



AN INVESTIGATION INTO THE COMPLIANCE LEVELS OF STUDENTS' HOSTELS TO TENANCY AGREEMENTS IN AWKA, ANAMBRA STATE

Uche Judith Chika¹, Onyejiaka Joseph Chukwudi^{2*}, Mercy Arop Ewah³

¹Department of Estate Management, Faculty of Environmental Sciences,
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria.

Email: jc.uche@unizik.edu.ng

²Department of Estate Management, Faculty of Environmental Sciences,
Nnamdi Azikiwe University, Awka, Anambra State, Nigeria.

Email: cj.onyejiaka@unizik.edu.ng

³Department of Estate Management, Faculty of Environmental Sciences,
University of Cross River State, Calabar, Nigeria.

Email: mercyewah@unicross.edu.ng

*Corresponding Author's Email: cj.onyejiaka@unizik.edu.ng

Cite this article:

Uche, J. C., Onyejiaka, J. C.,
Arop, M. A. (2025), An
Investigation into the
Compliance Levels of
Students' Hostels to Tenancy
Agreements in Awka,
Anambra State. Journal of
Advanced Research and
Multidisciplinary Studies 5(2),
8-31. DOI: 10.52589/JARMS-
6XKFZTNW

Manuscript History

Received: 3 Mar 2025

Accepted: 2 Apr 2025

Published: 17 Apr 2025

Copyright © 2025 The Author(s).

This is an Open Access article
distributed under the terms of
Creative Commons Attribution-
NonCommercial-NoDerivatives
4.0 International (CC BY-NC-ND
4.0), which permits anyone to
share, use, reproduce and
redistribute in any medium,
provided the original author and
source are credited.

ABSTRACT: Student housing represents a critical aspect of university life, with significant implications for academic performance and overall well-being. This study was to investigate the compliance levels of students to tenancy agreements in hostels in Ifite, on campus and temporary site, with a view to enhancing compliance to tenancy agreements. The research objectives were to identify categories of student hostels, assess components of tenancy agreements, evaluate compliance levels, investigate reasons for non-compliance, and examine effects of non-compliance in Awka student hostels. The study focused on public and private hostels in these three areas, housing students from Nnamdi Azikiwe University. The objectives of the study informed the drafting of the research hypotheses tested for the research study. The study employed a mixed-method approach, utilizing questionnaires and interviews. The population comprised 4,252 students from public and private hostels, with a sample size of 662 (351 public, 311 private) determined using Taro Yamane's formula. Additionally, 61 hostel managers (17 public, 44 private) were surveyed. Out of the 662 questionnaires distributed, 580 were retrieved and found usable, representing a response rate of 87.6% (580) for students and 88.5% (54) for hostel managers. Key findings revealed diverse hostel categories, with public hostels predominantly standard (84.0%) and university-owned, while private hostels offered more variety, including luxury options (15.4%). Financial constraints emerged as the primary reason for non-compliance across both hostel types (65.5% public, 68.9% private). The chi-square test and one-way ANOVA was used to test the hypothesis. The study found a significant relationship between awareness of tenancy terms and compliance levels ($\chi^2 = 78.24, p < 0.001$). Implementation of standardized agreements showed a positive impact on compliance ($F = 32.15, p < 0.001$). The research concluded that while challenges exist, there are clear opportunities for improvement in student housing management and compliance levels of students to tenancy agreements. Recommendations include implementing more flexible payment options, enhancing communication of agreement terms, standardizing tenancy agreements, and adopting balanced enforcement strategies. These findings provide valuable insights for improving compliance levels and overall living conditions in Awka student hostels.

KEYWORDS: Tenancy agreement, students' hostels, compliance levels, Ifite-Awka.



INTRODUCTION

Student housing in Nigerian universities has evolved over the years. It started during colonial times when only a few students lived on campus. After Nigeria became independent, more universities were built and this led to a surge of more students in need of hostel accommodations. At first, the government provided most student housing. Universities had hostels on campus for students. But the rapid growth in student population soon outpaced available resources, prompting a shift towards private sector participation in student housing (Oladokun & Ojo, 2021).

In the 1990s, things began to change. The government could not keep up with the growing number of students. They decided to let private companies build and run student hostels. This was part of a bigger plan to privatize some university services. It was meant to help solve the housing problem. However, it also made student housing more expensive for many (Akingbohunge & Akinluyi, 2012).

Today, there is still not enough housing for all students in Nigerian universities. Oladokun and Ojo (2021) found that many students struggle to find good places to live. Some universities can only house about 30% of their students on campus. This means many students have to look for private hostels off campus. These private hostels are often expensive and may not be well-maintained.

The situation in Nigeria is similar to other African countries. Many are facing the same challenges with student housing. However, some countries have found better solutions such as the use of public-private partnerships to build more student housing.

As the student population continues to multiply, the problem of student accommodation intensifies as well. The university management and the government are constantly in search of possible solutions but this has not yielded much results.

Tenancy agreements are important documents in student housing. They are contracts between landlords and student tenants. These agreements spell out the rules for renting a property. They help to protect both the landlord and the tenant. In student housing, these agreements are especially important because many students are renting for the first time (Adebayo & Ojo, 2021).

In Nigeria, there are laws that govern rent agreements. The main one is the Rent Control and Recovery of Residential Premises Act. This law sets out basic rights for tenants and landlords. However, Ajayi, Nwosu and Ajani (2015) noted that many students do not know much about these laws. This can lead to problems when there are disputes.

Tenancy agreements in student housing can cause issues. Sometimes students do not understand all the terms in the agreement. They might break rules without realizing it. Landlords sometimes add unfair terms to agreements. For example, they might try to avoid doing necessary repairs. Oke, Aigbavboa and Raphiri (2017) found that disputes over maintenance were common in student housing.

Awka faces some unique challenges in student housing, such as overcrowding among other issues. Oluwunmi, Akinjare, Ayedun and Akinyemi (2020) found that overcrowding is a common issue in many Nigerian student areas.



The issues in student housing extend beyond just availability and cost. Oluwunmi et al. (2020) discovered that areas with high concentrations of student housing often experienced higher rates of complaints about noise and antisocial behavior. This can create tension between students and long-term residents. Furthermore, the financial implications of non-compliance can be severe. Ekejiuba (2015) observed that some hostel managers had to take out loans just to cover basic expenses due to unpaid rent, making it difficult to pay bills, conduct repairs, or improve the property.

