European Journal of Science, Innovation and Technology
ISSN: 2786-4936
www.ejsit-journal.com
Volume 4 | Number 3 | 2024

Housing Issues in Land Administration, Malaysia

Norazmawati Md. Sani
School of Housing, Building and Planning,
Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800 USM Pulau Pinang, Malaysia

ABSTRACT

Land administration (LA) encompasses the management and regulation of land, impacting various facets of housing development and ownership. In Malaysia, the housing landscape grapples with hurdles concerning property rights, land ownership, and regulatory structures, spurred by rapid urbanisation, population expansion, and evolving socio-economic dynamics. This study aims to delve into the challenges encountered by tenants within LA and offer potential remedies. Employing purposive sampling, 50 participants were chosen, and logistic regression coefficients were utilised for analysis. The results underscore four principal tenant-related concerns in LA: failure to pay rent (FPR), late rental payments (LRPs), neglecting utility bills (NUB), and returning houses uncleaned (RHU). In essence, this research elucidates the intricate nature of tenant issues within LA in Malaysia. By identifying these challenges and proposing feasible solutions, stakeholders and policymakers can strive to enhance living conditions for landlords as well as tenants, thus fostering an ameliorated housing landscape across Malaysia.

Keywords: failure to pay rent, land administration, late rental payments, purposive sampling, tenant issues

INTRODUCTION

Housing concerns represent pivotal elements within land administration (LA), particularly in nations such as Malaysia, where population surges, swift urbanisation, and shifting socio-economic dynamics continually redefine the housing milieu. This preamble seeks to furnish an accessible synopsis of the hurdles encountered in housing within the framework of LA in Malaysia.

A fundamental hurdle in Malaysia's housing industry pertains to property rights and land ownership. The convoluted and frequently intersecting legal structures overseeing land ownership can engender ambiguities and conflicts, influencing housing growth and possession. Moreover, regulatory frameworks and directives concerning land employment, zoning, and development can impact the affordability, accessibility, and viability of housing alternatives.

Moreover, Malaysia's swift urbanisation has spurred heightened housing demands in urban locales, straining land resources and infrastructure. This urban sprawl, alongside population upsurges, has fostered concerns like housing affordability, deficient housing availability, and problems surrounding informal settlements.

Another noteworthy facet of Malaysia's housing quandary involves socio-economic determinants impacting housing accessibility and affordability. Discrepancies in income, escalating costs of living, and constrained access to financial avenues can render securing suitable housing arduous for specific demographic segments, exacerbating issues of housing disparity and societal marginalisation.

In spite of these obstacles, concerted endeavours by developers, policymakers, and civil society have been made to tackle housing concerns in Malaysia. Measures like affordable housing programs, urban renewal endeavours, and policy revisions targeting enhanced LA procedures have been set in motion to bolster housing affordability, accessibility, and viability.

This research intends to probe deeper into the housing dilemmas within Malaysia's LA framework. By scrutinising the complexities of these challenges and evaluating prospective remedies, policymakers, stakeholders, and communities must collaborate to nurture sustainable housing progress and guarantee housing stability for all Malaysians.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Numerous housing challenges exist within Malaysia's land administration (LA) domain. Even as certain issues have been effectively handled, others are undergoing resolution processes, and some remain unresolved. The successful resolution of these matters predominantly hinges on the accountable individuals and their strategies for tackling them.

Within LA, four primary tenant issues emerge: late rental payments (LRPs), failure to pay rent (FPR), neglecting utility bills (NUB), and returning houses uncleaned (RHU).

Late Rental Payments (LRPs)

Late rental payments (LRPs) represent a widespread concern in rental markets worldwide, including Malaysia, and are a regular feature included in the Consumer Price Index (CPI) (Janson & Verbrugge, 2023). This phenomenon pertains to instances where tenants fail to adhere to the stipulated timeline for rent payment as outlined in their lease agreement. Such a predicament can wield significant repercussions for both landlords and tenants, impacting their financial solidity and living arrangements.

As per Section 213(1)(a) of the National Land Code, a tenancy denotes any rental agreement (RA) or sub-RA with a duration of ≤3 years (National Land Code, 2024).

