







Assessment of Critical Stakeholders Conflict Factors on Tertiary Educational Trust Fund (TETFund) Building Construction Projects in Southwest Nigeria

Edoka Augustine Ijigah * 

Department of Building, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria

Oyewale Julius Ojo , Akinloye Fatai Lawal , Olowokere Emmanuel Nimbe 

Department of Project Management Technology, Federal University of Technology, Akure, Ondo State, Nigeria

Article Information

Suggested Citation:

Ijigah, E.A, Ojo, O.J., Lawal, A.F. and Olowokere, E.N. (2023). Assessment of Critical Stakeholders Conflict Factors on Tertiary Educational Trust Fund (TETFund) Building Construction Projects in Southwest Nigeria. *European Journal of Theoretical and Applied Sciences*, 1(2), 217-236. DOI: [10.59324/ejtas.2023.1\(2\).19](https://doi.org/10.59324/ejtas.2023.1(2).19)

* Corresponding author:

Edoka Augustine Ijigah
e-mail: eaijigah@futa.edu.ng

Abstract:

Building construction project are complex, unique, and involved the use of multidimensional stakeholders to execute the project from the design stage through construction and completion. This leads to conflict and if not properly managed affects project performance. This study assessed critical stakeholders conflict factors on TETFund building construction projects performance in southwest Nigeria with a view to ameliorating the problems of dispute, non-performance and project abandonment. Qualitative research approach was adopted and a structured questionnaire was administered to three hundred and ninety-four (394) project stakeholders (client's representative, consultants and contractors). Two hundred and ninety-seven (297) representing (75.38%) were retrieved from the respondents. The data collected was analyzed using both descriptive and inferential statistics. Mean Score (MS) was used to rank the level and effect of Stakeholders conflict on project

performance while Kruskal-Wallis, Anova and LSD post hoc test was used to determine the convergence and divergent views of clients, consultants and contractors. The top three causes of conflicts on TETFund building construction projects are discrepancy between measured work and valuation, errors, discrepancies and omissions in contract documents and delay of task dependency activities. The top three effects of stakeholders conflict on project performance are poor quality of work executed, lag in construction programmes and abuse of rule of engagement. It is hereby recommended that discrepancy between measured work and valuation, errors and omissions in contract documents and delay of task dependency activities which are the major causes of conflict should be addressed to improve performance of TETFund building construction projects.

Keywords: *building construction, conflict, factors, projects, stakeholders, TETFund.*

Introduction

Building construction industries are significant to the growth of economic sector as they contribute significantly to the social, economic,

and national growth of any country (George, 2015). It is a product-based sector that is determined by the distinctive qualities of each project and the participation of different stakeholders throughout the project life cycle



(Shabir & Tauha, 2014). But during the last two decades, the Nigerian construction industry had been in an intense period of introspection, specifically examining how performance and productivity of building projects can be improved by reducing the occurrence of stakeholder's conflicts (Owenaze, 2016). Friction like misunderstanding, personality clashes, petty jealousy and conflicts occurs in nearly every interaction between human beings in a social gathering and are also common among building project stakeholders (Lewis, 2007; Tariq & Gardezi, 2023). Occurrence of conflict on TETFund building construction projects are not left out as recent findings have shown that performance of TETFunds building construction projects delivered by stakeholders is poor due to the activities of the stakeholders engaged on the project (Aghimien & Aigbavboa, 2018; Amaechi, 2016; Ogundu & Nwokoye, 2015; Mangvwat, Ewuga & Izam, (2020). These stakeholders conflict have resulted in building collapse, project abandonment and poor quality of works executed by the industrial players (Adedeji & Ajayi, 2022). TETFund was established in May 2011 to replace the Education Trust Fund (ETF) Act of 1993 to provide physical infrastructural facilities in the university, college of education and polytechnics to positively promote academic excellence, students comfort and safety of both the staffs and students (Onyeike & Eseyin, 2014; Saeed & Kayani, 2019). Carrying out this responsibility on schedule and within budgeted cost allocation and quality will deliver a successful project and promote performance of building constructions (Oluyemi-Ayibiowu & Omolayo, 2022).

Literature Review

A Successful building construction projects are those that are finished on schedule, within budget, profitably for the contractors, and without any conflict. claims, disputes, or legal action and meet clients' requirement or satisfaction (Chitkara, 2012; Osuizugbo & Okuntade, 2020). Senaratne and Udawatta (2013), Mbatha, Alkizim and Mbiti (2021) stated that a poorly performed project mostly leads to

cost and time overrun, stakeholders conflict, project abandonment and negatively affect the economic development of the nation (Olatunji, Oke & Aghimien, 2016). In addition, Yng, Lean, Wai, Ping and Min (2002); Olamoju & Olakoke-Salami, (2021) stated that project stakeholders' (clients, contractors and consultants) attitude and characteristics affect project performance. A stakeholder is an individual or a group who can affect or is affected by the implementation of a project (Matuleviciene & Stravinskiene, 2015). Therefore, the failure of project management teams in Nigeria to address the concerns of building project stakeholders early had resulted in countless project failures across the country (Bourne & Walker, 2005; Osuizugbo & Okuntade, 2020). According to Aje, Odusami & Ogunsemi (2009), the challenges facing building projects performance are due to behaviors, culture diversity, relationship and structure within the organization which leads to stakeholders conflicts. While also, Sylvester and Kwaji (2017) identify level of cooperation among the project stakeholder as responsible for poor performance of TETFunds building construction projects in Nigeria.

Stakeholders' conflicts may also arise from the organization structure within the construction firm when no roles are specified for the functional and project managers on the project (London & Mc-George, 2008). Borvorn (2011) linked very complex phasing of design, financing, planning, overlapping and interrelation between parties involved by main contractors and the project owner or its representative as the major causes of claims and conflict. While Wit, Green and Jehn, (2012); Grau and Back (2015) suggested that modern management techniques are the cause of conflicts on large, domestic and international founded project. But Elziny, Mohamadien, Ibrahim and Abdel-Fattah (2016) submit that complex, multidisciplinary and multi-organizational construction projects stakeholders are prone to conflict because of cultural diversity and competition. The project manager is therefore faced with the task of managing different conflicting interest and objectives to finish a project on schedule at the

estimated cost and meet clients' requirement (Yousefi, Hipel & Hegazy, 2010). Therefore, as projects become more technical, complex, flexible and interdependent, the principal mechanism for projects claim, cost and time should be developed to give serious attention to conflicts.

Conflict can be destructive or constructive in nature (Mosaic, 2012). While destructive conflict is harmful and affect the root cause of the project, constructive conflict enhances the quality of the project by improving communication among project stakeholders. Instead of viewing the destructive part of stakeholders conflict or sees conflict as a problem, conflict can be managed, resolved and the process of conflict transformed constructively to enhance project performance. That is while researchers and policy makers have encouraged researches on stakeholders conflict as an innovative way of ensuring performance of projects (Wani, Suwirta, & Payeye, 2013; Lederach, 2015; Joseph, 2016). Any attempt that will efficiently resolve stakeholder's conflicts in a cheap and effective manner should start immediately the project is initiated (Goparaju, 2015; Ejohwomu, Oshodi & Onifade, 2016; Molwus, Ewuga & Orih, 2016). But previous researches achy have not produced a clear mission statement, priorities or suggest a framework to manage building projects in a way that stakeholders responsibility will be distributed to reduce Conflict therefore the need for this research.

