

RESEARCH ARTICLE

## Assessment of Level of Team Integration among Property Development Stakeholders in Lagos State

Ifeoluwa Alexander Arola

Department of Estate Management, University of Lagos

Received: 16 October 2024

Revised: 16 June 2025

Accepted: 17 July 2025

Published: 6 November 2025

**Cite article as:** Arola, I. A. (2025) Assessment of Level of Team Integration among Property Development Stakeholders in Lagos State. *African Journal of Housing and Sustainable Development*, 6(2), pp. 36-50.

© The Author, under the exclusive licence to Centre of Housing and Sustainable Development

Corresponding author:  
ifeoluwaarola@gmail.com

### ABSTRACT

As well established as the concept of integration is in developed countries, it has yet to gain ground in developing nations like Nigeria. Within the context of property development, integration refers to the introduction of working practices, methods and behaviour that create a culture of efficient and effective collaboration between individuals and organisations, thus improving property development outcomes. This study, undertaken in a Nigerian context, addresses the lack of literature on integration and collaboration in property development. It assesses the level of integration among stakeholders in Lagos State, identifying ten parameters of integration and 18 challenges to achieving it. A quantitative survey was conducted with 139 stakeholders, including property investors, developers, building professionals and financiers. The purpose of the survey was to identify what parameters of integration these stakeholders considered most important for effective teamwork, as well as to measure the levels of occurrence of these parameters among property development stakeholders and to identify the most significant challenges and impact of poor integration. The study found that key integration parameters in property development stakeholders in Lagos include a 'shared vision', 'team and process flexibility', and 'unrestricted sharing of information'. Despite the presence of a fairly high level of integration, the Lagos property market still falls short of expectations. Major challenges identified were project size, changing team composition, self-centeredness among professionals, and the absence of a system for measuring integration. Poor integration negatively impacts project performance, leads to delays and harms team relationships. To improve collaboration, the study recommends investing in collaborative technology, conducting workshops for team cohesion and establishing standard metrics for measuring integration.

**Keywords:** Integration, Collaboration, Teamwork, Stakeholders, Property development

### 1.0 Introduction

Property development (PD) is an essential part of the real estate industry and is vital to improving a country's gross domestic product (Botha, Adendorff, & Smallwood, 2014; McMahan, 2007). Productive human activities usually occur under some form of physical structure, whether it be

commercial properties for commerce and trade, industrial properties for manufacturing and industrial processes, or residential properties for the habitation of workers and entrepreneurs. No doubt, property development will always be a crucial part of human society, hence the need for improvement. The property development process is a multifaceted one that involves many phases from

conception/initiation to disposal and usually requires the actions of and collaboration among many stakeholders and professionals in the built environment, including architects, builders, agents, developers, investors, finance managers, marketers, and government authorities (Ebekozen & Aigbavboa, 2022; Wilkinson & Reed, 2008; Cadman & Topping, 1996). The rigorous process of property development therefore demands the formation of property development teams involving numerous professionals and stakeholders, as developers have varying skill levels and cannot execute the entire process single-handedly (Ratcliffe, Stubbs, & Shepherd, 2004). Property development stakeholders are obliged to work together in ensuring that the process of property development is effective and productive (Martinsuo & Ahola, 2010; Schöttle & Gehbauer, 2012; Latham, 1994).

In the property development industry globally, effective teamwork has become a key issue since the emergence of works such as Latham (1994) and Egan (1998, 2002). Several studies have also reported that ineffective teamwork among the property development team or the absence of a properly integrated property development team has caused many substantial losses to the industry and only provided poorer outcomes (Azmy, 2012; Baiden et al., 2006; Chow et al., 2005). As the process of property development becomes more complex, older ways of functioning in the property development process, such as DBB Models (Design-Bid-Build), have been increasingly criticised for failing to foster collaboration, even as self-preservation approaches have been common among team members (Aapaoja et al., 2013; Madichie & Madichie, 2009). This has led to suggestions for a switch to a more collaborative method, such as the Integrated Project Delivery (IPD) approach, (Aapaoja et al., 2013; Lank, 2006; Baiden et al., 2006; Egan, 2002; Egan, 1998; Latham, 1994).

In the Nigerian literature, although with little to no specific mention of integration, problems among stakeholders in property development have also been identified to be a major challenge to efficient property development within the country. Madichie and Madichie (2009) identified conflicting mandates among stakeholders in the field as a major

challenge, hence the need to seek ways of integrating the roles of the stakeholders in some form of partnership. Adu and Opawole (2019) noted the importance of effective teamwork among stakeholders to improve performance in construction processes in Nigeria's south-south region. Ebekozen et al. (2022) and Salau (2019) also explored awareness about, as well as the application of, the IPD Model among Nigerian stakeholders, with the study finding poor application of the model.

Extant literature in Nigeria has identified issues of cost overruns (Ikechukwu et al., 2017) and project delivery delays (Egwim et al., 2021; Eboh et al., 2019; Owolabi et al., 2014) as major problems hindering the delivery of important property development projects, such as housing provisions or investment commercial properties. Integration can contribute by reducing project delivery periods, reducing wastage and reducing the overall cost of project delivery (Salau, 2019; Azmy, 2012; CIC et al., 2007). The current study aims to contribute to enhancing property development practices via the promotion and adoption of integration and its approaches, thereby helping to address some major problems in the industry, such as housing shortages, high development costs, and substandard levels of development. As noted by Ebekozen et al. (2023), Ebekozen et al. (2022), and Salau (2019), there is a shortage of literature addressing issues of collaboration and integration among stakeholders in Nigeria's property development industry. Accordingly, this study offers new insights on integration in the Nigerian context of property development.

The objectives of this study are to identify the key integration parameters that should exist among stakeholders involved in property development within Lagos State. This will be followed by an ascertainment of the current level of integration among these stakeholders within the designated study area. The research further aims to identify the existing challenges that hinder the achievement of effective integration and, subsequently, to pinpoint the negative impacts resulting from the lack of proper collaboration. Ultimately, the study seeks to conclude by providing strategic recommendations aimed at improving the level of integration among property development stakeholders in the study area.