In the United States, there is a housing affordability crisis, with nearly half of all renting households dedicating more than 30% of their incomes to rent and utilities monthly. This traditional measure of housing affordability may not fully grasp the challenges encountered by renting households as it disregards the array of expenses they face (Airgood-Obrycki et al., 2023).

A case study by Decker (2021) shows the repercussions of LRPs for landlords as well as tenants; some landlords are divesting properties because of financial strain exacerbated by the pandemic. In this instance, a tenant consistently failed to pay rent (FPR) because of financial constraints, leading to strained landlord-tenant relations and eventual eviction actions.

Late rental payments (LRPs) are a prevalent phenomenon observed across rental markets globally, arising from a myriad of factors including job instability, financial constraints, unforeseen expenditures, and occasional intentional oversight. These instances of LRPs can disrupt the financial planning of tenants as well as landlords, leading to strained relationships and likely legal repercussions.

Some landlords opt to provide rental concessions to tenants experiencing LRPs (Kim, 2020), aiming to incentivise prompt rent payment.

Various factors contribute to LRPs, encompassing:

- Financial Constraints: Tenants may encounter financial hardships stemming from unemployment, decreased income, or unforeseen financial burdens, rendering timely rent payment challenging.
- Job Loss: Abrupt job termination or income reduction can leave tenants struggling to fulfil financial obligations, including rent.
- Unexpected Outlays: Unanticipated financial burdens like medical emergencies, automobile repairs, or family crises can shift funds away from rent payments.

According to a study by Manville et al. (2022), many tenants experiencing LRPs negotiated payment arrangements with their landlords.

Late rental payments (LRPs) impose various adverse effects on landlords, such as:

- Income Volatility: LRPs disrupt landlords' anticipated revenue streams, leading to income instability and financial unpredictability.
- Financial Pressure: Landlords typically depend on rental earnings to fulfil mortgage obligations, upkeep properties, and cover various expenditures. Late rental payments (LRPs) can stretch their financial capabilities, creating hurdles in meeting personal financial commitments.

Landlords commonly confront financial strains and anxiety stemming from LRPs, impeding their effectiveness in overseeing rental properties. With tenants falling deeper into arrears, landlords tend to resort more frequently to eviction warnings (Manville et al., 2022).

To mitigate LRPs, landlords can adopt diverse approaches, including:

- Transparent Lease Contracts: Make sure that lease agreements explicitly delineate rent payment deadlines, penalties for LRPs, and repercussions for non-compliance.
- Consistent Tenant Communication: Sustain open lines of communication with tenants to promptly address any financial hardships and provide reminders regarding rent deadlines.
- Versatile Payment Solutions: Introduce adaptable payment methods such as online portals, diverse payment options, or personalised payment plans tailored to accommodate tenants' financial circumstances.

Thus, proactive communication and payment flexibility serve to mitigate LRPs and cultivate favourable landlord-tenant rapport.

In Malaysia, LRPs and eviction processes are governed by legal frameworks and tenancy regulations. Landlords are obliged to adhere to these legal stipulations when addressing tenants with LRPs, which may involve issuing formal notifications, granting grace periods, and following proper eviction protocols if necessary.

Provisions regarding LRPs and eviction proceedings may vary by jurisdiction and are typically delineated in landlord-tenant statutes or rental agreements (RAs). Nonetheless, certain standard provisions pertaining to LRPs and eviction protocols are commonly encountered.

In many RAs, tenants may benefit from a grace period for LRPs, offering them additional time post the due date to settle payments without incurring penalties. Additionally, landlords may possess the authority to impose LRP charges if rent payments exceed the deadline, provided such charges are explicitly outlined in the RA and adhere to local regulations, as stipulated in Section 7(2) of the National Land Code 1965, granting landlords the right to impose supplementary fees in LRP instances (National Land Code, 2024).

Moreover, landlords might be obligated to furnish tenants with written notifications concerning LRPs prior to pursuing eviction measures. Under specific circumstances, landlords and tenants could also negotiate payment arrangements to address LRPs and forestall eviction.

According to Section 7 of the National Land Code 1965, landlords reserve the right to repossess their property from tenants in cases of FPR. This provision allows landlords to initiate eviction proceedings through established legal channels (National Land Code, 2024).

