.00     | 10.20      |
| 6                                  | 25.00     | 9.80       |
| 7                                  | 25.00     | 9.80       |
| 8                                  | 47.00     | 18.40      |
| **Type of grant benefited**        |           |            |
| Old age                            | 33.00     | 12.90      |
| Disability                         | 4.00      | 1.60       |
| Foster care                        | 2.00      | 0.80       |
| Care dependant                     | 4.00      | 1.60       |
| Child support                      | 140.00    | 54.90      |
| Social relief of stress            | 1.00      | 0.40       |
| Others                             | 71.00     | 27.80      |
| **Should government stop grant**   |           |            |
| Strongly disagree                  | 201.00    | 78.80      |
| Disagree                           | 24.00     | 9.40       |
| Somehow agree                      | 1.00      | 0.40       |
| Agree                              | 4.00      | 1.60       |
| Strongly agree                     | 25.00     | 9.80       |
| **Social development officials**   |           |            |
| Yes                                | 18.00     | 7.10       |
| No                                 | 230.00    | 90.20      |
| Not sure                           | 7.00      | 2.70       |
| **Presence of school in settlement** |       |            |
| Yes                                | 18.00     | 7.10       |
| No                                 | 232.00    | 91.00      |
| Not sure                           | 5.00      | 2.00       |
| **Intervention projects in settlement** |       |            |
| Yes                                | 200.00    | 78.43      |
| No                                 | 55.00     | 21.56      |
| **Body responsible for intervention project** |       |            |
| Government                         | 55.00     | 21.60      |
| Private body                       | 11.00     | 4.30       |
| Non-Governmental Organization (NGO)| 5.00      | 2.00       |
| Community                          | 48.00     | 18.80      |
| Individual                         | 2.00      | 0.80       |
| Others                             | 48.00     | 18.80      |
| **Project performance**            |           |            |
| Very poor                          | 138.00    | 54.10      |
| Poor                               | 19.00     | 7.50       |
| Fair                               | 21.00     | 8.20       |
| Good                               | 37.00     | 14.50      |
| Very good                          | 40.00     | 15.70      |
| Total                              | 255.00    | 100.00     |

An average household size of four was identified in the study area. This is large when compared to the average monthly income. Child support grant was indicated to be the main source of income by the respondents (54.90% ± 2.13) in the study area, and it was indicated as not enough to cushion households from the negative effects of poverty. A total of 78.8% ± 1.50 of the respondents strongly disagreed when asked if the South African government should stop grant payment. About 91.00% of the respondents also indicated the absence of a school in the settlement, and this explains the possible reason why the majority of the residents had very low levels of educational attainment. The study further indicated that 90.20% of the respondents reported the absence of social development offices in the study area. The question on government interventions in the past indicated that
78.43% of the respondents ticked that government had previously intervened in issues of the informal settlement but with very poor performance, as indicated by the majority (54.10%). The respondents’ judgment of the government’s intervention as “very poor” could be due to lack of obvious change in their economic, physical, infrastructural and health, and hence their poor living conditions which cumulatively made them judge the past interventions as being “very poor”.