## 2.0 Literature Review

This section provides an extensive review of relevant empirical literature in the subject area of integration among stakeholders and other areas of relevance. The review is organised in reverse chronological order to present the most recent findings first, mainly reviewing literature published within the last decade, with only a few being older than a decade. To start with, Ebekozi et al. (2023) investigated the issue of stakeholders' engagement in construction projects in South Africa, justifying the study on the paucity of literature on stakeholder engagements and collaboration in developing countries. Utilising a qualitative approach, semi-structured interviews and a research philosophy of interpretivism, the authors interviewed 25 experts of the built environment based in South Africa, among whom were quantity surveyors, construction project managers, engineers and architects. Their study found low levels of stakeholder engagement because of issues ranging from individual perceived hindrances (e.g., viewing other professionals as threats to job security) and organisational perceived hindrances (e.g., the lack of information) to government-related perceived hindrances (e.g., lack of government focus on regulation). The researchers also found feasible measures to mitigate these hindrances and improve stakeholder engagement to include encouraging teamwork between stakeholders, allowing stakeholders in decision-making, creating a platform for inclusion, and promoting basic conflict management skills among stakeholders.

Based on a stakeholder perspective, Ebekozi et al. (2022) investigated level of awareness about, as well as the application of, Integrated Project Delivery in Nigeria's construction sector. The study was premised on the fact that research remains limited on practitioners' application of IPD in Nigeria's construction delivery. The study pursued the following objectives: to investigate the level of awareness, to investigate the issues hindering the implementation of IPD and to proffer solutions to promote IPD application in project delivery in the country. The study adopted a qualitative approach, drawing data from Zoom and WhatsApp interviews with twenty (20) participants and analysing it thematically. The results showed that the practitioners were quite aware of IPD but its

application in the industry was quite poor. The emerging issues that hindered the adoption and application of the IPD delivery model were grouped into technological, legal, financial and cultural factors in Nigeria's context.

Nath et al. (2021) used a mix of inductive and deductive approaches to develop a framework to measure collaboration among stakeholders in India's development industry. After a comprehensive review of the literature to understand current practices in the industry and establish the psychological and project-level enablers of collaboration among stakeholders, the study analysed data gathered via a questionnaire and semi-structured interviews with richly experienced professionals in India. The respondents included main contractors, clients, subcontractors, project management consultants, and designers. The results showed that the three most important psychological enablers for collaboration – out of eight identified factors – were 'generosity', 'being appreciative' and 'transparency'. Additionally, six important enablers out of the identified ten project-level enablers were important for defining collaboration at the project level, viz: 'good communication', 'process design', 'engagement of stakeholders', 'adoption of information technology', 'real-time information sharing' and 'reliability towards work'. In seeking to make a novel contribution, the study provided a conceptual framework for measuring the level of collaboration on construction projects which includes the six project enablers but excluded the psychological factors.

The study by Egwim et al. (2021), although not directly focused on stakeholders' integration and collaboration in property development teams, is relevant to this review. The study extracts underlying factors that cause delays in construction projects within the context of Nigeria, the subject area of focus for this current study. The study utilised a similar approach to other studies incorporating a comprehensive review of literature to identify common factors that cause project delays. Next, the study utilised a survey in the form of a questionnaire to draw data from experts on which of these identified factors were most applicable. The experts included predominantly contractors, quantity surveyors, architects, technical consultants, technical office engineers, site

engineers, and procurement managers, among many others. Their findings showed that the major factors that caused delays in projects were factors that were attributable to suppliers and attributable to poor decision-making on the part of the project management team, as well as factors attributable to inclement or bad weather. These results showed that problems relating to the process by which these stakeholders in the industry work together were causing multiple delays to projects all around the country, hence the need for the study by Ebekozen et al. (2023) and Nath et al. (2021), as well as the current one.

Drawing data from experts within the contexts of various countries, including Vietnam, Australia, the United States of America, and the United Arab Emirates, Nguyen and Mohamed (2021) discussed the mediation effect of stakeholder management based on stakeholder characteristics and project performance. In other words, the study examined the relationship between stakeholder characteristics and project performance and the mediation effect of effective stakeholder management on these relationships. The study utilised existing literature to identify the factors contributing to stakeholder characteristics, project performance and effective stakeholder management. The research was conducted using Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) and found that stakeholder legitimate behaviour, opposing behaviour and conflicting stakeholder interests negatively affect the ability to achieve project performance. The study also found that effective stakeholder management (ESM) is a key element in eliminating the negative effects of such behaviour on qualitative project performance measures and that it is vital to achieving optimum project performance. The study also noted that the concept of ESM could be explained by agile response to change, adaptive scoping and stakeholder engagement.

Oyedeki (2020) investigated the concept of joint ventures, another collaborative effort in the field of property development among stakeholders. Rahman et al. (2014) described joint ventures as one of the contemporary models of property delivery that aid collaboration. In Oyedeki's (2020) study, the objectives were to assess the classes of properties developed through joint ventures in the study area, to examine the nature of the parties going into joint

ventures for property development in the study area, to assess the terms of a joint venture agreement and to examine problems associated with joint ventures in the study area. Their study involved a survey questionnaire successfully administered to 120 members of the Real Estate Developers Association of Nigeria (REDAN) in Lagos. The study found that residential and commercial were the most prevalent property types developed through joint venture agreements. They also found that collaboration between Private developers and financial institutions, followed by Private developers and Landowners, and followed by collaboration among Private Developers, were the most common forms of joint-venture agreements. Furthermore, they found that the most prevalent problems included financing, profit sharing, distrust, technology transfer, and staffing. All of these problems have been seen to be remediable with the concept of integration.

Adu and Opawole (2019) conducted a study to identify the major attributes of effective teamwork and the challenges encountered by the team during construction. The study was premised on the need to improve project performance through effective teamwork among industry stakeholders. The study involved a questionnaire survey of 420 industry stakeholders comprising representatives of clients, contractors and consultants in the south-south region of Nigeria. The study found that leadership skills, top management support and team interpersonal dynamics were among the most critical attributes for effective teamwork.