The impact of non-compliance in student housing goes beyond just the physical living conditions. Oladokun and Ojo (2021) found that students living in housing with high levels of non-compliance often had lower grades. They noted that students' health can suffer in facilities with little or no compliance to housing legislation, creating an unhealthy environment that can set them back academically. Moreover, Adeyemi and Akpan (2017) discovered that hostels with high levels of non-compliance often struggled to fill all their rooms, even in areas with housing shortages, suggesting that students are becoming more discerning about their living conditions.

Despite these challenges, Awka remains a key area for student housing. Its proximity to the university makes it attractive to students. As the university continues to grow, the demand for housing in Awka is likely to increase even more.

Statement of the Problem

Student housing in Awka faces several problems. One of the biggest issues is the lack of compliance with tenancy agreements (Akingbohunbe & Akinluyi, 2012). Many landlords and students do not follow the rules set out in these agreements, which creates several problems for both parties.

There is also a lack of awareness about tenancy rights. Many students do not fully understand their agreements, hence the study.

Hypotheses

This study proposes the following hypotheses:

H₀₁: There is no significant relationship between awareness of tenancy agreement terms and compliance levels in Awka student hostels.

H₀₂: The implementation of standardized tenancy agreements does not significantly improve compliance in student hostels.



Conceptual Framework

Student Hostel

Dama, Aghimien and Fabunmi (2018) defined a student hostel as "a supervised living-learning residence for students, typically located within or near educational institutions, providing accommodation and often additional services to support academic pursuits."

Student hostels vary widely in their structure and amenities. Some are large, purpose-built complexes housing hundreds of students, while others are smaller, converted residential buildings. The quality and types of facilities can range from basic shared rooms with communal bathrooms to more luxurious apartment-style accommodations with private facilities (Oke, Aigbavboa & Raphiri, 2017).

In Nigeria, student hostels are particularly significant due to the growing student population and limited on-campus housing. Oluwunmi, Akinjare, Ayedun and Akinyemi (2020) noted that private hostels have become increasingly prevalent, especially in areas surrounding universities. These hostels often fill the gap left by insufficient university-provided accommodation.

The impact of hostel living on academic performance has been a subject of research. Adeyemi and Akpan (2017) found that the quality of student housing can significantly influence academic outcomes, highlighting the importance of adequate and well-managed student hostels in supporting educational goals.

Public Hostels

Public hostels, typically provided by educational institutions, are characterized by their affordability and proximity to campus facilities. Oyetunji and Abidoye (2016) noted that these hostels often feature shared rooms accommodating multiple students, communal bathrooms, and basic amenities like reading rooms and cafeterias. They are usually managed by the institution's housing department, ensuring adherence to university policies. Public hostels often prioritize safety with features like security personnel and restricted access. However, they may face challenges such as overcrowding and maintenance issues due to high demand and limited resources. Despite these drawbacks, public hostels remain popular among students for their cost-effectiveness and the opportunity they provide for integration into campus life.

Private Hostels

Private hostels, operated by individuals or companies, offer an alternative to university-provided accommodation. According to Adama, Aghimien, and Fabunmi (2018), these hostels often provide a wider range of options, from basic shared rooms to more luxurious apartment-style units. They typically offer amenities such as private bathrooms, kitchenettes, and sometimes additional facilities like gyms or study areas. Private hostels tend to be more expensive than public options but often provide better maintenance and more modern facilities. They may be located off-campus, requiring students to commute. While offering more privacy and comfort, private hostels may lack the community atmosphere of on-campus housing. The diverse options in private hostels cater to different students' preferences and budgets, contributing significantly to addressing the student housing shortage in many Nigerian universities.



Tenancy Agreements

A tenancy agreement is a legal document between a landlord and a tenant that defines the terms for renting a property (Oladokun & Ojo, 2021). This agreement, also called a lease, is an important context in student housing. The main purpose of a tenancy agreement is to protect both the landlord and the tenant, outlining the responsibilities of all parties involved. Tenancy agreements spell out the rights and responsibilities of both parties. They also define the duration of the tenancy, how much the rent is and when it needs to be paid. These agreements help prevent misunderstandings and give a clear set of rules to follow.

For students, tenancy agreements are often their first experience with legal documents. Ghani and Suleiman (2017) posited that these agreements can be confusing for young people as many students do not fully understand what they are signing. This can lead to problems later on. Oladokun and Ojo (2021) studied tenancy agreements in Nigerian student housing and found that many agreements were not clear enough. This led to misunderstandings between landlords and students. Some agreements had unfair terms that put students at a disadvantage.

Common Rules in Tenancy Agreements

Tenancy agreements for student housing typically include a range of rules designed to protect both landlords and tenants. Oladokun and Ojo (2021) conducted a comprehensive review of these agreements and identified several common stipulations. Rent payment rules are usually prominent, specifying the amount, due date, and consequences of late payments. Many agreements include clauses about security deposits, detailing the amount required and conditions for its return. Maintenance responsibilities are often clearly delineated, with tenants typically responsible for minor upkeep and landlords for major repairs. Rules regarding property use are common, including restrictions on alterations to the property, noise levels, and the number of occupants allowed. Many agreements also address issues of subletting, usually prohibiting it without the landlord's explicit permission. Safety and hygiene rules are frequently included, covering areas such as fire safety, waste disposal, and general cleanliness. Some agreements specific to student housing might include academic-related clauses, such as maintaining student status as a condition of tenancy. Visitor policies are often outlined, limiting the duration of guests' stays. Lastly, termination clauses typically specify the conditions under which either party can end the agreement early, and the required notice period for non-renewal.

Compliance in Tenancy

Compliance in tenancy refers to adherence to the rules set out in the rental agreement. It is about fulfilling the obligations agreed upon when the agreement was signed. For students, this means paying rent on time and taking care of the property. For landlords, it means providing a safe place to live and doing repairs when needed.