Assessment of the level of stakeholders conflict in TETFund building projects in Southwest Nigeria was divided into three stages. The first category assessed the level of occurrence stakeholders conflict on building projects in the study area, the second stage assessed the effect of the stated conflict on projects performance while the third stage assess the gap between the level of occurrence and the effect of stakeholders conflict in TETFund building projects in Southwest Nigeria. To assess the level of occurrence of stakeholders conflict in TETFund building projects in Southwest Nigeria, the research identifies forty nine factors (49) factors from the literature. The factors

includes; discrepancy between measured work and valuation, errors, discrepancies and omissions in contract documents (Mba, 2013), delay of task dependency activities, misinterpretation of project information (Jimoh, et al., 2019), variation of contract sum (Alejo, 2018), late submission of claims, delayed dispute resolution, discrepancy between bill of quantities drawings and specification (Sylvester and Kwaji, 2017), absence of coordination and team spirit, access to the site for construction (Ramonu et al., 2018), incomplete project document, unclear contractual terms, wrong estimate and inaccurate quantities, allow for inspection, adverse weather condition, selection of non-feasible projects, cultural background, poor communication between project teams (Osuzugbo & Okuntade, 2020), delay of payment for work executed (Shawa et al., 2018) (Jimoh, Oyewobi, Osajarikre & Adaji 2019), health and safety policy, languages differences, interest rate, wrong selection of construction method, undocumented change order, availability of plants and equipment, non-compliance to building codes and regulations, demographic distribution (Ogunbayo, 2013), unrealistic contract duration (Sylvester & Kwaji, 2017), exchange rate fluctuation, resource management, un-coordinated design architectural mechanical structural and electrical (Jimoh, et al., 2019), change in weather and ground condition, restrictions of women gender inequality, lag in construction programmes (Saidu & Shakantu, 2017), contract arrangement, misunderstanding of technical specification (Molwus et al., 2016), defective design, financial capability of contractors, poor quality of work executed, non-appointment of arbitrator, Inflation, pollution, project risk policies and management (Jimoh, et al., 2019), working hour restriction, abuse of rule of engagement, force majeure flood earthquake, construction methodology, religious affliction of the stakeholders (Chaitanya & Nityanaad, 2015) and poor supervision. These factors were analysed to determine the convergence or divergence (views) of the stakeholders (clients, consultants and contractors) on the listed factors as it affects the occurrence of conflict in the construction industry.

Materials and Methods

Post- empiricism research paradigm involving the use of hard numerical fact- finding quantitative cross- sectional data was employed for this research. The study covers the six southwest sates of Ekiti, Lagos, Ogun, Ondo, Osun and Oyo state. Forty-seven (47) higher institutions and two hundred and fifty-four (254) TETFund projects in the six Southwest states was covered. The primary study population is a list of project oriented clients, contractors and consultants associated with Tertiary Education Trust Funds (TETFund) sponsored projects within the last ten years (2004- 2013) in all the institutions of higher learning (colleges of education, polytechnics and universities) in South west Nigeria. Preliminary investigation shows that there are two hundred and fifty-four (254) of such projects distributed among forty-seven (47) higher institutions. The two hundred and fifty-four (254) projects will have (254) clients, (254) contractors and 1524 consultants (project managements, architects, builders, quantity surveyors and engineers as the project stakeholders and will constitute the research population. Proportionate probability sampling method was adopted because of availability and accessibility of the project stakeholders across the higher institutions in Southwest Nigeria (Amare, 2015). Three hundred and ninety-four (394) copies of well-structured questionnaire was distributed to the TETFund project stakeholders by the use of proportional random sampling technique. Two hundred and ninety-seven questionnaires were retrieved from the respondent (75.38%) and the remaining ninety-seven (97) representing (24.62%) was not retrieved from the respondent as a result of the time frame given. The collected data were presented and examined with Statistical Package for Social Science (SPSS) versio 23 and Excel 2013. Mean Score (MS), Kruskal-Wallis test, Anova and LSD post hoc test were used to determine the convergence and divergent views of clients, contractors and consultants as they assessed critical. Stakeholders conflict factor on TETFund building construction projects. Factor analysis as data reduction method via principal

component extraction was used to classified stakeholders conflict factor into categories.

Table 1. Number of Copies of Questionnaire Administered and Retrieved in the Study Area

Administered	Retrieved	Percentage
394	279	75.38

Source: Authors' analysis (2023)

Results

Background Information of the Respondents

Three hundred and ninety- four (394) questionnaires were administered to clients. Consultants and contractors which are project respondents, two hundred and ninety-seven (297) of the questionnaire were retrieved and this represent 75.38% of the total questionnaires administered on the respondents to the survey. The percentage was considered sufficient for his study based on the claim by Kothari (2004) that the result of any survey that is more than 20-30% retrieved respondent should be accepted. From the result of the survey in Table 2, 86.2% of the respondents are males while 13.8% of the respondents are female. These respondents are from various academic institutions with university having the highest percentages of 51.9%, polytechnic 27.6% while college of educations is the least with 20.9% response rate from the respondents. Regarding the type of building construction projects, it is evident that 51.9% of the respondent's construct building projects, 31.0% of the respondents execute both building and civil engineering projects while only 17.2% execute only civil engineering projects. On the positions of stakeholders on construction project, consultant have the highest number of respondents 41.1%, while 38.4% of the respondents are contractors. client/client representative with 20.5% have the least percentage of respondents. Regarding the academic qualification category, it is evidence that most of the respondents' least represented academic qualification was Ph.D. with 4.4%. From the study 38.0% and 31.3% of the

respondents have been contractors, client's / clients representative or consultants who have executed TETFund project for over 10 to 15 years, while 13.5% of the stakeholders have executed TETFund project for less than 5 years which is the least percentage. In terms of respondents' professional qualification, it was shown from Table 2 that builders have the highest representation with 35.0%, project

managers with a representation of 28.3% and the least represented was architects with a percentage of 4.4%. Based on the forgoing, the information provided by these categories of construction stakeholders, having worked on TETFund project from 2004 to 2013 was considered adequate and reliable for further analysis upon which inferences was draw.

Table 2. Background Information of the Respondents

S/No	Categories	Classification	Frequency	Percentage
i	Gender	Male	256	86.2
		Female	41	13.8
			297	100
ii	Institution	University	153	51.5
		Polytechnics	82	27.6
		College of Educations	62	20.9
			297	100
iii	Type of construction projects	Building projects	154	51.9
		Building and Civil Engineering projects	92	31.0
		Civil Engineering projects	51	17.2
			297	100
iv	Position on construction project	Consultant	122	41.1
		Contractor	114	38.4
		Client/Client Representative	61	20.5
			297	100
v	Highest educational qualification	ND/NCE	15	5.1
		HND	60	20.2
		PDG	29	9.8
		B.Tech/B.sc	106	35.7
		M.SC	74	24.9
		Ph.D`	13	4.4
			297	100
vi	Respondents year of experience	5-10 years	113	38.0
		11-15 years	93	31.3
		16-20 years	51	17.2
			297	100
vii	Professional group of respondent	Architect	13	4.4
		Quantity Surveyor	38	12.8
		Project Manager	84	28.3
		Builder	104	35.0
		Engineers	58	19.5
			297	100

Table 3 is the analysis of variance regarding the level of stakeholder's conflict in TETFund building projects in Southwest Nigeria. From the analysis of variance (Anova) of the level of occurrence of conflict on TETFund construction project, the f-Statistics (4.124) is greater than the f- Critical (K=3 groups and a total sample of $N \geq 30 = 3.354$) indicated a

significant difference between the opinions of the stakeholders (client, consultants and contractors) on the level of occurrence of conflict on TETFund building construction projects in Southwest Nigeria. Further test needs to be carried out to ascertain the stakeholders with the different view.

Table 3. ANOVA for Level of Stakeholders Conflict in TETFund Building Projects in Southwest Nigeria

Stakeholders	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error	F	Sig
Client	61	3.542041	0.860041	0.834		
Consultants	122	3.526102	0.873204	0.723	4.124	0.042
Contractors	114	3.546388	0.875388	0.453		

Table 4 represents the level of stakeholders conflict in TETFund building projects in Southwest Nigeria from 2004 to 2013. The respondent from the clients stakeholders regards late submission of claims, discrepancy between measured work and valuation and variation of contract sum as the major factors that leads to stakeholders conflict when executing TETFund building projects in the study area with mean scores of 4.164, 3.967 and 3.951 respectively while project risk policies and management of the project with mean score of 2.967 took the last position. This finding is in agreement with the studies by Mba (2013), Shawa et al. (2018) and Jimoh et al. (2019).