Salau's (2019) investigated the possibility of adopting IPD concepts and its principles in the Nigerian context to address some of the pertinent problems of the industry. The study included Architectural firms, Engineering firms, Quantity surveying firms, and Multidisciplinary design firms located in Abuja, Kano, and Kaduna. The study found poor awareness and involvement with IPD concepts, identifying it to be the result of barriers such as lack of awareness of the concept among professionals, lack of an enabling environment for collaboration, lack of request for IPD use from clients, legal and contractual constraints, social and habitual resistance to change, and many more. The study also found cooperation and commitment among professional bodies for the implementation

of IPD and its concepts, as well as the full utilisation of enabling technologies, as some of the most prominent factors aiding the adoption of IPD in the Nigerian industry.

Assaf et al. (2014) evaluated the effectiveness of project teams and their impact on the performance of construction projects in Saudi Arabia. The study assessed project performance or success based on Efficiency, Impact on customers, Business success, and Preparation for the future. The study assessed team effectiveness on Team goals and objectives, Team leadership, Team roles and responsibilities, Team relationships, Trust and values within the project team, and Team communication. The study found that these teams comprising different industry stakeholders could impact project delivery and performance based on the dynamics of their effectiveness. Furthermore, the study found that Team roles and responsibilities, Team goals and objectives, and Team leadership were the most important factors in ensuring that these project teams performed efficiently, followed by Trust and values within the project team, team communication, and team relationships.

Baiden et al. (2006) investigated the extent of integration that was achieved by construction project teams managed by award-winning

construction managers within successful projects. Nine successful projects were used as case studies and managers from three management firms involved with some of these projects were interviewed for the qualitative study.

The study identified ten dimensions for integration on which it assessed the project teams during interviews with the managers: Single team focus and objectives, Seamless operation with no organisational defined boundaries, Mutually beneficial outcomes, Increased time and cost predictability, Unrestricted cross-sharing of information, Team flexibility and responsiveness to change, Creation of single and co-located team, Equal opportunity for project inputs, Equitable team relationships and respect for all, and No blame culture. The study found that None of the assessed project teams were completely fragmented and that neither did any of them exhibit the full range of criteria signifying a truly integrated operation. The authors argued, therefore, that it was either that fully integrated teams were not necessary for effective team operations and project success within the industry or that the sector must overcome significant organisational and behavioural barriers if the benefits of integration were to be fully realised in the future.

**Table 1a:** Parameters of Integration

S/N	Integration Parameters	Definition	Sources
1.	Shared Vision	All members of the property development team have the same focus and objectives for the project.	Deep et al. (2019); Chakkol et al. (2017); Evbuomwan & Anumba (1998)
2.	Engagement of Stakeholders	All stakeholders who are part of the team are fully involved in the project and have equal opportunities to contribute to the delivery process.	Hamzeh et al. (2019); Chakkol et al. (2017); Moore & Dainty (2001)
3.	Unrestricted Sharing of Information	Information is shared freely among the team members and access to information is restricted to certain members or groups within the team.	Hamzeh et al. (2019); Moore & Dainty (2001); Vyse (2001); Evbuomwan & Anumba (1998)
4.	Adoption of Information Technology (IT)	The team and its members are ready and able to utilise modern IT for real-time information sharing, more accurate processes and better predictability.	Hamzeh et al. (2019); Deep et al. (2019); Panahifar et al. (2018)
5.	Unrestricted Communication	Members of the team can communicate and operate without boundaries among themselves.	Hamzeh et al. (2019); Deep et al. (2019); Rahman et al. (2014); Vyse (2001)
6.	Mutual Commitment towards Work and	All members are wholly committed to their duties and responsibilities and also to	Deep et al. (2019); Chakkol et al. (2017); Rahman et al.

	Mutually Beneficial Outcomes	achieving outcomes beneficial to the team and not just to themselves.	(2014); Vyse (2001); Dainty et al. (2001)
7.	Team and Process Flexibility	Team composition and processes are flexible enough to respond to changes that might arise throughout the development project.	Hamzeh et al. (2019); Hughes et al. (2012); Anumba et al (2002); Evbuomwan & Anumba (1998)
8.	Trust and Respect among Team Members	Members are trusting of one another and operate in a manner of equitable relationship and respect for each other.	Hamzeh et al. (2019); Deep et al. (2019); Hayes (2002); Moore & Dainty (2001); Vyse (2001);
9.	Reliability towards work among team members	Members can rely on each other's skills and expertise for process execution to improve outcomes.	Deep et al. (2019); Chakkol et al. (2017); Anumba et al (2002); Evbuomwan & Anumba (1998)
10.	Absence of blame culture	Members face challenges together and do not resort to castigation for team members' inadequacies.	Bromley et al. (2003); Dainty et al. (2001); Vyse (2001); Evbuomwan & Anumba (1998)

**Source:** Adapted from Nath et al. (2021) and Baiden et al (2006)

A review of existing scholarships reveal several critical gaps that the present study seeks to address. First, most prior studies have relied on qualitative or mixed-methods approaches to examine stakeholder integration and collaboration, identifying the various dimensions of these processes. However, there is a noticeable absence of research employing quantitative approaches to establish relationships and measure the actual levels of integration. To bridge this gap, the present study adopts a quantitative method to assess integration levels among stakeholders in property development teams.

Second, although existing studies in Nigeria have explored collaboration and, in some cases, examined the application of integration models such as the Integrated Project Delivery (IPD) model, there remains a lack of targeted investigations focusing specifically on the property development sector in Lagos State. Lagos, as Nigeria's commercial and economic hub, presents a dynamic and diverse ecosystem where multiple forms of development projects occur simultaneously. Investigating integration within this unique context provides an opportunity to capture the realities of stakeholder interactions in a vibrant and fast-paced development environment. Accordingly, this study

directs its attention to stakeholders operating within Lagos State.