4.2. Environmental and Infrastructural characteristics of eZakheleni Informal Settlement

In South Africa the concern to “eradicate” informal settlements because of the increasing level of pollution, dirtiness and violent crime, among others, has been linked to fast-paced urbanization and informality in developing regions [44,45]. This report (Table 2) shows the environmental and infrastructural state of the eZakheleni informal settlement. Table 2 shows that the majority (91.00%) of the residents of eZakheleni informal settlement had access to pipe borne water from the municipality. Additionally, 98.00% of the respondents indicated that they had access to regular electricity from the municipality. However there was a weak response (53.70%) to the waste collection by the municipality. Most (54.90%) of the respondents indicated that they removed wastes through self-efforts. This supports the assertion that rapid population growth is uncontrollably causing social and environmental strains in the developing nations of the world, and the magnitude of this challenge is reflected by the increasing amount of solid and liquid waste generated and deposited [39]. Consequently, common features of developing nations such as South Africa are massive areas with stinking heaps of uncollected waste disposed carelessly by roadsides and open spaces which are sometimes borne out of noncompliance to waste disposal rules and improper facilities. To date, environmental sustainability remains a principal goal of the United Nation’s 2030 target. Therefore, safeguarding the environment and health of the South Africa citizens is a matter of utmost importance, even though the South African government has implemented different waste disposal avenues. However, the inefficiency of these environmental programmes in many parts of the nation necessitates further effort in the annual household data overview. Regarding access to toilet facilities, 75.70% of the respondents reported that they had access to toilet facilities, of which 66.30% of them were using pit toilets for their convenience through their efforts. According to [3,46–48] a pit toilet is not a good and safe toilet type [3,46–48]. In addition, 58.82% of the respondents indicated that they had no access to a good health facility when sick. This is not acceptable, as good health is a basic need. In general, they expressed a high level (41.60%) of dissatisfaction with their living conditions and so 61.20% preferred to relocate given such an opportunity.

Table 2. Infrastructural and environmental characteristics in the study area.

| Variables                        | Frequency | Percentage | S.D.   |
|----------------------------------|-----------|------------|--------|
| **Access to water**              |           |            |        |
| Yes                              | 232.00    | 91.00      | 0.28703|
| No                               | 23.00     | 9.00       |        |
| **Water distribution method**    |           |            |        |
| Pipe borne                       | 234.00    | 91.80      |        |
| In cans                          | 3.00      | 1.20       |        |
| Stream                           | 2.00      | 0.80       | 0.96050|
| Not sure                         | 2.00      | 0.80       |        |
| Others                           | 14.00     | 5.50       |        |
| **Water service provider**       |           |            |        |
| Municipality                     | 232.00    | 91.0       |        |
| Self-effort                      | 36.00     | 6.30       |        |
| Community effort                 | 3.00      | 1.20       | 0.69044|
| Others                           | 4.00      | 1.60       |        |
Table 2. Cont.

| Variables                                      | Frequency | Percentage |
|------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| **Access to electricity**                      |           |            |
| Yes                                            | 249.00    | 97.60      |
| No                                             | 6.00      | 2.40       |
| **Electricity service distribution method**    |           |            |
| Prepaid                                        | 178.00    | 69.80      |
| Non-prepaid                                    | 76.00     | 29.80      |
| Others                                         | 1.00      | 0.40       |
| **Electricity service provider**               |           |            |
| Municipality                                   | 241.00    | 94.50      |
| Self-effort                                    | 13.00     | 5.10       |
| Others                                         | 1.00      | 0.40       |
| **Access to waste removal**                    |           |            |
| Yes                                            | 137.00    | 53.70      |
| No                                             | 118.00    | 46.30      |
| **Waste distribution method**                  |           |            |
| Municipality clearance in front of each house  | 11.00     | 4.30       |
| Private clearance in front of each house       | 54.00     | 21.20      |
| Municipal clearance outside the settlement      | 152.00    | 59.60      |
| Others                                         | 38.00     | 14.90      |
| **Waste collection service provider**          |           |            |
| Municipal authority                            | 114.00    | 44.70      |
| Self-effort                                    | 140.00    | 54.90      |
| Others                                         | 1.00      | 0.40       |
| **Access to toilet**                           |           |            |
| Yes                                            | 193.00    | 75.70      |
| No                                             | 62.00     | 24.30      |
| **Type of toilet**                             |           |            |
| Flush system                                   | 64.00     | 25.10      |
| Pit toilet                                     | 169.00    | 66.30      |
| Portable (Community) Type                      | 8.00      | 3.10       |
| Neighbours                                     | 4.00      | 1.60       |
| Others                                         | 10.00     | 3.90       |
| **Access to Good Health Centre or Hospital**   |           |            |
| Yes                                            | 105       | 41.18      |
| No                                             | 150       | 58.82      |
| **Toilet system provider**                     |           |            |
| Municipal authority                            | 92.00     | 36.10      |
| Self-effort                                    | 161.00    | 63.10      |
| NGO                                            | 1.00      | 0.40       |
| Others                                         | 1.00      | 0.40       |
| **Level of satisfaction with the general living condition** | |            |
| Very dissatisfied                              | 105.00    | 41.20      |
| Dissatisfied                                   | 106.00    | 41.60      |
| Undecided                                      | 9.00      | 3.50       |
| Satisfied                                      | 33.00     | 12.90      |
| Very satisfied                                 | 2.00      | 0.80       |
| **Would you want to relocate to a better place?** | |            |
| Yes                                            | 156.00    | 61.10      |
| No                                             | 70.00     | 27.50      |
| Maybe                                          | 29.00     | 11.40      |
| **Total**                                      | 255.00    | 100.00     |
4.3. Respondents’ Perception of Security in the Ezakheleni Informal Settlement