From the consultants view the top three factors includes discrepancy between measured work and valuation (M.S. = 3.893), misinterpretation of project information (M.S. = 3.844) and errors, discrepancies and omissions in contract documents (M.S. = 3.836) while poor supervision of the project (M.S. = 2.828) was ranked least among the consultants. This finding is also in agreement with research carried out by Junaid & Gardezi, (2023); Mbatha, (2021) and Jimoh, et al., (2019). The perspective of the respondents among the contractors ranked discrepancy between measured work and valuation (M.S. = 3.895) first, delay of task dependency activities (M.S. = 3.877) second and

delayed dispute resolution (M.S. = 3.798) third. These findings are also related to the work of Alejo, (2018) and Mbatha, (2021). The least factor as ranked by the contractors was poor supervision of the project (M.S. = 3.158). Table 4 also shows the ranking of overall factors that predisposed stakeholders conflict in TETFund building projects in Southwest Nigeria. The top three factors based on the perceptions of the respondents are discrepancy between measured work and valuation (M.S. = 3.909), errors, discrepancies and omissions in contract documents (M.S. = 3.835) and delay of task dependency activities (M.S. = 3.822). Project professionals are advised to produce accurate designs, valuations and a good contract document to avoid building construction conflict as several scholars believed that construction conflict is avoidable (Samuel, 2021). The least of the factors are construction methodology (M.S. = 3.246), religious affliction of the stakeholders (M.S. = 3.222) and poor supervision of the project (M.S. = 3.074). Using the types of stakeholders as the basis to test the convergence or divergence in the opinions of the respondents regarding the level of stakeholders conflict in TETFund building projects in Southwest Nigeria in Table 4, it is evidence from the kruskal wallis test that the respondents had convergence views on thirty eight (38) factors

out of forty nine (49) factors listed. Late submission of claims, absence of coordination and team spirit, wrong estimate and inaccurate quantities, selection of non-feasible projects, poor communication between project teams, languages differences, demographic distribution, resource management, inflation, project risk policies management, poor supervision, construction time predictability, quality of work

rendered by the contractor, project administration, project risk avoidance or reduction, accuracy of cash flow forecast and number of defect are the eleven factors that the respondents had divergent views upon in predisposing the level of stakeholders conflict in TETFund building projects in Southwest Nigeria.

Table 4. Level of Occurrence of Stakeholders Conflict in TETFund Building Construction Projects in Southwest Nigeria

Conflict factors	Client			Consultants			Contractors			Overall			C.S	A. S
	M	S.D	R	M	S.D	R	M	S.D	R	M	S.D	R		
Discrepancy between measured work and valuation	3.97	0.66	2	3.89	0.77	1	3.90	0.81	1	3.91	0.76	1	0.28	0.871
Errors, discrepancies and omissions in contract documents	3.93	0.68	4	3.84	0.89	3	3.78	0.77	6	3.84	0.80	2	1.37	0.505
Delay of task dependency activities	3.72	0.66	13	3.82	0.70	4	3.88	0.81	2	3.82	0.74	3	1.66	0.437
Misinterpretation of project information	3.77	1.01	7	3.84	1.05	2	3.75	0.96	9	3.80	1.00	4	0.98	0.612
Variation of contract sum	3.95	0.81	3	3.72	0.77	7	3.76	0.86	7	3.79	0.81	5	2.96	0.228
Late submission of claims	4.16	0.69	1	3.74	0.77	6	3.63	0.95	16	3.79	0.85	6	15.0	0.0**
Delayed dispute resolution	3.74	0.60	12	3.63	0.71	15	3.80	0.76	3	3.72	0.71	7	2.87	0.238
Discrepancy between bill of quantities, drawings and specification	3.74	0.75	11	3.61	0.75	16	3.79	0.78	5	3.70	0.76	8	3.04	0.218
Absence of coordination and team spirit	3.92	0.71	5	3.48	0.86	31	3.79	0.75	4	3.69	0.80	9	13.7	0.0**
Access to the site for construction	3.71	1.05	15	3.61	0.94	17	3.72	0.97	11	3.67	0.98	10	1.08	0.582
Incomplete project document	3.74	0.51	10	3.66	0.59	11	3.62	0.72	17	3.66	0.64	11	1.32	0.518
Unclear contractual terms	3.75	0.83	9	3.53	0.82	25	3.67	0.82	13	3.63	0.82	12	4.19	0.123
Wrong estimate and inaccurate quantities	3.62	0.71	19	3.50	0.80	27	3.75	0.87	8	3.62	0.81	13	6.67	0.04*
Allow for inspection	3.77	0.94	8	3.57	0.78	20	3.61	0.84	20	3.62	0.84	14	3.81	0.149
Adverse weather condition	3.67	0.98	16	3.48	0.86	34	3.73	0.86	10	3.61	0.89	15	5.90	0.052
Selection of non-feasible projects	3.43	0.90	34	3.75	0.81	5	3.55	0.81	24	3.61	0.84	16	6.15	0.05*
Cultural background	3.44	0.65	32	3.66	0.63	10	3.64	0.72	15	3.61	0.67	17	5.79	0.055
Poor communication between project teams	3.90	0.91	6	3.48	0.77	32	3.60	0.87	23	3.60	0.85	18	14.7	0.0**
Delay of payment for work executed	3.71	0.96	14	3.54	0.74	22	3.59	0.82	22	3.59	0.82	19	1.91	0.385

Health and safety policy	3.44	0.94	30	3.58	0.97	18	3.68	0.59	12	3.59	0.84	20	3.81	0.149
Languages differences	3.36	0.55	40	3.68	0.66	8	3.61	0.60	19	3.59	0.63	21	10.8	0.01*
Interest rate	3.54	0.85	22	3.63	0.85	14	3.54	0.92	26	3.58	0.88	22	1.48	0.478
Wrong selection of construction method	3.64	0.80	17	3.50	0.91	29	3.61	0.99	18	3.57	0.92	23	1.41	0.494
Undocumented change order	3.62	0.76	20	3.56	0.93	21	3.51	0.77	30	3.55	0.83	24	2.54	0.281
Availability of plants and equipments	3.33	0.89	41	3.65	0.87	12	3.55	0.96	25	3.55	0.92	25	5.35	0.069
Non-compliance to codes and regulations	3.48	0.79	28	3.49	0.96	30	3.61	0.89	21	3.53	0.90	26	1.35	0.509
Demographic distribution.	3.44	0.74	33	3.43	0.80	39	3.65	0.67	14	3.52	0.75	27	6.54	0.04*
Unrealistic contract duration	3.49	0.85	25	3.53	0.95	24	3.52	0.69	29	3.52	0.84	28	0.01	0.994
Exchange rate fluctuation	3.33	1.18	42	3.64	0.97	13	3.47	1.07	32	3.51	1.06	29	3.62	0.163
Resource management	3.59	1.12	21	3.67	0.76	9	3.28	1.03	45	3.51	0.96	30	10.4	0.006
Un-coordinated design	3.49	1.07	26	3.43	0.99	38	3.54	0.94	27	3.49	0.99	31	0.39	0.823
Change in weather and ground condition	3.49	0.98	27	3.51	0.84	26	3.45	0.93	35	3.48	0.90	32	0.53	0.767
Restrictions of women and gender inequality	3.38	0.61	38	3.48	0.88	35	3.54	0.90	28	3.48	0.84	33	1.27	0.530
Lag in construction programmes	3.53	0.91	23	3.40	1.06	40	3.46	0.83	34	3.45	0.94	34	0.59	0.744
Contract arrangement	3.64	0.95	18	3.39	0.92	41	3.41	1.06	37	3.45	0.99	35	3.60	0.165
Misunderstanding of technical specification	3.26	0.81	45	3.50	0.86	28	3.47	0.77	33	3.44	0.82	36	5.35	0.069
Defective design	3.39	0.99	36	3.54	0.95	23	3.34	1.13	43	3.43	1.03	37	1.72	0.423
Financial capability of contractors	3.46	1.03	29	3.48	0.89	33	3.36	0.94	41	3.43	0.94	38	1.46	0.483
Poor quality of work executed	3.44	0.85	31	3.45	1.01	36	3.40	0.92	38	3.43	0.94	39	0.29	0.863
Non appointment of arbitrator	3.53	1.06	24	3.35	1.03	42	3.43	1.03	36	3.42	1.03	40	1.73	0.420
Inflation	3.07	1.06	48	3.44	1.00	37	3.49	0.90	31	3.38	0.98	41	8.48	0.01*
Pollution	3.36	1.11	39	3.34	1.07	43	3.40	1.05	39	3.36	1.07	42	0.22	0.898
Project risk policies and management	2.97	0.71	49	3.57	0.95	19	3.34	0.79	42	3.36	0.87	43	18.5	0.0**
Working hour restriction	3.43	1.02	35	3.26	0.90	46	3.38	0.97	40	3.34	0.95	44	1.77	0.413
Abuse of rule of engagement	3.39	0.95	37	3.30	0.89	44	3.30	0.84	44	3.32	0.88	45	0.19	0.910
Force majeure flood earthquake	3.30	1.02	44	3.21	1.17	47	3.27	1.10	46	3.25	1.11	46	0.47	0.792
Construction methodology	3.30	0.69	43	3.21	0.91	48	3.26	0.81	47	3.25	0.83	47	0.25	0.884
Religious Affliction of the stakeholders	3.10	1.00	47	3.28	1.22	45	3.23	1.23	48	3.22	1.18	48	2.19	0.334
Poor supervision	3.15	0.87	46	2.96	0.67	49	3.16	0.85	49	3.08	0.79	49	8.07	0.02*