Finally, much of the literature on stakeholder integration and collaboration draws from foreign contexts such as Singapore, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, and the United Kingdom. Nigerian scholarship, by contrast, has tended to emphasize issues of awareness and conceptual application, often without engaging in empirical measurement. This study advances the literature by moving beyond awareness and application, focusing instead on the quantitative measurement of integration among stakeholders.

### **3.0 Materials and Methods**

The study is a descriptive cross-sectional survey utilising a quantitative approach that allowed the researcher to achieve a holistic understanding of the study population. This approach helps to highlight areas of further research and potential solutions. The approach is also particularly suitable because of the vastness of the property development industry, with its large number of stakeholders. The study utilised the stratified sampling technique. The distribution of the strata is shown in Table 1b.

**Table 1b:** Study Population of the Strata

S/N	Sub-Category of Study Population (Strata)	Population	Source
1.	Private Property Investor	Undefined	
2.	Property Developer	1,400 Members	Members of REDAN in Lagos (Oyedeji, 2020)
3.	Building Contractor	4,000 Members (Est.)	NIOB – Lagos Chapter
4.	Architect	3,105 Members	Arc. David Majekodunmi, Chairman NIA – Lagos State Chapter
5.	Estate Surveyor and Valuer	2,280 Members	NIESV Lagos State
6.	Quantity Surveyor	4,372 Members	NIQS Lagos State Chapter (2018)
7.	Engineers	6,980 Members	COREN Portal
8.	Financier	71 Banks	Nzepro (N.D)
	<b>Total Target Population</b>	<b>22,208 Members</b>	

Utilising the Yamane sampling formula and a 10% acceptable error, the sample size drawn was 100 respondents. However, from the literature reviewed, quantitative studies such as Oyedeji (2020), Egwin et al. (2021) and Nath et al. (2021) utilised a survey sample size of 130, 120 and 120 respectively. For this reason and to accommodate the non-response cases, this study adopted a sample size of 150 respondents. The online questionnaire was designed using the Google Forms platform. It included an information page, which provided information about the purpose of the questionnaire, the handling of data, and participant confidentiality. The first section of the questionnaire collected basic demographic information about the participant, such as gender, occupation, years of experience in property development, etc., through multiple-choice questions. Using Likert-scale questions, the second section was designed to identify what integration parameters were considered important within the property development team. The third section addressed how commonly these parameters have

existed based on the respondent's experience, also using Likert-scale questions. The fourth section assessed the challenges that have led to the poor state of integration among stakeholders in property development; it equally used the Likert scale. Finally, the fifth section examined the impact of poor integration among stakeholders in property development teams, equally using Likert-scale questions.

Data from the questionnaire was analysed in terms of descriptive statistical means such as frequency tables, bar charts, pie charts, mean ranking, and relative importance index, etc. This method provided a proper understanding of the current state of integration within the industry, without any manipulation or testing of the variables, as understanding the state of integration is the first step to achieving any form of improvement in the industry. Table 2a presents the strata of the respondents

**Table 2a:** Study Population of the Strata

S/N	Sub-Category of Study Population	Sample Size Share	Responses Share	Percentage (%)	Response Rate (%)
1.	Private Property Investor	15 Respondents	15 Respondents	10.8	100%
2.	Property Developer	25 Respondents	23 Respondents	16.5	92%
3.	Building Contractor	20 Respondents	20 Respondents	14.4	100%
4.	Architect	20 Respondents	20 Respondents	14.4	100%
5.	Estate Surveyor and Valuer	20 Respondents	20 Respondents	14.4	100%
6.	Quantity Surveyor	15 Respondents	14 Respondents	10.1	93%
7.	Engineers	20 Respondents	16 Respondents	11.5	80%
8.	Financier	15 Respondents	11 Respondents	7.9	73%
	<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>150 Respondents</b>	<b>139 Respondents</b>	<b>100%</b>	<b>92.7% Response Rate</b>

#### 4.0 Findings and Discussions

The findings are organised into five (5) key sections: the demographic profile of the responding stakeholders, the important integration parameters as considered by the stakeholders, the levels of the integration parameters in property development teams, the challenges to integration, and the impacts of poor integration.

##### Demographic Profile

The demographic profile of the respondents shows various categories of professionals involved in

property development. The analysis revealed a majority of male respondents. Most respondents held M.Sc. degrees, followed by B.Sc./HND, PhD, and ND. The designations of the stakeholders were diverse, including private property investors, property developers, building contractors, architects, estate surveyors, quantity surveyors, engineers, and financiers, which were fairly balanced. Experience levels varied, with the largest group having 6 to 10 years of experience. A summary of the demographic profile of the respondents is shown in Table 1c.

**Table 1c:** Demographic Profile of Respondents

Gender	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Male	87 Respondents	62.6
Female	52 Respondents	37.4
<b>Total</b>	<b>139 Respondents</b>	<b>100%</b>
Education	Frequency	Percentage (%)
ND	1 Respondent	0.7
B.Sc/HND	49 Respondents	35.3
M.Sc	74 Respondents	53.2
PhD	15 Respondents	10.8
<b>Total</b>	<b>139 Respondents</b>	<b>100%</b>
Experience	Frequency	Percentage (%)
1-5 Years	35 Respondents	25.2
6-10 Years	47 Respondents	33.8
11-15 Years	41 Respondents	29.5
Above 15 Years	16 Respondents	11.5
<b>Total</b>	<b>139 Respondents</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Source:** Author (2024)

##### Important Parameters of Integration

Table 2b shows the results of the Relative Importance Index (RII) analysis carried out to identify what parameters of integration the respondents or stakeholders considered important. The results showed that the parameters of integration ranking from most important to least important were Shared Vision, Reliability towards work among team members, Team and process flexibility, Trust and respect among team members,

Mutual commitment towards work and mutually beneficial outcomes, Unrestricted communication, Absence of blame culture, Adoption of information technology, Unrestricted sharing of information, and Engagement of stakeholders. However, the results also showed that almost all the integration parameters could be considered important, as the least RII value among the parameters was the value of 0.89, thus showing the general importance of all the parameters to every stakeholder.