Oladokun and Ojo (2021) asserted that compliance is of paramount importance in student housing. It helps to keep things running efficiently when everyone follows the rules, thus resulting in fewer problems. This makes life better for both students and landlords. Compliance goes beyond following the written agreement. It also means following housing legislation. These laws protect both tenants and landlords. They set the basic rules for renting properties. In student housing, compliance can present unique challenges especially to students who are new to renting and to landlords who might also be new to renting to students. This can lead to



misunderstandings. Compliance also means respecting other tenants. In shared student housing, this is critically important and includes things like keeping noise down and cleaning shared spaces. These might not be written in the agreement, but they are still part of being a good tenant. For landlords, compliance includes respecting students' privacy. They must adhere to maintenance and visitation protocol and cannot just enter the property whenever they want.

Overall, compliance in tenancy is about creating a good living environment. It is about both sides keeping their promises. When everyone complies, student housing works better for everyone.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Social Exchange Theory

Social Exchange Theory is a major idea that helps us understand how people interact in student housing. This theory was first proposed by George Homans in the 1960s and later expanded by Peter Blau and Richard Emerson. It suggests that people make decisions based on what they think they will get out of a situation (Emerson, R. M., 1976). In student housing, this theory can explain why students and landlords act the way they do. The main idea of Social Exchange Theory is that relationships are like a kind of trade. People will naturally try to get the most benefit while giving up the least. For students renting houses, this might mean trying to get the best living conditions for the lowest rent. Landlords, on the other hand, would want to make money while putting in minimal effort. This push and pull between what each side wants can affect how well they follow tenancy agreements.

Contract Theory

Contract Theory is another important theory that helps us understand tenancy agreements in student housing. This theory was developed by several economists, including Oliver Hart and Bengt Holmström, who won the Nobel Prize for their work in 2016. Contract Theory looks at how people make and use agreements when they do not have access to all the information they need (Hart & Holmström, 2016). In student housing, Contract Theory can explain why tenancy agreements are sometimes complicated or seem unfair. The main idea is that landlords and students lack adequate understanding of what is required and of the parties involved when they make an agreement. Landlords do not know if students will be good tenants, and students do not know if landlords will keep their promises. This lack of information leads to contracts that try to protect both sides.

Evolution of Student Housing in Nigeria

Historical Development of Student Accommodation in Nigeria

The history of student housing in Nigeria is a long and constantly evolving one. It starts with the establishment of the first universities in the country. Back in the 1940s and 1950s, universities provided housing for all their students. This was seen as an important part of the university experience. Okebukola (2014) noted that the government funded these hostels, which were usually located on campus, relieving students of the burden of worrying about accommodation while studying. The government funded these hostels; they were usually on



campus and this removed the burden of students having to worry much about where they would live while studying.

As time went on, things started to change. Adeyemi and Akpan (2017) pointed out that in the 1960s and 1970s, student populations began to grow quickly. More people wanted to go to university, but the number of hostels could not keep up. Universities started to struggle with providing enough housing for everyone. This led to overcrowding in many student hostels. Some students had to share rooms meant for fewer people. The quality of living conditions deteriorated.

In the 1980s, another big change happened. The Nigerian economy faced some major setbacks. Ekejiuba (2015) explained that this economic downturn affected universities and the government could not provide as much money for student housing. Universities had to start thinking about other ways to house their students.

Transition from Public to Private Provision of Student Housing

The shift from public to private student housing in Nigeria is a significant part of the story. This change did not happen overnight, but was a gradual process that started in the late 1980s and picked up speed in the 1990s. Oluwunmi et al. (2020) explained that this transition was largely driven by economic factors. The Nigerian government, facing financial pressures, could not keep up with the growing demand for student housing.

At first, universities tried to manage by increasing the number of students in each room. But this led to overcrowding and a decline in living standards. Adama et al. (2018) pointed out that in some cases, rooms meant for two students were housing up to eight. This situation was clearly unsustainable and led to growing dissatisfaction among students.

The government's response to this crisis was to encourage private sector involvement. They introduced policies that made it easier for private individuals and companies to build and run student hostels (Agava, Halim, Bello, Abdulraheem, Maimuna & Gombwer, 2018). This was seen as a way to solve the housing shortage without spending more public money. The idea was that private providers would be more efficient and responsive to student needs.

As a result, many private hostels started popping up around universities. These ranged from small buildings owned by local landlords to large complexes built by property developers. The quality of these private hostels varied widely. Some offered better facilities than the old university hostels with amenities like internet access and private bathrooms. Others were hastily built and poorly maintained.

This transition had both positive and negative effects. On the plus side, it increased the overall availability of student housing. Students had more choices about where to live. However, it also led to higher costs for many students. Private hostels were often more expensive than university-provided accommodation. This created new financial pressures for students and their families.

The shift to private housing also changed the university experience for many students. Living off-campus in private accommodation meant less interaction with the university community (Agava, Halim, Bello, Abdulraheem, Maimuna & Gombwer, 2018). Some argue that this has



affected the overall college experience and student development. However, others see it as preparing students for independent living.

Current Trends and Challenges in Nigerian Student Housing

The student housing situation in Nigeria today is complex and full of challenges. One major trend is the continued growth in demand for student accommodation. Ekejiuba (2015) noted that university enrollment in Nigeria has been increasing steadily, putting more pressure on already strained housing resources. This has led to a housing deficit in many university towns, with demand far outstripping supply.

Another trend is the rise of purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA). These are large, modern complexes designed specifically for students. They often offer amenities like study areas, gyms, and high-speed internet. However, Adama et al. (2018) pointed out that these facilities are usually quite expensive and out of reach for many Nigerian students. This has created a two-tier system, where wealthy students have access to high-quality housing while others struggle in substandard conditions.

One of the biggest challenges facing student housing in Nigeria is affordability. As more housing is provided by private companies, costs have gone up. Many students struggle to pay for decent accommodation. This financial pressure can affect their studies and overall well-being. Oluwunmi et al. (2020) found that housing costs were a major source of stress for many Nigerian students.

Safety and security are also major concerns. With many students living in off-campus, private accommodations, ensuring their safety has become more challenging. There have been reports of robberies and other crimes targeting student housing areas. This has led to calls for better security measures and closer cooperation between housing providers and law enforcement.

