

An assessment of behavioral variables implied in teamwork: an experience with engineering students of Zaragoza University

Juan Luis Cano Fernández^{a*}, Iván Lidón López^a, Rubén Rebollar Rubio^a and Fernando Gimeno Marco^b

^aDesign and Manufacturing Engineering Department, Zaragoza University, María de Luna 3, 50018 Zaragoza, Spain; ^bPsychology and Sociology Department, Zaragoza University, Plaza Universidad 3, 22002 Huesca, Spain

(Received 31 August 2008; final version received 3 January 2009)

This paper presents a study of behavioral variables implied in the working dynamics of student groups undertaking their first project. The study has been carried out in two phases. During the first phase, the participants have answered a survey of open questions regarding their own behavior and that of their teammates, questions related to: the quality of their work as a team; their individual contribution to teamwork; and their perception of what they have learned after taking part in the experience. Analysis of the answers through the inter-judge consensus method has been the basis for developing a questionnaire of closed questions, which has constituted the second phase of the study. The procedure followed for developing the questionnaire and the results obtained after handing it to 92 students guarantee its validity and reliability for measuring and assessing the behavioral variables implied in how such groups work. The study concludes with the prospects for using such a tool, in order to support the work of student groups throughout the course.

Keywords: behavior; project management; questionnaire; teamwork

1. Introduction

One of the initial recommendations included in the convergence process for the European Higher Education Area is the adoption of active learning methodologies by students. Among such methodologies, approaches such as the following stand out: cooperative learning (Felder and Brent 2007), problem-based learning (Graaff and Kolmos 2003), or experiential learning (Kolb 1984), in which the student is no longer a passive element and assumes a more active role in the learning process, usually involving the performance of work within a team.

In this context, it is necessary, on the one hand, to provide the students with certain skills that will allow them to perform effectively and cope with the situations arising from that kind of work (Oakley *et al.* 2004) and, on the other, to monitor how performance as a group affects the quality of the results obtained.

*Corresponding author. Email: jlcano@unizar.es

51 Starting from this premise, we present the experience taking place in the subject of project
52 management of the Industrial Engineering Master degree at Zaragoza University, where groups
53 of five and six students have been able to address the need put forward by a real client, through
54 completion of a project (Cano *et al.* 2006). Davidovitch *et al.* (2006) noted that in order to prepare
55 the students for a real project environment there is a need to practice in the “real world” of project
56 management.

57 Evaluation of the student group in this academic year is related to the quality of the project
58 they have developed. Although there is agreement among the teachers group regarding the qual-
59 ity standards to be met by the work of the students, it does happen on occasion that students
60 differ in their perception of such standards. This becomes clear in aspects such as the varying
61 importance attached by students and teachers to the satisfaction shown by the client with the work
62 performed.

63 Within this framework, the teachers become interested in identifying and measuring those
64 variables that reveal the perceptions of students regarding aspects of how their groups work the
65 quality of their performance, and the relation between both. Concern with learning about the
66 ideal conditions for teamwork in an academic environment has driven several groups of teachers
67 to carry out studies with this goal in mind (Brewer and Mendelson 2003, Tonso 2006, Oakley
68 *et al.* 2007). Additionally, teamwork has been identified as one of the most important employability
69 skills (Markes 2006) and one of the skills used in industry (Pascail 2006, Korhonen-Yrjänheikki
70 *et al.* 2007).

71 For this purpose, a questionnaire has been devised as an instrument for the assessment of this
72 set of variables of a technical and behavioral nature. Developing the questionnaire has required
73 an interdisciplinary approach, and therefore a research team made up of teachers of the subject
74 and psychologists was formed.

75 The aim in putting this questionnaire together has been the benefit of relying on a useful tool for
76 teaching, making it possible to analyze, assess, and improve learning by the students. According
77 to Prince *et al.* (2007), doing research on teaching and integrating successful innovations into
78 classroom practice clearly has the potential to improve teaching and learning. In order to meet such
79 goals, the questionnaire should guarantee the psychometric properties featured by an adequate
80 measuring tool.

81 Next, we move on to the approach for project management teaching that has developed at
82 Zaragoza University.

86 2. The Project Management Course at the University of Zaragoza

87
88 The training scheme part of this course has been based on the performance, in groups of 5/6
89 students, of a project for a real client. Such clients are usually SMEs, non-governmental organi-
90 zations (NGOs), small town councils, etc. The usual scope of these works involves preparing a
91 project management plan, which is handed to the client for them to implement if they consider it
92 beneficial. In some cases, however, the students become involved in reaching the goals set by their
93 project. Typical examples of the commissions undertaken are extensions and relocations of com-
94 panies, organizing a variety of events (sport, social, cultural, artistic, etc.), preparing proposals
95 for financing the activities of NGOs, and the like (Cano *et al.* 2008).