**Table 2b:** RII Analysis of Important Parameters of Integration

S/N	Integration Parameters	VI	I	N	U	VU	Total	RII	Rank
1	Shared Vision	117	20	1	1	-	139	0.96	<b>1st</b>
2	Reliability towards work among team members	97	40	1	-	1	139	0.93	<b>2nd</b>
3	Team and process flexibility	93	45	-	1	-	139	0.93	<b>3rd</b>
4	Trust and respect among team members	91	46	1	-	1	139	0.93	<b>4th</b>
5	Mutual commitment towards work and mutually beneficial outcomes	81	57	-	-	1	139	0.91	<b>5th</b>
6	Unrestricted communication	82	53	3	1	-	139	0.91	<b>6th</b>
7	Absence of blame culture	86	45	5	1	2	139	0.91	<b>7th</b>
8	Adoption of Information Technology (IT)	77	57	4	1	-	139	0.90	<b>8th</b>
9	Unrestricted sharing of information	71	63	5	-	-	139	0.89	<b>9th</b>
10	Engagement of Stakeholders	64	74	-	-	1	139	0.89	<b>10th</b>

**Source:** Author (2024)

### Levels of Integration Parameters

Table 3 shows the results of the Mean Score (MS) analysis carried out to identify the various levels of the integration parameters in property development teams in Lagos. By comparing the mean of all the various parameters, the analysis shows which parameters are more present in property development teams than others. The result shows an overall level of integration of 3.25 in PD teams, which can be considered fairly high. All the various parameters were also of values that can be considered as fairly high, with only the ‘absence of

blame culture’ parameter being of an average level. This result shows that integration in property development teams in Lagos State is only at a fairly significant level, with certain aspects of integration being lower than others. In the result, only the ‘shared vision’ parameter was of the highest mean score compared to others with a value of 3.80, with the next closest value to it being ‘Engagement of Stakeholders’ at 3.47. This shows that many aspects of integration still require improvement in property development teams in Lagos if the full benefits of integration are to be actualized.

**Table 3:** MS Analysis of Levels of Integration Parameters in PD Teams

S/N	Integration Parameters	VC	C	N	U	VU	Total	Mean	Rmk.
1	Shared Vision	48	40	30	17	4	139	3.80	<b>F.h.</b>
2	Engagement of Stakeholders	15	70	25	24	5	139	3.47	<b>F.h.</b>
3	Unrestricted sharing of information	20	47	41	29	2	139	3.39	<b>F.h.</b>
4	Adoption of Information Technology (IT)	16	44	28	41	10	139	3.11	<b>F.h.</b>
5	Unrestricted communication	13	43	25	48	10	139	3.01	<b>F.h.</b>
6	Mutual commitment towards work and mutually beneficial outcomes	15	47	26	39	12	139	3.10	<b>F.h.</b>
7	Team and process flexibility	21	59	25	25	9	139	3.42	<b>F.h.</b>
8	Trust and respect among team members	15	45	31	37	11	139	3.12	<b>F.h.</b>
9	Reliability towards work among team members	18	59	26	28	8	139	3.37	<b>F.h.</b>
10	Absence of blame culture	10	26	35	48	20	139	2.70	<b>Avg.</b>
<b>Overall Level of Integration in PD Teams</b>								<b>3.25</b>	<b>F.H.</b>

**Source:** Author (2024); Decision Scale: 0.00-1.00 (Low); 1.01-2.00 (Fairly Low); 2.01-3.00 (Average); 3.01-4.00 (Fairly High); 4.01-5.00 (High)

### Challenges to Integration

Table 4 shows the result of the mean analysis of the challenges to integration in property development teams. The mean scores of the various challenges from the literature were assessed from the perspective of the stakeholders, with the results showing that the most significant challenges include Project size, Changing team composition over the project duration, Mindset of 'self' instead of 'we' among professionals, No Culture of constant measuring of integration, and focus on traditional measures of project success. All the other challenges identified in the literature were assessed

to be averagely significant. This result may suggest that the most significant challenges were issues such as large project sizes and inconsistency of Project personnel, which could pose serious issues to integration. It could also be inferred that, on the part of professionals, a self-centred mindset will affect the possibility of integration. As regards the industry, the lack of a culture of measuring integration and the persistent focus on traditional measures of project success (e.g., cost and time) also largely affect the idea of integration in property development teams in Lagos.

**Table 4:** MS Analysis of Challenges to Integration in PD Teams

S/N	Integration Challenges	SA	A	N	D	SD	Total	Mean	Rmk.
<b>Industry Culture Challenges</b>									
1	Traditional measures of measuring project success (Cost, time, & quality)	44	63	20	12	-	139	4.00	<b>VS</b>
2	No culture for the constant measuring of integration among teams	30	84	20	5	-	139	4.00	<b>VS</b>
3	Unwillingness to accept change	36	61	19	22	1	139	3.78	<b>AS</b>
<b>Individual Behavioural Challenges</b>									
4	Mindset of 'self' instead of 'we' among professionals	45	66	13	15	-	139	4.01	<b>VS</b>
5	Discrimination among team members	38	62	17	20	2	139	3.82	<b>AS</b>
6	Chasing individual goals (Selfish Pursuit)	44	67	11	15	2	139	3.98	<b>AS</b>
7	Lack of commitment to quality and efficiency	29	66	14	27	3	139	3.65	<b>AS</b>
8	Lack of collaborative spirit	35	59	14	28	3	139	3.68	<b>AS</b>
9	Lack of Knowledge and Information	31	45	22	33	8	139	3.42	<b>AS</b>
<b>Delivery Process Challenges</b>									
10	Lack of communication among stakeholders	24	62	10	40	3	139	3.46	<b>AS</b>
11	Poor Relationship among stakeholders	30	71	14	23	1	139	3.76	<b>AS</b>
12	Poor dispute resolution	33	62	13	29	2	139	3.68	<b>AS</b>
13	Lack of adequate interaction among stakeholders	34	65	11	28	1	139	3.74	<b>AS</b>
14	Lack of effective leadership	32	67	16	19	5	139	3.73	<b>AS</b>
15	Lack of collaborative technology	40	64	16	16	3	139	3.88	<b>AS</b>
<b>Project Challenges</b>									
16	Changing team compositions over the project duration	37	81	12	9	-	139	4.05	<b>VS</b>
17	Project Size	39	78	15	6	1	139	4.06	<b>VS</b>
18	Project Cost	48	53	15	20	3	139	3.88	<b>AS</b>