Test Statistics: M= Mean Item Score, S.D = Std. Deviation; R= Rank; C.S = Chi-Square, A.S = Asymp. Significant of Kruskal-Wallis Test (Grouping Variance – Stakeholders). ** Significant at the 0.01 level, *Significant at the 0.05 level.

The implication of these is that there are significant differences in the opinions of the respondents (p value <0.05), pertaining to the

eleven (11) listed factors, from the client, consultants and contractors. All the listed forty-nine (49) factors recorded high mean scores with

the least been 3.074 and an average mean of 3.537. Therefore, all the factors are to be reckoned with in deciphering the order of susceptibilities the level of stakeholders conflict in TETFund building projects in Southwest Nigeria.

Table 5 shows the post hoc test carried out to further determines where the actual different lies among the respondents based on their position as stakeholders (client/client representative, consultants and contractors) on conflict in

TETFund building projects in Southwest Nigeria. Analysis of the LSD Post hoc test, reveals a significant different between the pairs of contractor-client (p -value = 0.01) and consultant-client (p -value = 0.05) based on the perceptions of the respondent on the level of stakeholders' conflict in TETFund building projects in Southwest Nigeria. Therefore, the position of client, consultants and contractor varies on the eleven listed items. Further test was then carried out to reduce that factors using a reliability test.

Table 5. LSD Post Hoc Test on the Level Stakeholders Conflict in TETFund Building Projects in Southwest Nigeria

Stakeholders	Test statistic	Std. error	Std. test statistic	Sig.	Adj. Sig.
Contractor-Consultant	-12.377	10.488	-1.180	0.238	0.714
Contractor- Client	48.107	12.625	3.810	0.000	0.000**
Consultant- Client	35.730	12.772	2.796	0.005	0.015*

** mean different Significant at the 0.01 level, *Significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 6. KMO and Bartlett's Test Factors Affecting the Level of Stakeholders Conflict in TETFund Building Projects in Southwest Nigeria

KMO and Bartlett's Test		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.727
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	3016.736
	df	630
	Sig.	.000

Table 6 shows the result of the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) for the 49 loaded items. The KMO value for the 49 items is 0.727 while the (KMO) for each group is 0.837, 0.841, 0.782, 0.703, 0.645, 0.618, 0.621 and 0.550 respectively. The Bartlett's text of sphericity for the eight factors loading is significant ($p= 0.000$). The reliability test was conducted for the eight factors ranging between 0.540 to 0.837, which is higher than 0.5 hence, the eight factors loaded are reliable.

The result of the factor analysis was presented in Table 7. From the result in Table 7, the eight (8) items were loaded into the first group (technical conflict), namely misinterpretation of project information, errors, discrepancies and omissions in contract documents, unrealistic contract

duration, unclear contractual terms, misunderstanding of technical specification, noncompliance to building codes and regulations, incomplete project document and poor quality of work executed. The reliability test of the 8 drivers of technical conflict formed indicates an alpha value of 0.837 which is greater than 0.5 ($p= 0.000$) and is deemed reliable for further analysis significant. Detailed description for individual loading and Cronbach alpha values are presented in Table 7. From the result of the reliability analysis, the forty-nine (49) items loading results into eight (8) factor solutions, namely technical conflict, financial conflict, management conflict, logistics conflict, environmental conflict, design conflict, cultural conflict and legal conflict. The Kaiser-Meyer-

Olkin (KMO) value for all the groups are above 0.7 while the Bartlett's test of sphericity for the eight factors loading is greater than 0.5 ($p = 0.000 < 0.05$) and therefore significant. The Eight (8) stakeholders conflict drivers are loaded into the technical conflict group which includes misinterpretation of project information, errors,

discrepancies and omissions in contract documents, unrealistic contract duration, unclear contractual terms, misunderstanding of technical specification, noncompliance to building codes and regulations, incomplete project document and poor quality of work executed.

Table 7. Factor Analysis and Reliability Test of Critical Stakeholders Conflict Affecting on TETFund Building Construction Project

Conflict Types	Factors	F.L	Alpha
Technical	Misinterpretation of project information	0.751	0.837
	Errors, discrepancies and omissions in contract documents	0.732	
	Unrealistic contract duration	0.679	
	Unclear contractual terms	0.662	
	Misunderstanding of technical specification	0.623	
	Noncompliance to building codes and regulations	0.574	
	Incomplete project document	0.563	
	Poor quality of work executed	0.543	
Financial	Discrepancy between measured work and valuation	0.809	0.841
	Variation of contract sum	0.768	
	Exchange rate fluctuation	0.757	
	Interest rate	0.737	
	Wrong estimate and inaccurate quantities	0.673	
	Financial capability of contractors	0.551	
Management	Resource management	0.771	0.782
	Project risk policies and management	0.690	
	Absence of coordination and team spirit	0.678	
	Poor communication between project teams	0.638	
	Poor supervision	0.611	
	Contract arrangement	0.537	
Logistics	Delay of task dependency activities	0.821	0.703
	Delay of payment for work executed	0.799	
	Lag in construction programmes	0.739	
	Working hour restriction	0.512	
Environmental	Change in weather and ground condition	0.767	0.645
	Adverse weather condition	0.756	
	Force majeure due to flood or earthquake	0.738	
Design	Un-coordinated architectural mechanical, structural and electrical design	0.807	0.618
	Discrepancy between bill of quantities, drawings and specification	0.781	
	Defective design	0.668	
Cultural	Languages differences	0.786	0.621
	Cultural background	0.687	
	Restrictions of women gender inequality	0.596	
	Religious affliction of the stakeholders	0.572	
Legal	Delayed dispute resolution	0.773	0.55
	Non appointment of arbitrator	0.773	

NOTE; FL = Factor loading

Six (6) items were loaded into the second group (Financial conflict) namely discrepancy between measured work and valuation, variation of

contract sum, exchange rate fluctuation, interest rate, wrong estimate and inaccurate quantities and financial capability of contractors. Also six

(6) items were loaded into the third group Management conflict, namely resource management, project risk policies and management, absence of coordination and team spirit, poor communication between project teams, poor supervision and contract arrangement. The four (4) factors loaded in the fourth group logistics conflict includes delay of task dependency activities, delay of payment for work executed, lag in construction programmes and working hour restriction. Three (3) items were loaded into the fifth group Environmental conflict are change in weather and ground condition, adverse weather condition and force majeure due to flood or earthquake. The factor analysis result of the three (3) items were loaded into the sixth group Design conflict are un-coordinated architectural mechanical, structural and electrical design, discrepancy between bill of quantities, drawings and specification and defective design. Also (4) items are loaded into the seventh group Cultural conflict which includes languages differences, cultural background, restrictions of women gender inequality and religious affliction of the stakeholders. Lastly the eighth group Legal conflict have the following two (2) items namely delayed dispute resolution and non-appointment of arbitrator. Detailed description for individual loading and Cronbach alpha values are also presented in Table 7.