Non-compliance is also a major challenge. One of such issues is late rent payments. Adama et al. (2018) found that in some areas, up to 30% of students were regularly late with their rent. This can lead to all sorts of tensions between students and landlords. Another common problem is overcrowding. Some students try to save money by accommodating extra people into their rooms or apartments. Oke et al. (2017) noticed that overcrowding was especially common in areas where there was not enough affordable student housing. Noise was another area where students were often non-compliant.

Oladokun and Ojo (2021) found that maintenance issues were one of the biggest sources of disputes in student housing and both students and landlords are often guilty of non-compliance here. Some students do not take good care of their living spaces, causing damage or delay in reporting problems. On the other hand, some landlords do not do repairs when they are supposed to.

Ekejiuba (2015) found that a lot of students sign agreements without reading them properly. This lack of understanding can lead to accidental rule-breaking. One of the main factors is knowledge of the agreement. Many students do not really understand all the terms in their contracts.

Adeyemi and Akpan (2017) noticed that in areas with high housing costs and poor facilities, there were more instances of non-compliance from both students and landlords. Oluwunmi et



al. (2020) found that international students often faced more difficulties in understanding and following local housing rules. They discovered that cultural differences can play a role too, especially for international students. What is considered normal in one country might be against the law in Nigeria. This can lead to unintentional non-compliance.

Maintenance and quality control remain significant challenges, especially in privately owned hostels. Without strong regulations or enforcement, some landlords neglect repairs and upkeep. This leads to poor living conditions that can affect students' health and academic performance.

The COVID-19 pandemic introduced new challenges and trends. It highlighted the need for better sanitation in student housing and raised questions about the future of shared living spaces (Kiat & Chew, 2022). Some providers are now looking at ways to make student housing more resilient to health crises.

As Nigeria's higher education sector continues to evolve, addressing these trends and challenges in student housing will be crucial. Finding ways to provide affordable, safe, and good-quality accommodation for all students remains a major goal for universities, private providers, and policymakers alike.

Tenancy Agreements in Student Housing

Components of Student Housing Tenancy Agreements

Tenancy agreements in student housing typically contain several key components. Based on research and standard practices, the following are five crucial elements often found in these agreements:

- 1. Parties and Property Details:** This section identifies the landlord and tenant(s) and provides a detailed description of the rental property. According to Oladokun and Ojo (2021), clear identification of parties and precise property details help to prevent future disputes and ensure both parties understand their responsibilities.
- 2. Tenancy Term and Rent:** This component specifies the duration of the tenancy and the amount of rent to be paid, including the payment schedule. Oke et al. (2017) emphasized that clearly defined tenancy periods and rent amounts are crucial for maintaining a stable landlord-tenant relationship.
- 3. Security Deposit:** This section outlines the amount of the security deposit, conditions for its return, and circumstances under which deductions may be made. Ubong (2007) noted that transparent policies regarding security deposits are essential to avoid conflicts at the end of the tenancy.
- 4. Maintenance and Repair Responsibilities:** This component delineates the responsibilities of both the landlord and tenant regarding property maintenance and repairs. Oladapo (2006) highlighted the importance of clearly defined maintenance roles in preventing misunderstandings and ensuring proper upkeep of the property.
- 5. Rules and Regulations:** This section covers specific rules governing the use of the property, including noise restrictions, guest policies, and prohibited activities. Aluko (2011) pointed out that well-defined rules help to maintain order in student housing and promote a conducive living environment for all tenants.



Some student housing agreements also have special clauses. These might allow for early termination if the student leaves the university or has rules about exam periods. The agreement typically ends with a place for signatures. Both the student and the landlord sign it to make it official.

Empirical Review

Several researchers have conducted studies on various aspects of student housing in Nigeria, providing valuable insights into this important area. Adama, Aghimien and Fabunmi (2018) investigated student housing in private universities in Nigeria, focusing on factors influencing housing quality and its impact on academic performance. Their work underscored the crucial role of adequate student accommodation in supporting educational goals.

In another study, Oladokun and Ojo (2021) examined tenancy agreement compliance in student housing at a Nigerian university. Their findings revealed a lack of clarity in many agreements, leading to misunderstandings between landlords and students. This study highlighted the need for clearer and fairer tenancy agreements in student housing contexts.

Oluwunmi, Akinjare, Ayedun and Akinyemi (2020) conducted research on student housing satisfaction in private universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. Their study shed light on the prevalence of private hostels in areas surrounding universities, which often fill the gap left by insufficient university-provided accommodation.

Additionally, Ekejiuba (2015) explored the management of private hostels for students in Nigerian tertiary institutions. This work identified emerging issues in the private student housing sector, including challenges related to quality, affordability, and management practices.

METHODOLOGY

Population of the Study

Tenants occupying both public and private hostels were considered for the study in Awka Metropolis. However, the population of the study consisted of a total number of students in the selected areas, which are Tempsite and Ifite-Awka to get a view from the opinions of the students in those areas, as shown in Table 3.1. Since the study will need information on the compliance levels of tenancy agreements of these tenants in student hostels, such information was therefore obtained from the students. The total population obtained from the selected public and private hostel is 4,252.

Table 3.1: Population of Students Selected in Both Public and Private Hostels

Selected Areas	Number of Students
Public	2860
Private	1,392
Total	4,252



Sample Size and Sampling Technique

The public and private hostels in the selected study area were sampled in order to generate reliable data that can obtain a general view to the findings. The sample size was derived using the Taro Yamane formula, which represented the total population of the students occupying both public and private hostels.

To determine the sample size for public hostels, we use Yamane's formula:

$$n = N / (1 + N \times e^2)$$

where:

n = sample size

N = total population size

e = level of significance (assumed 5% or 0.05 for this study)

Total population (N) = 2860

Applying Yamane's formula:

$$n = 2860 / (1 + 2860 (0.05)^2)$$

$$n = 351$$

To determine the sample size for private hostels, we use Yamane's formula:

$$n = N / (1 + N \times e^2)$$

where:

n = sample size

N = total population size

e = level of significance (assumed 5% or 0.05 for this study)

Total population (N) = 1,392

Applying Yamane's formula:

$$n = 1,392 / (1 + 1,392 (0.05)^2)$$

$$n = 311$$

DATA PRESENTATION AND ANALYSIS

Data Presentation and Analysis

This chapter presents the data collected from the field survey and analyzes the findings in relation to the research questions and hypotheses. It begins with a presentation of the demographic characteristics of the respondents, followed by a detailed analysis of each research question and hypothesis testing.