**Source:** Author (2024); Decision Scale: 0.00-2.00 (Not So Significant); 2.01-3.99 (Averagely Significant); 4.00-5.00 (Very Significant)

### Impact of Poor Levels of Integration

Table 5 shows the results of the mean score analysis of the impact of poor integration in property development teams. All the responses were analysed and the various means were adjudged to be ‘not so likely’, ‘likely’, or ‘most likely’ to occur as a result of poor integration. The results show that all the impacts were most likely to occur as a result of poor integration in property development teams, with the highest possible impact being ‘poor project performance’, ‘delay in project delivery’, ‘poor

team working environment and relationships’, and ‘lack of innovation in team affairs and project execution’. The impacts next likely to occur were ‘inability to meet team goals and objectives’, ‘increased project cost’, ‘hostility among team members’ and ‘poor team readiness and cohesiveness for future projects’. From the results, it could be inferred that integration is quite important for project performance and delivery, as teams would most likely be able to operate better when they are most integrated.

**Table 5:** MS Analysis of Impact of Poor Integration in PD Teams

S/N	Impacts of Poor Integration	SA	A	N	D	SD	Total	Mean	Rmk
1.	Poor Project Performance	95	40	2	1	1	139	4.63	<b>ML</b>
2.	Increased Project cost	70	60	9	-	-	139	4.44	<b>ML</b>
3.	Delay in Project delivery	85	50	4	-	-	139	4.58	<b>ML</b>
4.	Inability to meet team goals and objectives	75	59	2	2	1	139	4.48	<b>ML</b>
5.	Poor team working environment and relationships	85	49	3	-	2	139	4.55	<b>ML</b>
6.	Poor team readiness and cohesiveness for future projects	60	70	6	1	2	139	4.33	<b>ML</b>
7.	Hostility among team members	68	55	13	1	2	139	4.34	<b>ML</b>
8.	Lack of innovation in team affairs and project execution	84	50	3	-	2	139	4.54	<b>ML</b>

**Source:** Author (2024); Decision Scale: 0.00-2.00 (Not So Likely); 2.01-3.99 (Likely); 4.00-5.00 (Most Likely)

### 5.0 Discussion of Findings

This section discusses findings from the survey as analysed in the previous subsections, particularly in terms of cross-analysis, inferences and references to existing literature.

The first objective of this study was to identify which integration parameters should exist among the stakeholders in property development teams in Lagos. The review of the literature identified numerous parameters for integration that are important in property development and should therefore exist in any well-integrated property development team. In the analysis of the survey, the parameters considered highly important by the respondents were given in the following order: ‘Shared Vision’, ‘Reliability towards work among team members’, ‘Team and process flexibility’, ‘Trust and respect among team members’, ‘Mutual commitment towards work and mutually beneficial

outcomes’, ‘Unrestricted communication’, ‘Absence of blame culture’, ‘Adoption of information technology’, ‘Unrestricted sharing of information’, and ‘Engagement of stakeholders’. However, even the least relative importance index was at a value of 0.89, thus indicating that all the identified parameters were considered important. These findings were consistent with some of the findings in works such as Baiden et al. (2006), Assaf et al. (2014), and Adu and Opawole (2019). However, the findings in these other studies vary as to the importance of the variables, hence signifying geographical or individual distinctions as to what parameters of integration are considered most important. Such differences are observable, as Salau (2019) considered technology use as being among the top two prominent parameters for the adoption of Integrated Project Delivery (IPD), an example of the integration model. However, in the present study, technology is considered the eighth (8th)

most important factor in this study; as such, any attempt to improve integration among stakeholders in a typical property development team in Lagos should consider these parameters according to their importance, hence the need to tailor solutions to meet the most pressing needs.

The second objective was to measure the level of integration existing among the stakeholders in property development teams in Lagos. After identification of the parameters of integration, this study assessed the respondents on their experience with the various integration parameters in the different property development teams they had been part of or had experienced. The findings showed just a fairly high overall level of integration (3.25/5.00), which was slightly above average. A closer examination of the integration parameters showed that nine out of the ten parameters were also just fairly high, with only the ‘absence of blame culture’ being at an average level. The highest of the parameters was ‘Shared Vision’, followed by ‘engagement of stakeholders’, ‘team and process flexibility’, ‘unrestricted sharing of information’, ‘reliability towards work among team members’, ‘Trust and respect among team members’, ‘adoption

of information technology’, ‘mutual commitment towards work and mutually beneficial outcomes’, ‘unrestricted communication’ and ‘absence of blame culture’. The finding of fairly high levels of integration in Lagos property development teams are inconsistent with the findings by Ebekozen et al. (2022) and Salau (2019), who both identified low levels of integration in the construction industry in Nigeria. However, this could be a result of the locational focus of this study, that is, only Lagos, which is a much more advanced and active property development market in terms of assessing the property development market and its professionals in Nigeria as a whole. However, the level of integration in Lagos property development teams is just slightly above average and still requires improvement to meet the demands of its market.

Another insightful aspect of analysis regarding levels of integration in property development teams in Lagos is comparing what the respondents regard as important parameters of integration with the levels of integration as seen in those parameters from the analysis. Table 6 shows the levels of integration seen in the analysis for the parameters ranked as important by the responding stakeholders.