Table 8 represents the effect of stakeholders conflict on TETFund building projects in Southwest Nigeria from 2004 to 2013. The respondent from the clients stakeholders regards Abuse of rule of engagement (M.S. = 4.328), lag in construction programmes (M.S. = 4.295) and poor quality of work executed (M.S. = 4.131) as the major effects of stakeholders conflict when executing TETFund building projects in the study area while errors discrepancies and omissions in contract document (M.S. = 3.148), defective design (M.S. = 3.131) and project risk policies and management (M.S. = 3.066) were ranked least among the forty nine (49) factors. From the consultants view the top three factors includes poor quality of work executed (M.S. = 4.623), lag in construction programmes (M.S. = 4.180) and late submission of claims (M.S. =

4.164) while change in weather and ground condition (M.S. = 3.303), errors discrepancies and omissions in contract document (M.S. = 3.279) and allow for inspection (M.S. = 2.246) were ranked least among the consultants. The perspective of the respondents among the contractors ranked poor communication between project teams (M.S. = 4.509) first, poor quality of work executed (M.S. = 4.325) second and lag in construction programmes (M.S. = 4.254) third. The least factor as ranked by the contractors were access to the site for construction (M.S. = 3.298). Cultural background (M.S. = 3.281) and discrepancy between bill of quantities, drawings and specification (M.S. = 3.088). Table 8 also shows the ranking of overall effects of stakeholders conflict in TETFund building projects in Southwest Nigeria. The top three effects of stakeholders conflict based on the perceptions of the respondents are poor quality of work executed (M.S. = 4.407) Lag in construction programmes (M.S. = 4.232) and abuse of rule of engagement (M.S. = 4.189). The least of the factors are Project risk policies and management (M.S. = 3.337), wrong estimate and inaccurate quantities (M.S. = 3.337) and cultural background (M.S. = 3.303). Using the types of stakeholders as the basis to test the convergence or divergence in the opinions of the respondents regarding the effect of stakeholders conflict in TETFund building projects in Southwest Nigeria, it is evidence from the kruskal wallis test that the respondents had convergence views on thirty (30) factors out of forty nine (49) factors listed. Poor communication between project teams, undocumented change order, non-appointment of arbitrator, resource management, absence of coordination and team spirit, working hour restriction, misinterpretation of project information, interest rate, health and safety policy, discrepancy between measured work and valuation, availability of plants and equipment, defective design, languages differences, un-coordinated design architectural mechanical structural and electrical, restrictions of women gender inequality, incomplete project document, allow for inspection, discrepancy between bill of quantities, drawings and specification and errors

discrepancies and omissions in contract document are the nineteen (19) factors that the respondents had divergent views upon in predisposing the effect of stakeholders conflict in TETFund building projects in Southwest Nigeria. The implication of this is that there are

significant differences in the opinions of the respondents (p value <0.05), pertaining to the 19 listed factors, from the client, consultants and contractors. All the listed forty-nine (49) factors recorded high mean scores with the least been 3.303 and an average mean of 3.651.

Table 8. Effect of Stakeholders Conflict on TETFund Building Projects in Southwest Nigeria

Conflict factors	Client/Client Representative			Consultants			Contractors			Overall			C.S	A. S
	M	S.D	R	M	S.D	R	M	S.D	R	M	S.D	R		
Quality of work executed	4.13	0.61	3	4.62	4.67	1	4.32	0.77	2	4.41	3.04	1	3.92	0.14
Lag in construction programmes	4.23	0.59	2	4.18	0.76	2	4.25	0.69	3	4.23	0.7	2	0.67	0.71
Abuse of rule of engagement	4.33	0.68	1	4.12	0.82	4	4.19	0.77	4	4.20	0.77	3	2.55	0.28
communication between project teams	4.00	0.84	5	3.82	0.76	12	4.51	4.85	1	4.12	3.08	4	6.41	0.04*
Delay of task dependency activities	3.92	0.53	10	4.03	0.80	5	4.17	0.81	6	4.06	0.76	5	5.51	0.064
Noncompliance to codes and regulations	3.98	0.72	6	3.95	0.88	7	4.06	0.79	7	4.00	0.81	6	0.97	0.615
Undocumented change order	3.61	0.61	25	3.87	0.83	11	3.88	0.85	12	3.94	0.82	7	19.9	0.0**
Late submission of claims	3.93	0.68	8	4.16	0.83	3	3.95	0.80	8	3.91	0.79	8	0.60	0.740
Non appointment of arbitrator	3.69	0.77	20	3.73	0.76	16	4.18	2.81	5	3.90	1.85	9	6.56	0.04*
Delay of payment for work executed	3.89	0.82	11	3.92	0.68	8	3.87	0.59	13	3.89	0.67	10	0.25	0.883
Variation of contract sum	3.80	0.70	12	3.96	0.69	6	3.83	0.64	14	3.88	0.67	11	2.98	0.225
Poor supervision	3.69	0.85	18	3.89	0.92	9	3.93	0.73	10	3.87	0.84	12	3.31	0.191
Resource management	4.02	0.76	4	3.89	0.75	10	3.72	0.62	18	3.85	0.71	13	6.76	0.03*
Absence team coordination and team spirit	3.97	0.73	7	3.72	0.79	17	3.90	0.65	11	3.84	0.73	14	7.06	0.03*
Unclear contractual terms	3.77	0.78	15	3.76	0.56	13	3.94	0.64	9	3.83	0.65	15	4.91	0.086
Contract arrangement	3.80	0.54	13	3.71	0.79	20	3.82	0.66	15	3.77	0.69	16	0.88	0.646
Working hour restriction	3.93	0.63	9	3.71	0.66	19	3.63	0.64	23	3.73	0.66	17	8.34	0.02*
Exchange rate fluctuation	3.54	0.57	31	3.75	0.64	14	3.61	0.65	25	3.65	0.63	18	4.91	0.086
Unrealistic contract duration	3.57	0.50	27	3.55	0.62	31	3.75	0.76	17	3.63	0.66	19	3.11	0.211
pollution	3.74	0.81	16	3.52	0.72	34	3.64	0.81	22	3.61	0.78	20	4.24	0.120
Delayed dispute resolution	3.67	1.11	21	3.57	0.94	27	3.60	0.90	27	3.60	0.96	21	0.41	0.814