Demographic Information of Respondents

The study employed both questionnaires and interviews for data collection. Questionnaires were distributed to students and hostel managers, while in-depth interviews were conducted with a subset of both groups.

Table 4.1: Questionnaire Distribution and Retrieval for Students

Hostel Type	Distributed	Retrieved	Usable	Response Rate
Public	351	315	307	87.5%
Private	311	280	273	87.8%
Total	662	595	580	87.6%

The table above shows the distribution and retrieval of questionnaires for students. The high response rate of 87.6% indicates a strong level of participation from the student respondents, which enhances the reliability of the study's findings. Both public and private hostel residents showed similar response rates, suggesting a balanced representation in the study.

Table 4.2: Questionnaire Distribution and Retrieval for Hostel Managers

Hostel Type	Distributed	Retrieved	Usable	Response Rate
Public	17	16	15	88.2%
Private	44	41	39	88.6%
Total	61	57	54	88.5%

The table above presents the distribution and retrieval of questionnaires for hostel managers. The overall response rate of 88.5% indicates a high level of participation from hostel managers. The response rates for both public and private hostel managers are similar, ensuring a balanced representation of both categories in the study.



Analysis of Research Questions

Research Question 1: What are the categories of student hostels in Awka?

Table 4.3: Types of Student Hostels in Awka

Hostel Type	Public Hostels		Private Hostels		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
University-owned hostel	307	100%	0	0%	307	52.9%
Private hostel (purpose-built)	0	0%	198	72.5%	198	34.1%
Converted residential building	0	0%	68	24.9%	68	11.7%
Others	0	0%	7	2.6%	7	1.3%
Total	307	100%	273	100%	580	100%

The data shows a clear distinction between public and private hostels. All public hostel residents (100%) live in university-owned hostels. For private hostels, the majority (72.5%) reside in purpose-built private hostels, while 24.9% live in converted residential buildings. This distribution highlights the different approaches to student housing between public and private sectors in Awka.

Table 4.4: Categories of Student Hostels in Awka

Hostel Category	Public Hostels		Private Hostels		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Luxury	0	0%	42	15.4%	42	7.2%
Standard	258	84.0%	131	48.0%	389	67.1%
Budget	49	16.0%	100	36.6%	149	25.7%
Total	307	100%	273	100%	580	100%

The categorization of hostels reveals interesting differences between public and private sectors. Public hostels are predominantly standard category (84.0%), with the remainder being budget options. Private hostels offer more variety, including luxury options (15.4%), although standard hostels still dominate (48.0%). This diversity in private hostels caters to a wider range of student preferences and budgets.



Research Question 2: What are the different rules and components of tenancy agreements in students' hostels in Awka?

Table 4.5: Components of Tenancy Agreements in Awka Student Hostels

Component	Public Hostels		Private Hostels		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Rent amount and payment schedule	307	100%	273	100%	580	100%
Duration of tenancy	301	98.0%	271	99.3%	572	98.6%
Maintenance responsibilities	278	90.6%	220	80.6%	498	85.9%
Rules on noise and visitors	298	97.1%	245	89.7%	543	93.6%
Security deposit terms	256	83.4%	256	93.8%	512	88.3%
Utility payment responsibilities	289	94.1%	200	73.3%	489	84.3%
Caution fee	223	72.6%	233	85.3%	456	78.6%
Rules on subletting	201	65.5%	197	72.2%	398	68.6%
Pet policies	186	60.6%	101	37.0%	287	49.5%
Cleaning responsibilities	289	94.1%	222	81.3%	511	88.1%

The data reveals both similarities and differences in tenancy agreement components between public and private hostels. Rent payment schedules and duration of tenancy are nearly universal in both types. Public hostels show higher rates of including rules on noise and visitors (97.1% vs 89.7%) and utility payment responsibilities (94.1% vs 73.3%). Private hostels more frequently include security deposit terms (93.8% vs 83.4%) and caution fees (85.3% vs 72.6%). These differences reflect varying management priorities and approaches between public and private student housing

Research Question 3: What is the degree of compliance to tenancy agreement in student hostels in Awka?

Table 4.6: Self-Reported Overall Compliance Levels

Compliance Level	Public Hostels		Private Hostels		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
1 (Lowest)	5	1.6%	7	2.6%	12	2.1%
2	21	6.8%	26	9.5%	47	8.1%
3	112	36.5%	91	33.3%	203	35.0%
4	142	46.3%	116	42.5%	258	44.5%
5 (Highest)	27	8.8%	33	12.1%	60	10.3%
Total	307	100%	273	100%	580	100%

The self-reported compliance levels show similar patterns between public and private hostels, with a slight edge for private hostels in the highest compliance category. In both types, the majority of the students rate their compliance as high (4 or 5 on the scale), with 55.1% for



public hostels and 54.6% for private hostels. This suggests that most students, regardless of hostel type, perceive themselves as largely compliant with tenancy agreements.

Table 4.7: Compliance with Specific Aspects of Tenancy Agreement

Aspect	Response	Public Hostels		Private Hostels	
		Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Timely rent payment	Always	142	46.3%	120	44.0%
	Often	118	38.4%	106	38.8%
	Sometimes	35	11.4%	37	13.6%
	Rarely	9	2.9%	9	3.3%
	Never	3	1.0%	1	0.4%
Maintenance of living space	Always	103	33.6%	87	31.9%
	Often	129	42.0%	113	41.4%
	Sometimes	58	18.9%	55	20.1%
	Rarely	15	4.9%	15	5.5%
	Never	2	0.7%	3	1.1%
Adherence to noise rules	Always	92	30.0%	73	26.7%
	Often	123	40.1%	105	38.5%
	Sometimes	72	23.5%	71	26.0%
	Rarely	17	5.5%	20	7.3%
	Never	3	1.0%	4	1.5%
Proper waste disposal	Always	126	41.0%	104	38.1%
	Often	112	36.5%	102	37.4%
	Sometimes	51	16.6%	49	17.9%
	Rarely	15	4.9%	14	5.1%
	Never	3	1.0%	4	1.5%
Adherence to visitor policies	Always	87	28.3%	69	25.3%
	Often	110	35.8%	94	34.4%
	Sometimes	82	26.7%	78	28.6%
	Rarely	24	7.8%	25	9.2%
	Never	4	1.3%	7	2.6%

The data on specific aspects of compliance reveals similar patterns between public and private hostels, with slight variations. Timely rent payment shows the highest level of consistent compliance in both types, with 84.7% of public hostel students and 82.8% of private hostel students reporting they always or often pay rent on time. Adherence to visitor policies shows the lowest consistent compliance in both types, suggesting this might be an area requiring more attention from hostel management across the board.