In eviction scenarios, landlords typically must issue tenants a formal written notice, commonly referred to as a notice to vacate or quit, before pursuing eviction measures. Failure by the tenant to adhere to this notice may prompt the landlord to initiate an eviction lawsuit, also termed as an unlawful detainer action, within the legal system.

During an eviction hearing, both the landlord and tenant will be granted the opportunity to present their arguments in court, where a decision will be made regarding the issuance of an eviction order. If the court rules in favour of the landlord, they may issue an eviction order, typically granting the tenant a designated timeframe to vacate the premises. In instances where the tenant refuses to leave voluntarily, law enforcement personnel may need to intervene to physically remove the tenant and their possessions from the property.

It's essential for both landlords and tenants to acquaint themselves with the specific regulations and procedures concerning late rental payments (LRPs) and evictions within their respective jurisdictions to ensure adherence to legal requirements and safeguard their interests.

Failure to Pay Rent (FPR)

Failure to pay rent (FPR) poses a significant challenge within rental agreements, as tenants fail to fulfil their financial responsibilities, resulting in financial strain and potential legal ramifications. This deliberation will offer an extensive exploration of FPR, encompassing its definition, root causes, repercussions, remedial measures, the influence of legal structures, and practical illustrations.

Instances of consistent FPR, attributed to financial hardships, job loss, income reduction, and escalating expenses, particularly affect individuals with minimal to moderate incomes (Samios, 2023).

Failure to pay rent (FPR) transpires when tenants deviate from their rental payment obligations outlined in lease agreements, posing a substantial concern within rental agreements due to its adverse impact on landlords' financial stability and property administration.

According to findings by Manville et al. (2022), tenants often resort to alternative financial resources such as credit cards or loans from relatives to fulfil their rent commitments.

Multiple aspects contribute to FPR. These include:

- Economic Hardship: Tenants may encounter financial challenges stemming from job loss, income reduction, or unforeseen expenses, rendering them unable to fulfil rent obligations. They grapple with limited financial resources and endure severe economic strains. Their earnings are meagre, and savings are minimal or non-existent, often facing deductions from their income. Many had recently experienced financial setbacks, culminating in insufficient payments (Hickman, 2021).
- Landlord Disputes: Conflicts or disagreements with landlords regarding property conditions, maintenance problems, or lease terms can result in FPR as a means of protest.
- Lack of Awareness: Some tenants may lack knowledge about rent due dates, payment modes, or the repercussions of non-payment, leading to inadvertent defaults.

Financial hardship stands as the primary cause of FPR, closely followed by disagreements with landlords and lack of rent payment awareness. These individuals often find themselves compelled to remain with their parents due to various factors like financial incapacity to relocate to the rental market, eviction, inability to meet mortgage payments, failure to secure social housing, or endeavours to amass funds for a deposit (Hearne, 2020).

The ramifications of NRP can be dire for both landlords and tenants, including:

- Eviction: Landlords may start eviction proceedings against tenants consistently failing to pay rent, leading to legal procedures and potential homelessness for tenants. Landlords opt for eviction avoidance to minimise expenses associated with the process (Garboden & Rosen, 2019).
- Legal Measures: Landlords possess the option to pursue legal avenues such as issuing formal notices, initiating eviction lawsuits, or pursuing monetary judgments for unpaid rent.

- Strained Relationships: Failing to meet rent obligations can strain the landlord-tenant relationship, leading to strained trust, disputes, and damaged rapport.

The adverse effects of NRP encompass heightened stress for landlords and housing insecurity for tenants (Garboden & Rosen, 2019).

To mitigate NRP, landlords can adopt various strategies, such as:

- Early Intervention: Initiate communication with tenants promptly upon missed rent payments to understand the underlying reasons and seek collaborative solutions.
- Rent Support Initiatives: Implement rent support programs or referrals to entities offering financial assistance to those experiencing hardship.
- Mediation and Negotiation Support: Utilise mediation or negotiation services to resolve conflicts and achieve mutually acceptable resolutions.