Misinterpretation of project information	3.69	0.72	19	3.71	0.82	18	3.43	0.86	35	3.60	0.83	22	7.87	0.02*
Inflation	3.66	0.68	22	3.71	0.70	21	3.46	0.84	34	3.60	0.76	23	4.79	0.091
Adverse weather condition	3.66	0.70	23	3.62	0.95	25	3.53	0.92	29	3.59	0.89	24	0.96	0.618
Force majeure flood earthquake	3.62	0.92	24	3.56	1.09	29	3.60	1.08	28	3.59	1.05	25	0.05	0.978
Misunderstanding of technical specification	3.46	0.92	35	3.68	0.98	22	3.49	0.76	31	3.56	0.89	26	3.16	0.206
Interest rate	3.56	0.76	29	3.67	0.81	23	3.43	0.66	36	3.56	0.75	27	7.52	0.02*
Health and safety policy	3.41	0.59	36	3.73	0.64	15	3.39	0.63	42	3.53	0.65	28	21.0	0.0**
Discrepancy between measured work and valuation	3.38	0.95	38	3.37	0.80	41	3.77	0.84	16	3.53	0.87	29	19.8	0.0**
Availability of plants and equipment	3.46	0.77	34	3.41	0.68	38	3.68	0.79	19	3.52	0.75	30	9.02	0.01*
Religious Affliction	3.41	0.84	37	3.56	0.89	30	3.49	0.81	33	3.50	0.85	31	2.66	0.265
Selection of non-feasible projects	3.30	0.86	43	3.49	0.63	35	3.61	0.71	24	3.50	0.7	32	4.11	0.128
Defective design	3.13	0.87	48	3.53	0.97	33	3.67	0.94	20	3.50	0.96	33	15.1	0.0**
Languages differences	3.61	1.05	26	3.58	0.78	26	3.33	0.89	44	3.49	0.89	34	7.74	0.02*
Financial capability of contractors	3.34	0.98	40	3.55	0.93	32	3.49	0.98	32	3.49	0.96	35	2.73	0.256
Wrong selection of construction method	3.71	0.64	17	3.40	1.07	39	3.41	1.03	38	3.47	0.99	36	2.65	0.266
Un-coordinated design	3.38	0.55	39	3.63	0.56	24	3.32	0.68	45	3.46	0.63	37	16.2	0.0**
Restrictions of women and gender inequality	3.79	0.80	14	3.34	1.15	45	3.40	1.08	40	3.46	1.07	38	6.11	0.05*
Construction methodology	3.56	0.92	28	3.43	0.94	36	3.40	0.85	39	3.44	0.90	39	2.11	0.348
Incomplete project document	3.23	0.86	44	3.34	0.90	44	3.60	0.96	26	3.42	0.92	40	8.26	0.02*
Demographic distribution	3.53	1.26	32	3.31	0.92	46	3.43	1.02	37	3.40	1.04	41	4.96	0.084
Allow for inspection	3.21	0.71	46	3.25	0.83	49	3.66	0.93	21	3.40	0.87	42	20.2	0.0**
Access to the site for construction	3.56	0.67	30	3.35	0.78	43	3.30	0.66	47	3.37	0.72	43	4.92	0.085
Discrepancy between bill of quantities, drawings and specification	3.49	0.74	33	3.57	0.69	28	3.09	0.53	49	3.37	0.68	44	38.4	0.0**
Errors discrepancies and omissions in contract document	3.15	0.68	47	3.28	0.62	48	3.51	0.71	30	3.34	0.68	45	9.91	0.01*
Change in weather and ground condition	3.34	0.87	41	3.30	1.27	47	3.38	1.12	43	3.34	1.14	46	0.52	0.770
Project risk policies and management	3.07	1.08	49	3.42	0.97	37	3.40	1.18	41	3.34	1.08	47	4.23	0.121
Wrong estimate and inaccurate quantities	3.33	0.85	42	3.38	0.97	40	3.30	0.73	46	3.34	0.86	48	0.66	0.719
Cultural background	3.23	1.28	45	3.36	1.04	42	3.28	1.12	48	3.30	1.12	49	0.48	0.786

Test Statistics: M= Mean Item Score, S.D = Std. Deviation; R= Rank; C.S = Chi-Square, A.S = Asymp. Significant of Kruskal wallis Test (Grouping Variance – Stakeholders). ** Significant at the 0.01 level, *Significant at the 0.05 level

Table 9 presented the results of analysis of variance (Anova) of the effect of conflict on TETFund construction project. the f-Statistics (4.345) is greater than the f-critical (K=3 groups and a total sample of $N \geq 30 = 3.354$) indicating

a significant difference between the opinions of the stakeholders (client, consultants and contractors) on the effect of conflict on TETFund building construction projects in Southwest Nigeria.

Table 9. ANOVA for the Effect of Stakeholders Conflict on TETFund Building Projects in Southwest Nigeria

Stakeholders	N	Mean	Std. deviation	Std. error	F	Sig.
Clients	61	3.622673	0.783571	0.825		
Consultants	122	3.652245	0.902306	0.458	4.345	0.032
Contractors	114	3.664755	0.933469	0.679		

Table 10. LSD Post Hoc Test on the Effect of Stakeholders Conflict in TETFund Building Projects in Southwest Nigeria

Stakeholders	Test Statistic	Std. Error	Std. Test Statistic	Sig.	Adj. Sig.
Contractor-Consultant	-26.458	10.578	-2.501	0.012	0.037*
Contractor- Client	-9.097	12.881	-0.706	0.480	1.000
Consultant- Client	17.361	12.733	1.363	0.173	0.518

*. The mean different is significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 10 present the result of LSD Post hoc test of effect of stakeholders conflict on building performance. The result of the LSD Post hoc test analysis reveals that they are a significant different between the pairs of contractor-consultant (p -value = 0.05) based on the perceptions of the respondent on the level of stakeholders conflict in TETFund building projects in Southwest Nigeria. Therefore, the position of consultants and contractor varies on the nineteen listed stakeholders conflict factors.

Table 11 was a test carried out to investigate the relationship between the level of occurrence of

stakeholders' conflict and its effect on building project performance using paired sample t-test. The result of the paired sample t-test between level of occurrence of stakeholders conflict and its effects on project performance shows a significant difference (p -value $0.019 < 0.05$) between the level of occurrence of stakeholders' conflict and its effect on TETFund building construction projects performance in Southwest Nigeria. gap analysis was used to determine conflict factors that mostly affect building construction project performance in southwest Nigeria in Table 11.

Table 11. Paired Sample t-Test Between Level of Occurrence and Effects of Stakeholders Conflict

	Conflict factors	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
Pair 1	Level of occurrence	3.5372	0.17123	0.02446	-2.419	48	0.019
	Effect on project performance	3.6509	0.26649	0.03807			

Table 12. GAP Analysis of Level of Occurrence of Conflict and its Effect on TETFund Building Projects Performance in Southwest Nigeria

S/No	Conflict Factors	ECM	LCM	Gap
1	Poor quality of work executed	4.407	3.428	0.979
2	Abuse of rule of engagement	4.189	3.317	0.872
3	Poor supervision	3.865	3.074	0.791
4	Lag in construction programmes	4.232	3.448	0.784
5	Poor communication between project teams	4.121	3.603	0.518
6	Non appointment of arbitrator	3.896	3.418	0.478
7	Noncompliance to building codes and regulations	4.000	3.532	0.468
8	Undocumented change order	3.939	3.552	0.387
9	Working hour restriction	3.727	3.340	0.387
10	Resource management	3.852	3.505	0.347
11	Force majeure flood earthquake	3.586	3.253	0.333
12	Contract arrangement	3.771	3.448	0.323
13	Delay of payment for work executed	3.892	3.593	0.299
14	Religious Affliction of the stakeholders	3.502	3.222	0.280
15	Pollution	3.609	3.364	0.245
16	Delay of task dependency activities	4.057	3.822	0.235
17	Inflation	3.599	3.384	0.215
18	Unclear contractual terms	3.832	3.626	0.206
19	Construction methodology	3.444	3.246	0.198
20	Absence of coordination and team spirit	3.842	3.690	0.152
21	Exchange rate fluctuation	3.653	3.512	0.141
22	Late submission of claims	3.913	3.785	0.128
23	Misunderstanding of technical specification	3.562	3.438	0.124
24	Unrealistic contract duration	3.630	3.515	0.115
25	Variation of contract sum	3.879	3.785	0.094
26	Defective design	3.498	3.434	0.064
27	Financial capability of contractors	3.485	3.428	0.057
28	Adverse weather condition	3.593	3.613	-0.02
29	Restrictions of women gender inequality	3.458	3.478	-0.02
30	Project risk policies and management	3.337	3.357	-0.02
31	Interest rate	3.556	3.579	-0.023
32	Availability of plants and equipment	3.522	3.546	-0.024
33	Un-coordinated design	3.458	3.485	-0.027
34	Health and safety policy	3.532	3.589	-0.057
35	Languages differences	3.488	3.589	-0.101
36	Wrong selection of construction method	3.468	3.572	-0.104
37	Selection of non-feasible projects	3.498	3.609	-0.111
38	Delayed dispute resolution	3.603	3.717	-0.114
39	Demographic distribution.	3.401	3.519	-0.118
40	Change in weather and ground condition	3.340	3.482	-0.142
41	Misinterpretation of project information	3.599	3.795	-0.196
42	Allow for inspection	3.397	3.623	-0.226
43	Incomplete project document	3.418	3.66	-0.242