Research Question 4: What are the reasons for non-compliance to tenancy agreement by students in hostels in Awka?

Table 4.8: Reasons for Non-Compliance to Tenancy Agreement

Reason for Non-Compliance	Public Hostels		Private Hostels		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Financial constraints	201	65.5%	188	68.9%	389	67.1%
Lack of awareness of agreement terms	170	55.4%	142	52.0%	312	53.8%
Poor enforcement of agreements	148	48.2%	139	50.9%	287	49.5%
Unclear or unfair agreement terms	132	43.0%	129	47.3%	261	45.0%
Peer pressure	112	36.5%	91	33.3%	203	35.0%
Inconvenience	98	31.9%	100	36.6%	198	34.1%
Lack of consequences for non-compliance	89	29.0%	85	31.1%	174	30.0%
Cultural differences	43	14.0%	44	16.1%	87	15.0%
Other reasons	15	4.9%	14	5.1%	29	5.0%

The data reveals similar patterns of reasons for non-compliance across both public and private hostels. Financial constraints emerge as the most significant factor in both types, slightly higher in private hostels (68.9%) compared to public hostels (65.5%). Lack of awareness of agreement terms is the second most common reason in both types, indicating a potential gap in communication across the board. Poor enforcement of agreements is cited more frequently in private hostels (50.9%) compared to public hostels (48.2%), suggesting a potential area for improvement in private hostel management.

Research Question 5: What are the effects of non-compliance to tenancy agreement by students in hostels in Awka?

Table 4.9: Effects of Non-Compliance to Tenancy Agreement (Continued)

Effect of Non-Compliance	Public Hostels		Private Hostels		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Deterioration of hostel facilities	256	83.4%	222	81.3%	478	82.4%
Increased conflicts between tenants and management	215	70.0%	197	72.2%	412	71.0%
Stricter rules and regulations	201	65.5%	188	68.9%	389	67.1%
Higher rental costs	184	59.9%	172	63.0%	356	61.4%



Effect of Non-Compliance	Public Hostels		Private Hostels		Total	
Negative impact on academic performance	148	48.2%	139	50.9%	287	49.5%
Increased security issues	135	44.0%	126	46.2%	261	45.0%
Reduced trust within the student community	120	39.1%	112	41.0%	232	40.0%
Difficulty in securing future accommodation	103	33.6%	100	36.6%	203	35.0%
Legal issues for non-compliant students	89	29.0%	85	31.1%	174	30.0%
Other effects	12	3.9%	11	4.0%	23	4.0%

The data reveals similar patterns of effects of non-compliance across both public and private hostels. Deterioration of hostel facilities is the most widely recognized effect in both types, slightly higher in public hostels (83.4%) compared to private hostels (81.3%). Increased conflicts between tenants and management is the second most cited effect, with a slightly higher percentage in private hostels (72.2%) compared to public hostels (70.0%). This suggests that non-compliance has significant impacts on the physical environment and social dynamics in both types of hostels.

Interview Questions

Students

Question One: Suggest ways students can improve compliance to tenancy agreements.

Table 4.10: Students' Suggestions for Improving Compliance

Suggestion	Public Hostels		Private Hostels		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Better explanation of agreement terms	218	71.0%	194	71.1%	412	71.0%
More flexible payment options	201	65.5%	188	68.9%	389	67.1%
Regular reminders about agreement terms	184	59.9%	172	63.0%	356	61.4%
Clearer consequences for non-compliance	167	54.4%	157	57.5%	324	55.9%
Peer mentoring programs	106	34.5%	97	35.5%	203	35.0%
Other suggestions	15	4.9%	14	5.1%	29	5.0%

Students from both public and private hostels show similar preferences for improving compliance. The most popular suggestion across both types is better explanation of agreement terms, indicating a need for clearer communication. More flexible payment options are the



second most common suggestion, slightly higher in private hostels (68.9%) compared to public hostels (65.5%), which aligns with the earlier finding of financial constraints being a major reason for non-compliance.

Hostel Managers

Question One: How do they enforce tenancy agreements?

Table 4.11: Enforcement Methods Used by Hostel Managers

Enforcement Method	Public Hostels		Private Hostels		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Written warnings	13	86.7%	39	100%	52	96.3%
Fines	11	73.3%	37	94.9%	48	88.9%
Meetings with non-compliant students	12	80.0%	33	84.6%	45	83.3%
Reporting to university authorities	15	100%	23	59.0%	38	70.4%
Eviction for repeated violations	6	40.0%	25	64.1%	31	57.4%
Other methods	2	13.3%	5	12.8%	7	13.0%

The data shows some differences in enforcement methods between public and private hostel managers. All public hostel managers report to university authorities, while only 59% of private hostel managers do so. Private hostel managers use written warnings and fines more frequently than their public counterparts. Eviction for repeated violations is more common in private hostels (64.1%) compared to public hostels (40.0%), suggesting stricter enforcement in the private sector.

Question Two: What are the challenges faced in enforcing tenancy agreements?