**Table 6:** Ranked Integration Parameters and Corresponding Integration Levels

Integration Parameters	Rank according to responses	Rank according to levels
Shared Vision	1	1
Reliability towards work among team members	2	5
Team and process flexibility	3	3
Trust and respect among team members	4	6
Mutual commitment towards work and mutually beneficial outcomes	5	8
Unrestricted communication	6	9
Absence of blame culture	7	10
Adoption of information technology	8	7
Unrestricted sharing of information	9	4
Engagement of stakeholders	10	2

Comparing the ranks of the various integration parameters according to responses and their levels of occurrence in practice, as seen in Table 4.7 above, can help to show the discrepancy between expressed important integration parameters and revealed important integration parameters. The analysis showed that only the ‘shared vision’ and ‘team and process flexibility’ parameters had the same ranking from both responses and levels of

integration. This could mean that ‘shared vision’ is perceived as the most crucial parameter for integration among property development teams and that team and process flexibility is also highly important for effective integration. This analysis could also reveal some inconsistencies, as is the case with the parameter of ‘unrestricted sharing of information’, which the respondents ranked ninth but ranked fourth according to integration levels.

This suggests that, although the parameter is implemented reasonably well, it is not considered as important by respondents or it is taken for granted in practice. This is also evident in the parameter of 'Engagement of stakeholders'. This could reveal either an over-allocation of resources to these parameters or a need for reorientation among the stakeholders. It is argued in this study that communication of information and stakeholder engagement are vital for successful integration as proved by Nath et al. (2021), Nguyen and Mohamed (2021) and Baiden et al. (2006). Therefore, stakeholders should change their orientation and take those parameters more seriously to derive more benefits from such integration parameters.

The third objective of this study was to identify existing challenges to achieving effective integration among stakeholders and property development teams in Lagos. The results of the analysis show that the most significant challenges include Project size, Changing team composition over the project duration, Mindset of 'self' instead of 'we' among professionals, no culture of constant measuring of integration, and use of traditional measures of project success. All the other challenges were considered averagely significant, including chasing individual goals, project cost, lack of collaborative technology, discrimination among team members, unwillingness to accept change, poor relationship among stakeholders, lack of adequate interaction among stakeholders, lack of effective leadership, lack of a collaborative spirit, poor dispute resolution, lack of commitment to quality and efficiency, lack of communication among stakeholders, and lack of knowledge and information. Many of these challenges are consistent with findings by Ebekozien et al. (2023, 2022) and Salau (2019).

Many of these problems may directly exert a negative influence on the various integration parameters, e.g., project size, making engagement of stakeholders much more difficult owing to the number of stakeholders that need to be present on the property development team. The mindset of 'self' instead of 'we' among the professionals could also affect the unrestricted sharing of information and communication, thereby causing the withholding of information among team members. Another example could also be seen in how the

absence of integration as an industry standard measure of project success could also be one of the reasons for the low levels of mutual commitment to collaboration and mutually beneficial outcomes. As such, solutions should target existing challenges with a view to boosting levels of integration parameters existing among stakeholders in property development teams.

The fourth objective of this study was to identify the impact of the lack of proper integration among the stakeholders. The results show that all the impacts were most likely to occur as a result of poor integration in property development teams, with the highest possible impact being 'poor project performance', 'delay in project delivery', 'poor team working environment and relationships' and 'lack of innovation in team affairs and project execution'. The impacts next likely to occur were 'inability to meet team goals and objectives', 'increased project cost', 'hostility among team members' and 'poor team readiness and cohesiveness for future projects'. In the previous literature, e.g., Egwim et al. (2021), Nguyen and Mohamed (2021) and Assaf et al. (2014), most of these impacts have also been identified to be the result of poor collaboration and ineffective teamwork.

Avoiding many of these negative impacts has been proven in the literature to be alleviated by improving various aspects of integration parameters, such as when improved communication and smooth flow of information can help to avoid delays in project delivery owing to mishaps or setbacks in the various processes. Accordingly, it is necessary to provide solutions for improving integration among stakeholders in property development teams in Lagos in order to avoid the various impacts plaguing property development within the state and the country generally.

## **6.0 Conclusion and Recommendations**

It has been found that integration within property development teams in Lagos State is essential but not fully optimised. The research identified several key parameters of integration, such as shared vision, reliability and team flexibility, which are highly valued by stakeholders. Despite the recognition of various important integration parameters, the actual

levels of integration are only fairly high, with several challenges hindering full integration. Challenges such as project size, changing team compositions and individualistic mindsets pose significant threats to effective integration. Addressing these challenges is crucial to improving team dynamics and project outcomes, ultimately leading to more successful property development projects. The findings underscore the importance of improving communication, fostering a collaborative culture and addressing the specific challenges faced by property development teams. By focusing on these areas, property development teams can enhance their integration levels, leading to more successful project outcomes.

The following recommendations are made based on the findings of this study:

- i. Specific important integration parameters such as shared vision, unrestricted sharing of information and stakeholder engagement must be invested in by property development firms and other industry practitioners. Managers of property development teams should invest in communication technology practices and training that can help team members collaborate as they share information freely. Regular workshops or meetings focused on aligning the team's vision could also enhance cohesion.
- ii. The establishment of metrics for measuring integration among team members should become standard industry practice and be adopted by various organizations in the built environment. Doing so could provide ongoing feedback and help identify areas needing improvement. Regular assessments using these metrics can drive continuous improvement and subsequently increase the level of integration among the stakeholders in the property development industry.
- iii. The adoption of information technology in property development teams should be encouraged in the bid to streamline processes and improve integration. Investment in collaborative technology platforms is recommended.

The following areas are suggested for future research:

- i. Longitudinal case-study research that could

assess the integration levels as they change over the course of a specific project can help identify what interventions are most effective at different stages of the research.

- ii. Detailed case studies of projects that have successfully achieved high levels of integration could provide practical examples and lessons for other teams to follow.
- iii. Comparative studies could also be highly beneficial for this research area. Comparison between Lagos State and other regions or countries could provide insights into how cultural and economic factors influence integration in property development teams. Comparison between integration in projects handled by public or private institutions, or by joint ventures or public-private partnerships, can shed light on the best ways to achieve integration in the property development industry.
- iv. Further research could also explore the specific role of emerging technologies, such as Building Information Modelling (BIM) and Artificial Intelligence (AI), in enhancing integration among property development stakeholders.