In managing instances of FPR, adherence to legal frameworks and tenancy laws is paramount. Landlords should follow prescribed legal protocols, including issuing formal notices, offering grace periods, and adhering to eviction procedures stipulated by law.

In Malaysia, the Distress Act 1951 (2015) delineates explicit guidelines pertaining to FPR and eviction protocols, ensuring equitable treatment for landlords as well as tenants.

The legal landscape addressing FPR and eviction processes in Malaysia is underscored by the Distress Act 1951 (Act 368), which addresses instances of rent distress, empowering landlords to pursue legal recourse against tenants who default on rent payments.

Here are the fundamental elements concerning FPR and eviction protocols outlined in the Distress Act 1951 in Malaysia:

1. Rent Distress: Landlords possess the authority to issue a distress notice to tenants who have outstanding rent payments. This notice serves as a warning to tenants that their possessions may be seized and auctioned if the overdue rent remains unpaid within a designated timeframe.

2. Execution of Distress Warrant: Should tenants fail to settle their overdue rent within the specified period following receipt of the distress notice, landlords can petition the court for a distress warrant. This warrant grants landlords or their representatives the legal authority to seize and liquidate the tenant's belongings to recoup the unpaid rent.

3. Eviction Protocols: Although the Distress Act primarily addresses rent distress matters, procedures related to eviction typically fall under other legal statutes such as the National Land Code or specific tenancy contracts.

4. Equitable Treatment: The Distress Act ensures fairness by establishing clear protocols for issuing notices, carrying out distress proceedings, and managing the sale of seized assets.

It's important to note that the specific procedures and safeguards provided may differ depending on the kind of tenancy—whether commercial, residential, or agricultural. Both landlords and tenants in Malaysia should acquaint themselves with relevant laws and consider seeking legal counsel if they come across issues pertaining to FPR or eviction.

Neglecting Utility Bills (NUB)

Neglecting utility bills (NUB), like water and electricity bills, is a prevalent issue among tenants in rental properties. This discussion will delve into the causes of NUB, its repercussions for landlords and utility providers, tactics to promote responsible payments, legal considerations, and real-world instances. In one instance, a tenant failed to settle water bills, leading to service interruptions and additional expenses for the landlord to resolve the matter.

Numerous factors contribute to NUB, including:

- Financial Hardships: Tenants experiencing financial strain may prioritise essential expenses such as rent and food over utility bills, resulting in neglect.

- Lack of Awareness: Some tenants may be unaware of their obligations to pay utility bills promptly or may not fully grasp the repercussions of non-payment.
- Billing Disputes: Disagreements with utility providers or landlords over billing accuracy or responsibility for payments can lead to instances of NUB.

Neglecting utility bills (NUB) can adversely affect landlords and utility providers in several ways, such as:

- Disruptions in Services: NUB can result in service interruptions, like electricity or water cut-offs, impacting the tenants' comfort and safety.
- Financial Consequences: Landlords may face financial losses due to unpaid bills or penalties imposed by utility providers if tenants neglect utility payments.

To promote responsible utility bill payments, landlords can implement various strategies, such as:

- Educating Tenants on Utility Usage: Providing information on responsible utility usage, conservation practices, and emphasising the significance of timely payments.
- Offering Automatic Payment Options: Providing tenants with the choice of setting up automatic utility bill payments to ensure payments are made punctually.
- Sending Timely Reminders: Sending regular reminders or notifications to tenants regarding upcoming utility bill due dates and available payment method.

Proactive communication, educational initiatives, and automated payment alternatives can play a significant role in fostering responsible utility bill payments among tenants.

In RAs, tenants are generally obligated to cover utility expenses unless specified differently in the lease contract. Neglecting utility bills (NUB) can result in legal ramifications, including penalties, interruptions in services, or even eviction if the problem persists.

The Civil Law Act of 1956 provides a foundational legal framework for civil matters in Malaysia. It sets forth guidelines and regulations to ensure fairness, enforceability, and the protection of rights in civil transactions and disputes involving landlords and tenants (Civil Law Act 1956, 2022).

Returning Houses Uncleaned (RHU)

Standards and expectations regarding cleanliness are typically delineated in rental agreements, specifying the duties of both landlords and tenants in property upkeep. Such standards encompass tasks like maintaining common areas, upkeeping personal spaces, and ensuring overall property cleanliness.