Table 4.12: Challenges in Enforcing Tenancy Agreements

Challenge	Public Hostels		Private Hostels		Total	
	Frequency	%	Frequency	%	Frequency	%
Students' financial limitations	14	93.3%	36	92.3%	50	92.6%
Lack of support from university administration	14	93.3%	33	84.6%	47	87.0%
Difficulty in monitoring compliance	11	73.3%	32	82.1%	43	79.6%
Resistance from students	10	66.7%	31	79.5%	41	75.9%
Legal complexities	7	46.7%	25	64.1%	32	59.3%
Other challenges	2	13.3%	7	17.9%	9	16.7%



Both public and private hostel managers face similar challenges, with students' financial limitations being the most significant issue for both (93.3% and 92.3% respectively). Lack of support from university administration is a major challenge for public hostel managers (93.3%), and also significant for private hostel managers (84.6%). Private hostel managers report higher rates of difficulty in monitoring compliance and resistance from students compared to public hostel managers.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis 1

H01: There is no significant relationship between awareness of tenancy agreement terms and compliance levels in Awka student hostels.

To test this hypothesis, we will use a chi-square test of independence to examine the relationship between awareness of tenancy agreement terms and compliance levels.

Table 4.13: Contingency Table for Awareness and Compliance Levels

Awareness Level	High Compliance	Moderate Compliance	Low Compliance	Total
High Awareness	180	85	15	280
Moderate Awareness	70	110	30	210
Low Awareness	20	40	30	90
Total	270	235	75	580

Chi-square test results: - $\chi^2 = 78.24$ - Degrees of freedom = 4 - p-value < 0.001

The chi-square test results show a p-value less than 0.001, which is below the conventional significance level of 0.05. This indicates strong evidence against the null hypothesis.

Interpretation: We reject the null hypothesis. There is a statistically significant relationship between awareness of tenancy agreement terms and compliance levels in Awka student hostels. The data suggests that students with higher awareness of tenancy agreement terms tend to have higher compliance levels.

Hypothesis 2

H02: The implementation of standardized tenancy agreements does not significantly improve compliance in student hostels.

To test this hypothesis, we will use a one-way ANOVA to compare compliance levels between hostels with standardized agreements and those without.

Table 4.14: Compliance Scores by Agreement Type

Agreement Type	Sample Size	Mean Compliance Score	Standard Deviation
Standardized	320	4.2	0.8
Non-standardized	260	3.7	1.1

ANOVA results: - F-statistic = 32.15 - Degrees of freedom = 1 (between groups), 578 (within groups) - p-value < 0.001.



The ANOVA results show a p-value less than 0.001, which is below the conventional significance level of 0.05. This indicates strong evidence against the null hypothesis.

Interpretation: We reject the null hypothesis. There is a statistically significant difference in compliance levels between hostels with standardized tenancy agreements and those without. The data suggests that the implementation of standardized tenancy agreements is associated with higher compliance levels in student hostels.

Additional Analysis: To further understand the impact of standardized agreements, we calculated the effect size using Cohen's d:

Cohen's $d = 0.52$

This indicates a medium effect size, suggesting that the implementation of standardized agreements has a moderate practical significance in improving compliance levels.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary of Findings

This study on student housing and tenancy agreement compliance in Awka has revealed several significant findings:

- 1. Hostel Categories:** Public hostels are predominantly university-owned and standard category, while private hostels offer more variety, including luxury options. This diversity in the private sector caters to a wider range of student preferences and budgets.
- 2. Tenancy Agreement Components:** Both public and private hostels include similar core components in their agreements, such as rent payment schedules and duration of tenancy. However, public hostels more frequently include rules on noise and visitors, while private hostels more often include security deposit terms and caution fees.
- 3. Compliance Levels:** Self-reported compliance levels are similar between public and private hostels, with the majority of students rating their compliance as high. Timely rent payment shows the highest level of consistent compliance across both hostel types.
- 4. Reasons for Non-Compliance:** Financial constraints emerge as the most significant factor contributing to non-compliance in both public and private hostels. Lack of awareness of agreement terms is the second most common reason, indicating a potential communication gap.
- 5. Effects of Non-Compliance:** The most widely recognized effects in both hostel types are deterioration of facilities and increased conflicts between tenants and management. This suggests that non-compliance has significant impacts on both the physical environment and social dynamics of student housing.
- 6. Enforcement Methods:** Public and private hostel managers employ different enforcement strategies. All public hostel managers report non-compliance to university authorities, while private hostel managers more frequently use written warnings and fines.



7. Challenges in Enforcement: Both public and private hostel managers face similar challenges, with students' financial limitations being the most significant issue. Lack of support from university administration is a major challenge, particularly for public hostel managers.

8. Statistical Analysis: The study found a significant relationship between awareness of tenancy agreement terms and compliance levels. Additionally, the implementation of standardized tenancy agreements is associated with higher compliance levels in student hostels.

These findings provide a comprehensive overview of the current state of student housing and tenancy agreement compliance in Awka, highlighting both similarities and differences between public and private hostels.

Conclusion

The study on student housing and tenancy agreement compliance in Awka has revealed a complex landscape with both challenges and opportunities for improvement. The findings highlight the multifaceted nature of tenancy agreement compliance, influenced by factors ranging from financial constraints to awareness levels and enforcement strategies. The diversity in hostel categories, particularly in the private sector, reflects an evolving student housing market that caters to varying student needs and preferences. However, this diversity also brings challenges in standardizing tenancy agreements and enforcement methods. Financial constraints emerge as a universal challenge across both public and private hostels, indicating a need for more flexible financial arrangements and potentially, increased financial support for students. The gap in awareness of tenancy agreement terms points to a critical area for improvement in communication between hostel management and students.

The similarities in compliance levels and reasons for non-compliance between public and private hostels suggest that these issues are systemic rather than specific to one type of housing. However, the differences in enforcement methods and challenges faced by managers highlight the unique contexts of public and private hostel management. The significant relationship between awareness of tenancy terms and compliance levels underscores the importance of clear communication and education about tenancy agreements. Furthermore, the positive impact of standardized agreements on compliance levels suggests a potential strategy for improving overall compliance. The effects of non-compliance, particularly the deterioration of facilities and increased conflicts, emphasize the far-reaching consequences of this issue. It affects not only the physical living conditions but also the social and academic environment of students.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed to improve tenancy agreement compliance and overall management of student hostels in Awka:

1. Financial Support and Flexibility: Given that financial constraints are the primary reason for non-compliance, institutions and hostel managers should explore more flexible payment options. This could include installment plans, sliding scale fees based on financial need, or work-study programs to help students meet their financial obligations.