The establishment of the National Upgrading Support Programme (NUSP) by the South African government was with the motive to support the National Department of Human Settlements to implement the Upgrading of Informal Settlement Programme (UISP). However, there is still a huge need to recognize the important role of the informal settlements like the eZakheleni informal settlement as part of the socio-economic, political and resourceful part of the urban environment. This leads to the next section (Table 3) of the paper which provides a brief overview of the security status of the informal settlements in question. A total of 97.2% of the respondents indicated that the distance to the nearest police station was 1–3 km. It was added that that the time of arrival of police to the settlement in a course of any need was mainly between 1–2 h. Experience has shown that informal areas upgrading projects are associated with social and economic benefits that are particularly high; therefore, there is a need for better/effective police service [40,49,50].

Table 3. Perception on the security situation in the study area.

| Variables                                         | Frequency | Percentage | S.D. |
|---------------------------------------------------|-----------|------------|------|
| Distance of the closest police station            | 1–3 km    | 248.00     | 97.20| 0.54466 |
|                                                   | 4–5 km    | 5.00       | 2.00 |       |
|                                                   | >5 km     | 2.00       | 0.80 |       |
| Time of arrival of police                         | <1 h      | 89.00      | 34.90| 0.93476 |
|                                                   | 1–2 h     | 105.00     | 41.20|       |
|                                                   | >2 h      | 61.00      | 23.90|       |
| Have you ever experienced any fire outbreaks?     | Yes       | 151.00     | 59.20| 0.50104 |
|                                                   | No        | 104.00     | 40.80|       |
| Distance of fire station from settlement          | <1 km     | 31.00      | 12.20|       |
|                                                   | 1–3 km    | 133.00     | 52.20| 1.10928 |
|                                                   | 4–5 km    | 15.00      | 5.90 |       |
|                                                   | >5 km     | 76.00      | 29.80|       |
| Time for fire service to arrive when called       | <1 h      | 39.00      | 15.30|       |
|                                                   | 1–2 h     | 104.00     | 40.80| 1.00344 |
|                                                   | >2 h      | 59.00      | 23.10|       |
|                                                   | Not sure  | 53.00      | 20.80|       |
| Safety and security in this settlement            | Very unsafe | 26.00     | 10.20| 1.15994 |
|                                                   | Unsafe    | 77.00      | 30.20|       |
|                                                   | Undecided | 26.00      | 10.20|       |
|                                                   | Safe      | 116.00     | 45.50|       |
|                                                   | Very safe | 10.00      | 3.90 |       |
| Safety of lives and properties                    | Very unsafe | 35.00     | 13.70|       |
|                                                   | Unsafe    | 101.00     | 39.60|       |
|                                                   | Undecided | 32.00      | 12.60| 1.15446 |
|                                                   | Safe      | 78.00      | 30.60|       |
|                                                   | Very safe | 9.00       | 3.50 |       |
| Frequency of criminals prevented                   | Never     | 39.00      | 15.20| 1.28172 |
|                                                   | Rarely    | 55.00      | 21.60|       |
|                                                   | Sometimes | 105.00     | 41.20|       |
|                                                   | Usually   | 40.00      | 15.7 |       |
|                                                   | Always    | 16.00      | 6.30 |       |
Table 3. Cont.