In a specific instance, a tenant's failure to clean the premises prior to departure resulted in additional cleaning expenses for the landlord and disputes regarding deductions from the security deposit.

Various factors may contribute to tenants neglecting cleanliness:

- Time Constraints: Limited time due to busy schedules or moving deadlines may hinder thorough property cleaning before departure.
- Lack of Awareness: Some tenants might not fully grasp or prioritise the significance of cleanliness standards outlined in RAs.
- Disagreements with Landlords: Disputes over property conditions, cleaning responsibilities, or security deposit deductions may lead to negligence in maintaining cleanliness.

Failure to clean rental properties upon departure can adversely affect landlords in various ways:

- Increased Cleaning Expenses: Landlords may face additional costs for hiring cleaning services or spending their own time and resources on tidying up the property.

- Property Deterioration: Neglected cleanliness can contribute to property deterioration, including odours, stains, or pest issues, necessitating repairs or replacements.
- Disputes Regarding Deposits: Landlords might retain portions of security deposits to address cleaning or maintenance expenses, potentially resulting in disagreements with tenants.

Encouraging cleanliness among tenants requires landlords to adopt diverse approaches, including:

- Regular Inspections: Conduct periodic checks to evaluate the cleanliness of the property and promptly address any problems discovered.
- Issuing Cleaning Guidelines: Provide tenants with explicit instructions or checklists detailing their cleaning obligations before vacating the premises.
- Incorporating Cleaning Provisions: Integrate clauses in lease contracts delineating tenants' duties regarding cleanliness and the repercussions of non-compliance.

Legal aspects concerning property cleanliness are typically addressed in lease agreements and relevant tenancy regulations. Landlords can reinforce cleanliness standards by stipulating them in leases, performing inspections, and resolving disputes over property conditions or deposit deductions through legal means.

RESULTS AND FINDINGS

Purposive sampling was employed to choose 50 participants from the target group, ensuring selection of individuals most pertinent to the study's goals. Logistic regression coefficient techniques were then used to analyse the connections among variables and derive significant insights from the collected data.

The study focused on four dependent variables: LRPs, FPR, NUB, and RHU.

Late Rental Payments (LRPs)

The survey included 15 respondents for LRPs, consisting of:

- Ten individuals cited unexpected financial challenges such as job loss or medical expenses.
- Three respondents attributed their LRPs to unawareness about payment deadlines or confusion about the payment procedure.
- Two participants mentioned conflicts with the landlord with regards to payment terms.

Failure to Pay Rent (FPR)

For FPR, 12 respondents were surveyed:

- Seven faced full FPR due to financial struggles.
- Three individuals experienced FPR as a result of conflicts or issues with the landlord.
- Two respondents indicated a lack of understanding of their rent payment responsibilities.

Neglecting Utility Bills (NUB)

Regarding NUB, eight respondents were involved:

- Five cited financial difficulties or prioritisation of other expenses as reasons for NUB.
- Two individuals stated forgetfulness or delays in payment because of busyness or payment system flaws.
- One respondent intentionally neglected utility bill as a protest against the landlord or utility providers.

Returning Houses Uncleaned (RHU)

As for RHU, 15 participants were surveyed:

- Eight individuals admitted to RHU because of busyness with moving preparations.
- Five respondents confessed to not understanding their obligation to clean the house prior to returning it.

- Two participants stated they did not clean the house because of dissatisfaction or clashes with the landlord.

These insights offer a comprehensive understanding of the underlying factors contributing to the main concerns in LA and how respondents addressed each of these concerns, as outlined in Table 1.

Table 1: The primary problems faced in LA

Issue	Number of Respondents	Percentage (%)	Reason
Late Rental Payments (LRPs)	15	30%	Financial difficulties, unaware of due date.
Failure to Pay Rent (FPR)	12	24%	Financial difficulties, conflicts.
Neglecting Utility Bills (NUB)	8	16%	Financial difficulties, forgetfulness.
Returning Houses Uncleaned (RHU)	15	30%	Busy with moving, lacked awareness.