## References

- Aapaoja, A., Herrala, M., Pekuri, A. & Haapasalo, H. (2013). The characteristics of and cornerstones for creating integrated teams. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 6. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJMPB-09-2012-0056>.
- Adu, E. & Opawole, A. (2019). Assessment of performance of teamwork in construction projects delivery in south-southern Nigeria. *Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology*, 18(1), 230-250. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jedt-01-2019-0025>.
- Assaf, S., Hassanain, M. A., & Mughal, H. (2014). Effectiveness of project teams and their impact on the performance of Saudi construction projects. *Research Journal of Applied Sciences, Engineering and Technology*, 7(24), pp. 5148-5156. <https://doi.org/10.19026/rjaset.7.911>.
- Azmy, N. (2012). *The Role of Team Effectiveness in Construction Project Teams and Project Performance*. Thesis presented to Iowa State University, Ames, Iowa.
- Baiden, B. K., Price, A. D. F., & Dainty, A. R. J. (2006). The extent of team integration within construction projects. *International Journal of Project Management*, 24, pp.13-23.
- Botha, B., Adendorff, C., & Smallwood, J. (2014). Property Development: A Business Process Model.

- Journal of Construction Project Management and Innovation*, 4(2), pp. 1012-1033.
- Cadman, D. & Topping, R. (1996) *Property Development*, 4th ed., Chapman & Hall, London.
- Chow, L. J., Then, D. & Skitmore, M. (2005) Characteristics of teamwork in Singapore construction projects. *Journal of Construction Research*, 6(1), pp. 15-46.
- Construction Industry Council – CIC et al. (2007). *Profiting from Integration*. Strategic forum for construction conference. London.
- Ebekozien, A. & Aigbavboa, C. (2022). Evaluation of built environment programmes accreditation in the 21st-century education system in Nigeria: stakeholders' perspective. *International Journal of Building Pathology and Adaptation*, 41(6), pp. 102-118. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ijbpa-02-2022-0027>.
- Ebekozien, A., Aigbavboa, C., & Ramotshela, M. (2023). A qualitative approach to investigate stakeholders' engagement in construction projects. *Benchmarking: An International Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/bj-11-2021-0663>.
- Ebekozien, A., Aigbavboa, C., Aigbedion, M., Ogbaini, I. F., & Aginah, I. L. (2022). Integrated project delivery in the Nigerian construction sector: an unexplored approach from the stakeholders' perspective. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 30(4), pp. 1519-1535. <https://doi.org/10.1108/ecam-09-2021-0823>.
- Eboh, E. E., Egolum, C. C., Ezeokoli, F. O., & Onyia, C. I. (2019). Analysis of factors responsible for project cost variation in Enugu, Nigeria. *Journal of Scientific Research and Reports*, 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.9734/jsrr/2019/v25i3-430180>.
- Egan, J. (1998). *Rethinking construction*. London: Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions.
- Egan, J. (2002). *Accelerating change*. London: Department of the Environment, Transport and the Regions.
- Egwim, C. N., Alaka, H., Toriola-Coker, L. O., Balogun, H., Ajayi, S. O., & Oseghale, R. (2021). Extraction of underlying factors causing construction projects delay in Nigeria. *Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jedt-04-2021-0211>.
- Lank, E. (2006), *Collaborative Advantage: How Organizations Win by Working Together*, Palgrave Macmillan, New York, NY.
- Latham, M. (1994) *Constructing the Team, Report of Government/Industry Review of Procurement and Contractual Agreement in the UK Construction Industry*, HMSO, London.
- Madichie, N. O. & Madichie, O. A. (2009). A theoretical review of the property development challenges in Nigeria. *International Journal of Business and Emerging Markets, Inderscience Enterprises Ltd*, 1(3), pp. 296-311.
- Martinsuo, M. & Ahola, T. (2010), Supplier integration in complex delivery projects: comparison between different buyer-supplier relationships. *International Journal of Project Management*, 28, pp. 107-116.
- McMahan, J. (2007). *Professional Property Development*. McGraw-Hill. <https://doi.org/10.1036/0071485988>.
- Nath, D., Reja, V. K. & Varghese, K., 2021. A framework to measure collaboration in a construction project. In: Sandanayake, Y. G., Gunatilake, S. and Waidyasekara, K. G. A. S. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 9th World Construction Symposium*, 9-10 July 2021, Sri Lanka. [Online]. pp. 2-13. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31705/WCS.2021.1>. Available from: <https://ciobwcs.com/papers/>.
- Nguyen, T. & Mohamed, S. A. M. (2021). Mediation effect of stakeholder management between stakeholder characteristics and project performance. *Journal of Engineering, Project, and Production Management*. <https://doi.org/10.2478/jepmm-2021-0011>.
- Owolabi, J. D., Amusan, L. M., Oloke, C. O., Olusanya, O., Tunji-Olayeni, P., Owolabi, D., Peter, J., & Omuh I. (2014), "Causes and effects of delay on project construction delivery time", *International Journal of Education and Research*, 2(4), pp. 197-208.
- Oyedemi, J. O. (2020). Evaluation of joint ventures in property development in Lagos, Nigeria. *Journal of Surveying, Construction & Property*, 11(1), 30-37. <https://doi.org/10.22452/jscp.vol11no1.3>.
- Ratcliffe, J., Stubbs, M., & Shepherd, M. (2004). *Urban Planning and Real Estate Development*. 2nd Edition. London: UCL Press.
- Salau, S. (2019). *Adaptability of Integrated Project Delivery (IPD) concepts in the Nigerian construction industry*. Unpublished Thesis. Ahmadu Bello University. Accessible from: <https://kubanni.abu.edu.ng/items/d7af27fa-ebff-4ade-928e-9a7697d27c24/full>.
- Schöttle, A. & Gehbauer, F. (2012), Incentive systems to support collaboration in construction projects. In Tommelein, I. D. and Pasquire, C. L. (eds.), *Proceedings for the International Group for Lean Construction*, San Diego, CA, USA, Montezuma Publishing, San Diego, CA.
- Wilkinson, S., & Reed, R. (2008). *Property Development* (5th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203933428>.