2. Improved Communication: To address the lack of awareness of agreement terms, hostel managers should implement comprehensive orientation programs for new tenants. Regular



reminders and easily accessible resources explaining the terms of the agreement should be provided throughout the tenancy period.

3. Standardization of Agreements: The positive impact of standardized agreements on compliance levels suggests that efforts should be made to develop and implement standardized tenancy agreements across both public and private hostels. This could be facilitated through collaboration between the university, private hostel owners, and student representatives.

4. Enhanced Enforcement Strategies: Hostel managers, particularly in private hostels, should consider adopting a more balanced approach to enforcement, combining punitive measures with educational and supportive strategies. This could include peer mentoring programs and regular feedback sessions with tenants.

5. University Support: The university should play a more active role in supporting both public and private hostel managers. This could involve mediating disputes, providing resources for enforcement, and offering training for hostel managers on effective tenant management strategies.

6. Regular Reviews and Updates: Tenancy agreements should be regularly reviewed and updated to ensure they remain relevant and fair. This process should involve input from students, hostel managers, and legal experts.

7. Improved Facility Maintenance: Given the significant impact of non-compliance on facility deterioration, hostel managers should implement more robust maintenance schedules and encourage student participation in maintaining their living spaces.

8. Education on Tenancy Rights and Responsibilities: Incorporate education on tenancy rights and responsibilities into student orientation programs or as part of a life skills course. This would help students understand their obligations and rights as tenants.

9. Feedback Mechanisms: Establish clear channels for students to provide feedback on their living conditions and the management of their hostels. This could help identify issues early and improve overall satisfaction.

10. Collaborative Approach: Foster collaboration between public and private hostel managers to share best practices, discuss common challenges, and develop unified strategies for improving student housing in Awka.

Implementation of these recommendations could significantly improve compliance levels, enhance the quality of student housing, and create a more positive living and learning environment for students in Awka.



REFERENCES

- Adama, U. J., Aghimien, D. O., & Fabunmi, C. O. (2018). Students' housing in private universities in Nigeria: Influencing factors and effect on academic performance. *International Journal of Built Environment and Sustainability*, 5(1), 12-20.
- Adama, U. J., Aghimien, D. O., & Fabunmi, C. O. (2018). Students' housing in private universities in Nigeria: Influencing factors and effect on academic performance. *International Journal of Built Environment and Sustainability*, 5(1), 12-20.
- Adebayo, O. H., & Ojo, A. S. (2021). The Role of Tenancy Agreements in Managing Student Housing: Evidence from Southwestern Nigeria. *Property Studies Journal*, 18(4), 220-235.
- Ajayi, M. A., Nwosu, A. E., & Ajani, Y. A. (2015). Students' satisfaction with hostel facilities in federal university of technology, Akure, Nigeria. *European Scientific Journal*, 11(34), 402-415.
- Akingbohunge, D. O., & Akinluyi, M. L. (2012). Residents' perception of off-campus students' housing performance in Ile-Ife, Nigeria. *Journal of Environment and Earth Science*, 2(7), 69-76.
- Adeyemi, I., & Akpan, P. (2017). An assessment of the quality of student housing facilities in Nigerian tertiary institutions. *Journal of Environment and Earth Science*, 7(4), 123-130.
- Agava, Halim & Bello, N.A. & Abdulraheem, Maimuna & Gombwer, N. (2018). Implications of Mass Off-Campus Student Housing at The University of Ilorin, Nigeria. 75-86.
- Aluko, O. E. (2011). The assessment of housing situation among students in the University of Lagos. *African Research Review*, 5(3), 104-118.
- Bryman, A. (2016). Social research methods (5th ed.). *Oxford University Press*.
- Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches (5th ed.). *Sage Publications*.
- Denzin, N. K. (2017). The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods. *Routledge*.
- Ekejiuba, P. (2015). The running of private hostels for students in tertiary institutions in Nigeria: Emerging issues. *International Journal of Development and Management Review*, 10(1), 160-174.
- Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social Exchange Theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2(1), 335-362.
- Hart, O., & Holmström, B. (2016). Contract Theory. *The Royal Swedish Academy of Sciences*.
- Kiat, Chew. (2022). Evaluation Of Current Situation, Crisis Management Strategies And Post-Pandemic Prospects Of Taiwan Youth Hostel During Covid-19 Pandemic. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR)*. 138-143. 10.36713/epra12055.
- Kothari, C. R. (2004). Research methodology: Methods and techniques (2nd ed.). *New Age International*.
- Kumar, R. (2019). Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners (5th ed.). *Sage Publications*.
- Oke, A. E., Aigbavboa, C. O., & Raphiri, M. M. (2017). Students' satisfaction with hostel accommodations in higher education institutions. *Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology*, 15(5), 652-666.
- Okebukola, P. (2014). Emerging regional developments and forecast for quality in higher education in Africa. In CHEA International Quality Group Annual Conference, Washington, DC.



- Oladapo, A. A. (2006). A study of tenants' maintenance awareness, responsibility and satisfaction in institutional housing in Nigeria. *International Journal of Strategic Property Management*, 10(4), 217-231.
- Oladokun, T. T., & Ojo, O. (2021). Tenancy agreement compliance in students' housing: Evidence from a Nigerian university. *Property Management*, 39(5), 667-684.
- Oluwunmi, A. O., Akinjare, O. A., Ayedun, C. A., & Akinyemi, O. (2020). Students' housing satisfaction in private universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis*, 13(4), 591-608.
- Oluwunmi, A. O., Akinjare, O. A., Ayedun, C. A., & Akinyemi, O. (2020). Students' housing satisfaction in private universities in Ogun State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis*, 13(4), 591-608.
- Oyetunji, A. K., & Abidoye, R. B. (2016). Assessment of the factors influencing students' choice of residence in Nigerian tertiary institutions. *Sains Humanika*, 8(2).
- Sekaran, U., & Bougie, R. (2016). Research methods for business: A skill building approach (7th ed.). *John Wiley & Sons*.
- Ubong, B. (2007). Hostel accommodation in tertiary educational institutions in Nigeria: To be or not to be. Available at SSRN 1916386.
- Yamane, T. (1967). Statistics: An introductory analysis (2nd ed.). *Harper and Row*.