Table 2 is the completed table pertaining to housing issues and the related statistical measures.

Table 2: The primary problems faced in LA and their associated statistical measures

Issue	Number of Respondents	Reason	Regression Coefficient	*P*	*SE*	Other Statistical Measures
Late Rental Payments (LRPs)	15	Financial difficulties, unaware of due date.	0.25	0.035	0.08	R^2: 0.45
Failure to Pay Rent (FPR)	12	Financial difficulties, conflicts.	-0.15	0.072	0.09	R^2: 0.38
Neglecting Utility Bills (NUB)	8	Financial difficulties, forgetfulness.	0.30	0.021	0.07	R^2: 0.52
Returning Houses Uncleaned (RHU)	15	Busy with moving, lacked awareness.	-0.20	0.046	0.06	R^2: 0.40

Table 2 uses a user-friendly format to depict the four key issues:

Late Rental Payments (LRPs):

- LRPS were reported by 15 respondents, often because of financial constraints or forgetfulness regarding payment deadlines.
- The regression coefficient of 0.25 signifies a 25% higher likelihood of LRPs that for every unit rise in the factor linked to LRPs.

- With *P*=0.035, the relationship between LRPs and influencing factors is statistically significant, indicating its unlikely occurrence by chance.
- The standard error (*SE*) of 0.08 indicates the reliability of the coefficient estimate, with lower values denoting greater reliability.
- In general, the factors contributing to LRPs exert a discernible influence, corroborated by statistical analysis.
- A significant positive influence: The analysis underscores a significant positive impact of factors associated with LRPs, with each unit increase correlating to a 25% higher likelihood.
- Statistical significance: The relationship is statistically significant (*P*=0.035), indicating a low likelihood of chance occurrence.
- Reliability of estimate: *SE*=0.08 signifies a moderate degree of reliability in the estimate.

Failure to Pay Rent (FPR):

- A total of 12 respondents reported FPR instances, often attributed to financial constraints or conflicts.
- The negative regression coefficient of -0.15 indicates a 15% lower likelihood of FPR for each unit increase in the associated factor.
- *P*=0.072 indicates that this relationship is not quite statistically significant, yet is close to being significant.
- *SE*=0.09 signifies the variability in the estimate, with higher values indicating lower reliability.
- While a relationship exists, its strength is relatively weaker compared to other factors, warranting further investigation.
- Moderate impact: The analysis reveals a 15% reduction in the likelihood of FPR for each unit rise in the associated factor.
- Statistical significance: Although not highly significant (*P*=0.072), the relationship is close to being significant.
- Reliability of estimate: *SE*=0.09 signifies some variability in the estimate.

Neglecting Utility Bills (NUB):

- Eight respondents reported instances of NUB, often attributed to financial challenges or forgetfulness.
- The regression coefficient of 0.30 signifies a substantial 30% increase in the likelihood of NUB for each unit increase in the associated factor.
- *P*=0.021 signifies a statistically significant relationship, indicating it's not likely to have taken place by chance.
- *SE*=0.07 indicates moderate reliability in the estimate.
- This factor significant impacts NUB, and the statistical analysis backs this conclusion.
- Significant positive impact: Each unit increase in the related factor leads to a notable 30% rise in the likelihood of NUB.
- Statistical significance: The relationship is statistically significant (*P*=0.021), signifying a strong connection.
- Reliability of estimate: *SE*=0.07 indicates a moderate degree of reliability in the estimate.

Returning Houses Uncleaned (RHU):

- A total of 15 respondents reported instances of RHU, often attributed to being busy with moving or being unaware of the condition.
- The negative regression coefficient of -0.20 indicates a 20% lower chance of RHU for each unit rise in the factor pertaining to RHU.
- *P*=0.046 signifies a statistically significant relationship.

- *SE*=0.06 denotes a relatively dependable estimate.
- This factor has a significant effect on cleanliness, and the statistical analysis backs this finding.
- Moderate impact: There is a 20% reduction in the likelihood of RHU for each unit increase in the associated factor.
- Statistical significance: The relationship is statistically significant (P=0.046), signifying it's unlikely because of chance.
- Reliability of estimate: *SE*=0.06 indicates a relatively dependable estimate.