| Variables                        | Frequency | Percentage |
|----------------------------------|-----------|------------|
| Frequency of criminals apprehended|           |            |
| Never                            | 81.00     | 31.80      |
| Rarely                           | 59.00     | 23.10      |
| Sometimes                        | 76.00     | 29.80      |
| Usually                          | 28.00     | 11.00      |
| Always                           | 11.00     | 4.30       |
| Total                            | 255.00    | 100.00     |

When asked if they had experienced fire incidences, the majority (59.20%) said yes, with the indication that the closest fire station from the settlement and time arrival was about the same as that to the police station. Furthermore, most (39.60%) of the respondents indicated that the settlement was unsafe in terms of security of life and property. This is a common trend with informal settlements and is supported by existing literature [3,12,51,52]. Surprisingly, 31.80% of the residents indicated that they had never witnessed a situation of a criminal apprehension in the settlement, and this shows weak security of life and property of the households in the settlement.

4.4. Estimates of Factors Contributing to the Households’ Living Condition in the Study Area

As modelled in the previous section, the households’ monthly expenditure variable (proxy for the households’ living condition) was the dependent variable in the ordinary least squares regression. The Breusch–Pagan/Cook–Weisberg test for heteroscedasticity was carried out after regression and none of the degrees of freedom for chi-squared test were significant. The null hypothesis of homoscedasticity was accepted. If it had been found heteroscedastic, there could have been need to estimate the robustness of the standard error. In addition, in order to avoid inconsistency and bias from the estimated parameters, the study subjected the variables to multicollinearity test using the Collin command in STATA 11. Table 4 shows the test for multicollinearity among the variables. This was carried out with variance inflation factor (VIF), and the mean VIF was 1.46. In addition, the high level of tolerance computed for the variables indicates that there was an absence of multicollinearity in the analysis. Obviously, some of the variables that captured the socioeconomic characteristics and living conditions of the respondents showed statistical significance. This implies that the null hypothesis of this study should be rejected.

Table 4. Test of multicollinearity among variables.

| Variables                        | VIF | Tolerance | Eigenvalue |
|----------------------------------|-----|-----------|------------|
| Household head’s occupation      | 1.14| 0.8788    | 0.6249     |
| Household’ size                  | 1.71| 0.5865    | 0.5567     |
| Water accessibility by the participants | 1.63| 0.6118    | 0.2834     |
| Grant accessibility by the participants | 1.71| 0.5831    | 0.2605     |
| Waste accessibility by the participants | 1.60| 0.6264    | 0.2148     |
| Toilet accessibility by the participants | 1.53| 0.6543    | 0.1879     |
| Years of working experience      | 1.72| 0.5803    | 0.1727     |
| Coping actions when food insecure | 1.63| 0.6118    | 0.1672     |
| Food security status             | 1.31| 0.7642    | 0.1369     |
| Intervention projects            | 1.83| 0.5469    | 0.1307     |
| Body responsible for the intervention | 2.05| 0.4868    | 0.1125     |
| Awareness of the climate change  | 2.01| 0.4987    | 0.1037     |
| Means of treating Sickness       | 2.26| 0.4416    | 0.0847     |
| Financial sources                | 1.33| 0.7524    | 0.0746     |
| Risk of flood                    | 1.50| 0.6681    | 0.0685     |
| Capable of eating 3 meals daily  | 1.28| 0.7792    | 0.0535     |
| Educational status               | 1.34| 0.7449    | 0.0475     |
Table 4. Cont.

| Variables                        | VIF  | Tolerance | Eigenvalue |
|----------------------------------|------|-----------|------------|
| Access to good health            | 1.49 | 0.6724    | 0.0457     |
| Distance to public services      | 1.28 | 0.7798    | 0.0080     |
| Type of grant used by households | 1.73 | 0.5770    | 0.0161     |
| Use of grant                     | 2.69 | 0.3715    | 0.0113     |
| Mean VIF                         | 1.46 |           |            |

VIF, variance inflation factor. Source: Authors’ compilation from the computer printout of multicollinearity test.