44	Wrong estimate and inaccurate quantities	3.337	3.623	-0.286
45	Access to the site for construction	3.374	3.67	-0.296
46	Cultural background	3.303	3.609	-0.306
47	Discrepancy between bill of quantities, drawings and specification	3.367	3.704	-0.337
48	Discrepancy between measured work and valuation	3.525	3.909	-0.384
49	Errors, discrepancies and omissions in contract documents	3.340	3.835	-0.495

Note: ECM = Effect of conflict mean, LCM = Level of conflict mean

Table 12 presents the mean gap analysis between the occurrence of stakeholders conflict and the corresponding frequency of effect on project performance taking cue from the fact that the steps in terms of the different between future/anticipated and present /currency is referred to as gap analysis. Out of the forty-nine (49) factors presented from the literature and analysed, positive gaps exist in twenty-six (26) factors while the remaining twenty-three (23) factors experience negative gap. This then implies that cognate attention should be given to the conflict factors with positive gaps over others. The top five stakeholders conflict factors, having analysed positive mean gaps are poor quality of work executed, abuse of rule of engagement, poor supervision, lag in construction programmes and poor communication between project teams. All the listed factors are in agreement with research carried out by Mba (2013), Shawa et al. (2018), Jimoh et al. (2019), Junaid & Gardezi (2023) and Mbatha (2021). Stakeholders conflict have far reaching effects on building construction building projects in Southwest Nigeria than just mere occurrence.

Discussion

The study assessed critical stakeholders' conflict factors on (TETFund) building construction projects in Southwest Nigeria using Kruskal Wallis, Anova and LSD post hoc test was used to determine the convergence and divergent views of clients, consultants and contractors. The result of the Anova shows a significant difference between the opinions of the stakeholders (client, consultants and contractors) on the level of occurrence of conflict on TETFund building construction projects in Southwest Nigeria. Kruskal-Wallis test shows that the respondents had

convergence and divergence views on some listed items while the analysis of the LSD Post hoc test, reveals a significant different between the pairs of contractors-client (p -value = 0.01) and consultant-client (p -value = 0.05). Sample t -test between level of occurrence and effects of stakeholders conflict shows a significant difference (p -value $0.019 < 0.05$) between the level of occurrence of stakeholders' conflict and its effect on TETFund building construction projects performance in Southwest Nigeria. The clients regard late submission of claims, discrepancy between measured work and valuation and variation of contract sum as the major causes of stakeholders conflict. This finding is in agreement with the studies by Mba, (2013), Shawa et al. (2018) and Jimoh, et al. (2019). The consultants' viewed discrepancy between measured work and valuation, misinterpretation of project information and omissions in contract documents as the major causes of conflicts. This finding is also in agreement with the studies by Junaid & Gardezi, (2023), Mbatha (2021) and Jimoh, et al. (2019). The contractors ranked discrepancy between measured work and valuation, delay of task dependency activities and delayed dispute resolution as the major causes of conflicts on TETFund building construction projects. These findings are also related to the work of Alejo, (2018) and Mbatha, (2021). The top three causes of conflicts by the stakeholders (clients, consultant and contractors) are discrepancy between measured work and valuation, errors or omissions in contract documents and delay of task dependency activities. This study represents the views of all the stakeholders on TETFund building construction projects on the causes of stakeholders conflict in the study area.

Conclusion

The main aim of this study was to assess critical stakeholders' conflict factors on TETFund building construction projects in southwest Nigeria. The study found that there are forty-nine main stakeholders' conflict factors affecting the performance of TETFund construction project in southwest Nigeria. The top three causes of conflicts on TETFund building construction projects based on the perceptions of the respondents are discrepancy between measured work and valuation, Errors, discrepancies and omissions in contract documents and Delay of task dependency activities. The least among the listed factors are construction methodology, religious affliction of the stakeholders and poor supervision of the project.

Based on the findings from the study, it is recommended that:

- Detail designs, good specification, accurate cost estimate and adequate project planning should be carried to reduce stakeholders conflict enhance project performance.

- Poor quality of construction work, lag in construction programmes, abuse of rule of engagement and poor communication between project teams which are the major effects of stakeholders' conflict on construction performance also have positive mean gaps and should be avoided to enhance project performance

- Attention should be given to the eight critical stakeholders conflict factors to enhance project performance.

Conflict of interests

No conflict of interest.

References

Adedeji, A.O. & Ajayi, O.M. (2022). Causes of Conflict in Construction Projects in Ondo State, Nigeria. *International Journal of Civil Engineering*,

Construction and Estate Management, 10(3), 49-59.
<https://doi.org/10.4314/njt.v35i2.6>

Aghimien, D.O. & Aigbavboa, C.O. (2018). Proceedings of the International Conference on Industrial Engineering and Operations Management: *Performance of Selected Funding Schemes Used in Delivering Educational Buildings in Nigeria*. Washington DC, USA.

Aje, O.I., Odusami, K.T. & Ogunsemi, D.R. (2009). The impact of contractors management capability on cost and time performance of construction projects in Nigeria. *Journal of Financial Management of Property and Construction*, 14(2), 171-187.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/13664380910977619>

Alejo, A.O. (2018). The Origin of Conflict to Dispute in Nigeria Construction Site. *Civil and Environmental Research*, 10(5), 85-89.

Amaechi, C.E. (2016). Evaluation of the Extent of TETFund Contribution towards Quality Transformation of Tertiary Institutions in Imo State. *Journal of Pristine*, 12(1), 198-209.

Borvorn, I.N.A. (2011). Common disputes related to public work projects in Thailand. *Songklanakarinn Journal of Science and Technology*, 33(5), 565-573.

Bourne, L. & Walker, D.H.T. (2005). Visualising and mapping stakeholder influence. *Management Decision*, 43(5), 649-660.
<https://doi.org/10.1108/00251740510597680>

Chaitanya, K. & Nityanand, F. (2015). Management of Claims and Disputes in Construction Industry. *International Journal of Science and Research*, 2319-7064.

Chitkara, K.K. (2012). *Construction Project Management: Planning, Scheduling and Controlling*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.

Ejohwomu, O.A., Oshodi. O.S. & Onifade M.K. (2016). Causes of conflicts in construction projects in Nigeria: consultant's and contractor's perspective. *Nigerian Journal of Technology*, 35(2), 270-277.
<http://dx.doi.org/10/4314/njt.v35i2.6>

Elziny, A.A., Mohamadien, M.A., Ibrahim, H.M. & Abdel-Fattah, M.K. (2016). An expert system

to manage dispute resolutions in construction projects in Egypt. *Ain Shams Engineering Journal*, 7(1), 57-71. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asej.2015.05.002>

George, O. (2015). Nature of the construction industry, Its Needs and Its Development: A review of four decades of research. *Journal of Construction in Developing Countries*, 20(2), 115–135.