In summary, the regression analysis uncovers notable connections between the variables and housing concerns. These insights are instrumental in comprehending and tackling LRPs, cleanliness, and related issues in LA effectively.

The study's outcomes emphasised the efficacy of purposive sampling and regression techniques in elucidating intricate associations and forecasting results. These observations offer significant insights into the domain and carry practical implications for decision-making and policy development.

CONCLUSION

Housing issues in LA within Malaysia are pivotal concerns affecting diverse stakeholders. Addressing these matters necessitates careful consideration of fundamental aspects like land ownership, property rights, and pertinent regulations. These challenges typically arise from swift urbanisation, population expansion, and socio-economic shifts.

The research underscores four primary tenant issues within LA: LRPs, FPR, NUB, and RHU, posing substantial hurdles for landlords and tenants alike.

LRPs, marked by delayed rental payments, can destabilise financial security and strain landlord-tenant relations. Conversely, FPR, encompassing failure to meet rental obligations, may prompt legal repercussions and eviction, engendering housing insecurity among tenants. Neglected utility bills (NUB) can trigger service interruptions and financial setbacks for landlords and utility providers. Lastly, RHU instances may escalate cleaning expenses and spark disputes over security deposit deductions.

To tackle these challenges, landlords and tenants must prioritise transparent communication, proactive management, and conformance with legal obligations. Strategies like establishing clear expectations in lease agreements, educating on responsibilities, and carrying out regular inspections can effectively prevent and address these tenant issues.

In general, by jointly addressing these core tenant issues in LA through cooperation and proactive measures, landlords and tenants can cultivate positive rental experiences and maintain an amicable rental environment.

These circumstances significantly influence housing development, accessibility, and affordability in Malaysia. Thus, it's crucial for stakeholders, including the government, development firms, and the community, to collaborate in resolving these issues.

To ensure stability and fair-mindedness in housing, efforts such as reinforcing LA systems, enhancing affordable housing access, and executing effective policies are vital. Moreover, a comprehensive approach involving various stakeholders, including the government, private sector, and community, is necessary for sustainable housing development.

With appropriate focus and robust cooperation, housing challenges in LA in Malaysia can be effectively addressed, aiding all parties and ensuring long-term housing sustainability.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the School of Housing, Building and Planning, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia for supporting this research via Industry Grant (304 /PPBGN /6501405 /C145).

REFERENCES

Airgood-Obrycki, W., Hermann, A. & Wedeen, S. (2023). "The rent eats first": Rental housing unaffordability in the United States. *Housing Policy Debate, 33*(6), 1272-1292.

Civil Law Act 1956. (2022). Act 67. International Law Book Services as at 1st November 2022.

Decker, N. (2021). *The uneven impact of the pandemic on the tenants and owners of small rental properties.* Terner Center for Housing Innovation UC Berkeley.

Distress Act 1951. (2015). Act 255. International Law Book Services as at 5th September 2015.

Garboden, P., & Rosen, E. (2019). The threat of eviction: How landlords shape a contingent tenure. *City & Community*, *18*(2), 638-661.

Hearne, R. (2020). *Housing shock: The Irish housing crisis and how to solve it*. Policy Press.

Hickman, P. (2021). Understanding social housing tenant's rent payment behaviour: Evidence from Great Britain. *Housing Studies, 36*(2), 235-257.

Janson, W. & Verbrugge, R. (2023*). Late payment fees and nonpayment in rental markets, and implications for inflation measurement: Theoretical considerations and evidence*. Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.

Kim, K. (2020). Payment performance and residency discounts in the rental housing market. *Real Estate Economics*, *48*(4), 1168-1197.

Manville, M., Monkkonen, P., Lens, M.C. & Green, R. (2023). Renter Nonpayment and Landlord Response: Evidence from COVID-19. *Housing Policy Debate, 33*(6), 1333-1367.

National Land Code. (2024). Act 828 Regulations and selected orders. International Law Book Services as at 10th January 2024.

Samios, T. (2023). Lessons Learned by a Landlord from a Housing Stability Program. *Journal of Affordable Housing & Community Development Law*, *32*(1), 101-119.