Table 5 shows the estimated parameters for the determinants of the households’ living conditions using ordinary least square regression. Among the numerous variables that were included in the analysis were water accessibility by the participants ($p < 0.05$), toilet accessibility by the participants ($p < 0.10$), years of working experience ($p < 0.10$), food security status ($p < 0.05$), educational status ($p < 0.01$) and access to good health ($p < 0.10$). The parameter estimate of the households’ water accessibility was statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) with a positive coefficient (0.9211479). This implies that there is direct relationship between the water accessibility by the households and their living conditions in the study area. It means that households that had access to portable water had their living conditions improved/increased by 0.9211479 when compared with their households’ counterparts who did not have access to water. This is in line with the priority expectation, as access to water by households is a good indicator of a decent living condition. Water has also been confirmed as an essential element of life; it influences sanitation in complex ways, and the relationship can vary from place to place [53,54].

Table 5. Analysis of factors influencing the households’ living conditions.

| Variables                        | Coefficient | Std. Error | t     | $p > |t | Tolerance |
|----------------------------------|-------------|------------|-------|------|----------|----------|
| Household head’s occupation      | −0.0564686  | 0.0564887  | −1.00 | 0.320| 0.8788   |
| Household size                   | −0.0928237  | 0.0760536  | −1.22 | 0.225| 0.5865   |
| Water accessibility by the patients | 0.9211479  | 0.3712455  | 2.48  | 0.015**| 0.6118  |
| Grant accessibility by the participants | 0.0279572  | 0.1003999  | 0.28  | 0.781| 0.5831   |
| Waste accessibility by the participants | −0.0070289 | 0.1394965  | −0.05 | 0.960| 0.6264   |
| Toilet accessibility by the participants | 0.3248116  | 0.1686828  | 1.93  | 0.057*| 0.6543  |
| Years of working experience      | 0.0439332   | 0.0261942  | 1.68  | 0.097*| 0.5803   |
| Coping actions when food insecure | 0.89577    | 0.7503897  | 1.19  | 0.235| 0.6118   |
| Food security status              | 0.1175769   | 0.056511   | 2.08  | 0.040**| 0.7642   |
| Intervention projects             | −0.0973219  | 0.0834587  | −1.17 | 0.246| 0.5469   |
| Body responsible for the intervention | 0.0239772  | 0.0400403  | 0.60  | 0.551| 0.4868   |
| Awareness of the climate change   | 0.0395039   | 0.1607815  | 0.25  | 0.806| 0.4987   |
| Means of treating sickness        | −0.0462828  | 0.041694   | −1.11 | 0.270| 0.4416   |
| Financial sources                 | 0.0447222   | 0.0917704  | 0.49  | 0.627| 0.7524   |
| Risk of flood                     | 0.2304953   | 0.1872476  | 0.23  | 0.727| 0.7524   |
| Capable of eating 3 meals daily   | 0.1310551   | 0.1314202  | 0.98  | 0.321| 0.7792   |
| Educational status                | 0.1803549   | 0.0661766  | 2.73  | 0.008***| 0.7449 |
| Access to good health             | 0.2766559   | 0.1642959  | 1.68  | 0.095*| 0.6274   |
| Distance to public services       | −0.0195398  | 0.0478925  | −0.41 | 0.684| 0.7798   |
| Type of grant used by households  | −0.0036476  | 0.0324722  | −0.11 | 0.91 | 0.5770   |
| Use of grant                      | 0.0205436   | 0.0456915  | 0.45  | 0.654| 0.3715   |
| Constant                          | 1.711139    | 0.9076817  | 1.89  | 0.062|          |
| Observation number                | 255         |            |       |      |          |
| Prob > F                          | 0.0053      |            |       |      |          |
| R-squared                         | 0.3218      |            |       |      |          |
| Adjusted R-squared                | 0.1750      |            |       |      |          |
Table 5. Cont.

| Variables                                      | Coefficient | Std. Error | t     | p > | Tolerance |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------|------------|-------|-----|-----------|
| Root Mean Square Error (RMSE)                  |             |            | 0.58876 | 2.16|           |
| Cook–Weisberg test for heteroskedasticity      |             |            |       |     |           |
| Ho: Constant variance fitted values of households living condition: $\chi^2$ (1) = 2.16: |             |            |       |     |           |
| Probability $> \chi^2 = 0.1547$                |             |            |       |     |           |

Note: ***, ** and * means 1%, 5% and 10% levels of significance, respectively.