Goparaju, P.S. (2015). A review of conflict management techniques in projects. *Brazilian Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 12(2), 214-232. <https://doi.org/10.14488/BJOPM.2015.v12.n2.a3>

Grau, D. & Back, W.E. (2015). The Predictability Index – Novel Metric to Assess Cost and Schedule Performance. ASCE, *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, 141(12), 04015043. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)CO.1943-7862.0000994](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)CO.1943-7862.0000994)

Jimoh, R., Oyewobi, L., Osajarikre, J., Adaji, A. & Sani, M. (2019). Strategies for Managing Conflicts on Construction Sites in Abuja-Nigeria. *Journal of Techno Social*, 11(2), 55-64. <https://doi.org/10.30880/jts.2019.11.02.007>

Joseph, B. (2016). The Role of Media in Ethnic Conflict Transformation A Case Study of Kokrajhar. Ph.D. Retrieved from: <http://hdl.handle.net/10603/191977>

Kothari, C.R. (2004). *Research methodology: Methods and Techniques*. New Delhi: New Age International Limited.

Lederach, J. (2015). *Little Book of Conflict Transformation: Clear Articulation of the Guiding Principles by A Pioneer in The Field*. Skyhorse Publishing.

Lewis, P. J. (2010). *Project Planning, Scheduling and Control*. USA: McGraw Hill Publishing House.

London, K. & Mc-George, D. (2008). Dispute avoidance and resolution: a literature review, Research Report. CRC – *Construction Innovation, Australia*, 1, 49.

Mangwat J.S., Ewuga, D.J. & Izam, Y.D. (2020). In MATEC Web of Conferences: *Time*

and Cost Performance of Fixed Price Building Contracts in Tertiary Institutions in Nigeria. <https://doi.org/10.1051/mateconf/202031206003>

Matuleviciene, M. & Stravinskiene, J. (2015). The Importance of Stakeholders for Corporate Reputation, *Engineering Economics*, 26(1), 75–83. <https://doi.org/10.5755/j01.ee.26.1.6921>

Mba, O.A. (2013). Conflict management and employee's performance in Julius Berger Nigeria PLC, Bonny Island, *Journal of Human Resource Management and Labour studies*, 1(1), 34-45.

Mbatha, S.K. (2021). Causes and Impacts of Conflicts in Construction Projects: A Viewpoint of Kenya Construction Industry. *International Journal of Soft Computing and Engineering (IJSCE)*, 10(5), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijscce.D3485.0510521>

Mbatha, S.K., Alkizim, A.O. & Mbiti, T.K. (2021). The practice of conflict management in construction projects in Kenya. *International Journal of Soft Computing and Engineering*, 10(4), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijscce.D3483.0310421>

Molwus, J.J., Ewga, D.J. & Orih, E. (2016). Managing conflict in the Nigerian construction industry: A study of Jos in North-Central Nigeria. *ATBU Journal of Environmental Technology*, 9(1), 19-29.

Mosaic (2012). Conflict management. A Whitepaper of Mosaic Projects. Retrieved from: http://www.mosaicprojects.com.au/WhitePapers/WP1041_Managing_Conflict.pdf

Ogunbayo, O. (2013). Conflict Management in Nigerian construction industry: Project Managers' View. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Economics & Management Sciences*, 4(2), 140.

Ogundu, I. & Nwokoye, P.I. (2015). Tertiary Education Trust Fund and Development of Higher Education in Nigeria. *Journal of Vocational Education and Technology*, 6(1-2), 99-106

Olamoju, A.M., & Olagoke-Salami, S.O. (2020). Evaluation of Causes and Effects of Conflicts Between Contractor and Client Representatives in Nigerian Construction Industry (A Case Study

of Lagos State). *Iloro Journal of Environmental Research & Development*, 4(1), 69-76.

Olatunji, S.O., Oke, A.E., Aghimien, D.O. & Saidu, S.A. (2016). Effect of construction project performance on economic development of Nigeria. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*, 7(12), 142-149.

Oluyemi-Ayibowu B.D., Omolayo J.O. (2022). Critical factors responsible for time overruns in Nigeria building construction industry. *International Journal of Mechanical and Civil Engineering*, 4(1), 22-33. <https://doi.org/10.52589/IJMCEIQYK7V9W142>

Onyeike, V.C. & Eseyin, E.O. (2014). Tertiary Education Trust Fund (TETFund) and the Management of University Education in Nigeria. *Global Journal of Educational Research*, 13(2), 63-72. <https://doi.org/10.4314/gjedr.v13i2.2>

Osuzugbo, I.C. & Okuntade, T.F. (2020). Conflict Management Practice among Stakeholders in Construction Project Delivery. *Covenant Journal in Research & Built Environment*, 8(1), 40-57. <https://doi.org/10.47231/ZWUX7965>

Owenaze, J.E. (2016). Identifying Strategies for Preventing Disputes in Building Construction Projects in Nigeria. *International Journal of Science, Environment and Technology*, 5(5), 3558-3569. <https://doi.org/10.4314/njt.v35i2.8>

Ramonu, J.A.L., Ilevbaoje, J.O., Olaonipekun, O.A., Omotosho, A.O., Owamah, H.I. & Adewole T.A. (2018). Prevention of Conflict in Construction Industry Considering; Organization, Consultancy Firm, Contractual Firm and the Professionals Personnel in Nigeria, *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, 9(12), 472-484.

Saeed, N. & Kayani, A.I. (2019). A study to investigate the importance of physical facilities to improve teaching learning process at college level in tehsil kotli azad kashmir. *Asian Journal of Contemporary Education*, 3(1), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.18488/journal.137.2019.31.1.14>

Saidu, I. & Shakantu, W. (2017). An investigation into cost overruns for ongoing building projects in Abuja, Nigeria. *Acta Structilia*, 24(1), 53-72. <https://doi.org/10.18820/24150487/as24i1.3>

Senaratne, S. & Udawatta, N. (2013). Managing intragroup conflicts in construction project teams: case studies in Sri Lanka. *Architectural Engineering and Design Management*, 9(3), 158-175. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17452007.2012.738041>

Shabir, H.K. & Tauha H.A. (2014). In International Conference on challenges in IT, Engineering and Technology: *Causes Leading to Conflicts in Construction Projects: A Viewpoint of Pakistani Construction Industry*. Phuket, Thailand. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15242/IIIE.E0714040>

Shawa, B.J., Lello, D.S. & Ntiyakunze, S.K. (2018). Analysis of Causes of Conflicts within the Design Teams in Building Projects in Tanzania. *International Journal of Engineering Trends and Technology*, 60(1), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.14445/22315381/IJETT-V60P201>

Sylvester, S.I. & Kwaji, M. (2017). Conflict Management in Building Construction Industries: Case Study of Adamawa State. *International Journal of Environmental Studies and Safety Research*, 2(3), 58-68.

Tariq, J. & Gardezi, S.S.S. (2023). Study the Delays and Conflicts for Construction Projects and their Mutual Relationship: A Review. *A in Shams Engineering Journal*, 14, 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asej.2022.101815>

Wani, H.A., Suwirta, A. & Payeye J. (2013). Conflict resolution and conflict transformation: Some reflections. *Jurnal Kajian Pendidikan*, 3(1), 34-44.

Wit, F.R.C., Greer, L.L. & Jehn, K.A. (2012). The paradox of intragroup conflict: A MetaAnalysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 97(2), 360-390. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0024844>

Yng, F.L.Y., Lean, C.S., Wai, E.C.C, Ping, E.L. & Min, L. (2002). *Performance evaluation of alternative project procurement methods*. Project Report, National University of Singapore.

Yousefi, S., Hipel, K.W. & Hegazy, T. (2010). Attitude- Based strategic negotiation for conflict management in construction projects. *Project Management Journal*, 41(4), 99-107. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pmj.20193>