Similarly, the parameter of accessibility to a toilet by the participants was found to be statistically significant ($p < 0.10$) with a positive sign (0.3248116). This implies that households’ access to a toilet improved their living conditions. This is expected because households’ access to a toilet improves the health and living conditions. Access to and efficient use of safe sanitation facilities such as a toilet is an essential part of public health. This underscores the need for the provision of decent toilet facilities for all in order to promote decent living conditions in our communities [55]. The coefficient of years of working experience was statistically significant ($p < 0.10$) with a positive coefficient (0.0439332). This indicates that respondents’ working experience had a strong positive relationship with their living conditions in the study area. This is expected as households are more likely to make more income to improve their living conditions when they have more years of working experience [39,56]. In the same vein, the households’ food security status parameter had a significant ($p < 0.05$) and positive (0.1175769) effect on their living conditions. This indicates that if the households’ food security increases by one individual, their living conditions would increase by 0.1175769 units. This is in line with the a priori knowledge that households’ food security status is supposed to positively affect their living conditions. Food is a core element of an adequate standard of living in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948 (Article 25, the right to food) [57].

As expected, the parameter of households’ educational status was positive (0.1803549) and significant ($p < 0.01$). This implies that the households that possessed better educational attainment had better possibility of improving their living conditions in the study area. This is expected as educational attainment could lead to better income and livelihood hence, better living condition as against their counterparts without such education. According to [58], better education and health can result in improved employment prospects, higher incomes, lower slum populations and better nations. Finally, the parameter households’ access to good health facilities had a positive (0.2766559) and significant coefficient ($p < 0.10$). This indicates access to good health facilities by the residents in the study area contributed positively to their living conditions. This is expected as accessibility of the households to good health facilities should lead to good health, and hence vitality and strength to make a living. Therefore, ameliorating the immediate living conditions in the informal settlements offers the greatest promise for reducing morbidity, mortality, disparities in health and for improving people’s wellbeing and quality of life [59].

5. Conclusions, Recommendations and Future Research Directions

The study analysed the living conditions of the eZakheleni informal settlement of Durban, South Africa, and its implications for the community’s revitalization. Living conditions identified were socio-economic conditions, issues that pertained to safety and security, waste management, chances of attaining an education for a better living, as well as access to public amenities. A striking finding of a large number of female-headed households in the study area implied a faulty family system which could have undesirable consequences, not only for the informal settlements but the society at large. A study that looks into ways of improving family systems for a better society is necessary, as this has long-term effects of building a formidable, stable society that is able to identify itself. The
high unemployment rates, poor income sources (which are largely social grants), aged settlement with no upgrade and failed previous interventions indicated a despondent situation calling for sustainable interventions. The findings of this study conclude that education, basic housing services (water accessibility, toilet accessibility), food security, working experience, social connectivity and health are key contributors to households’ living conditions in the study area. It is recommended that further dedicated quality of life research (with health status, child mortality rate, maternity death at delivery, environmental factors, food security, age as basic indicators) in the study area be conducted. While research is conducted, the community could be assisted in various self-help programmes and projects of expanding sources of income streams to minimize the risks that lead to despondency. Social capital to improve safety and security usually works well in communities as it strengthens relationships and trust, and such is a necessity given the slow response of police officers. Local government can bring holistic revitalization policies and procedures for the eZakheleni informal settlement in order to have a more dignified and stable society. An integrated upgrade in consonance with previous studies must come in the form of provision of proper infrastructure, adequate security provision and health facilities for this vulnerable informal settlement.
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