96 For a student group with no previous experience, carrying out a real project for a client involves
97 an interesting challenge. So, the course is set within a fictitious consulting company where students
98 work in groups, under the mentoring of their teachers. The teachers offer students the usual services
99 of a Project Management Office (mentoring, time control, progress reports, psychological support
100 and training, lectures, conferences, and seminars).

101 However, personal differences between the members may arise, derived from the very dynamics
102 of teamwork. To deal with such problems, two seminars are offered in order to develop the
103 collaborative skills of the students. In the first of these, “Causes of Failure in Projects,” the teachers Q2
104 present the experience gathered throughout the years regarding the most significant problems
105 perceived in student groups taking the same subject, as well as the sort of attitude and behavior
106 that will help prevent such problems. The performance of this seminar relies on students from
107 previous years relating their own experiences during the course. The second seminar, “Conflict
108 Management,” is offered by a teacher from the Psychology and Sociology Department, and by
109 means of a series of role-plays, students represent the most common conflict situations that may
110 arise in teamwork, and strategies to deal with them are proposed. Additionally, a subject related
111 to human aspects in project management is included in the program offered to the students. These
112 actions are combined with guided reflection in topics such as coordination among the groups.

113 In the following chapter, we explain the methodology followed to develop the questionnaire
114 mentioned previously.
115
116

117 3. Method

118 3.1. Participants

119 The groups participating in this study are the following.
120
121

- 122 • In the first assessment phase, a group of 21 students participated, of which 15 were males
123 (71.43%), and 6 females (28.57%). This group, of which the components were selected ran-
124 domly, represents 14% of the total 149 students registered for the subject that year. The first
125 assessment phase relied on the six teachers responsible for the projects subject.
- 126 • In the second assessment phase, a group of 92 students participated, with an average age of
127 23.73 and a standard deviation of 1.46 years. Among them, 68 were males (73.9%) and 24
128 females (26.1%). This group makes up 74.19% of the total 124 students registered.
129
130

131 3.2. Procedure for developing the questionnaire

132 Development of the assessment questionnaire was carried out in two phases.
133

134 During the first phase (2005–06 term), the teacher group, considering the theoretical basis of the
135 subject’s teaching plan and the bodies of knowledge of the main International Project Management
136 Associations (Caupin *et al.* 2006) and Project Management Institute (2004), selected and defined
137 a set of 10 variables (see Section 2.3.), which they considered key indicators of teaching practices
138 and their assessment. With the aim of defining and measuring these variables, a questionnaire
139 was developed involving two different answering criteria: in the first place, the evaluation of each
140 variable was made by means of a subjective scale from 0 (most negative, substandard) to 10 (most
141 positive, excellent); secondly, indicating the reason or reasons for the said numerical evaluation.
142 The content analysis of the information yielded by the student group was carried out through
143 the inter-judge consensus method (Glaser and Strauss 1967, López-Araguren 2001), in which Q3
144 three teachers specifically trained for the task participated. The results of this analysis led to the
145 identification of the content categories of the different variables (items), which in turn became
146 the basis for the development of a new instrument, now consisting of closed questions.
147

148 During the second assessment phase (2006–07 term), the students taking part answered the
149 questions of this second instrument, this time responding both to the variables globally and to
150 each of the items by means of the ordinal scale of 10 intervals described before.

3.3. Features of the questionnaire

The questionnaire “retrospective assessment of teamwork” comprises 10 scales concerning the variables of the object of study of this research project. The variables or constructs assessed are as follows.

1. Perceived quality of the work performed.
2. Quality of performance as a project group.
3. Quality of technical/individual contributions in a project group.
4. Quality of individual contributions as member of a project group.
5. Teamwork competence in a project group.
6. Work motivation in a project group.
7. Satisfaction with work in a project group.
8. Advice for improving the quality of the work performed.
9. Advice for improving teamwork.
10. Proposals for improving individual work in a project group.

The first seven variables are defined by a single item with an answer format in an ordinal “continuous classification” scale of 10 intervals, from 0 (most negative, substandard) to 10 (most positive, excellent). In addition, the variables or scales 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, and 10 are made up of a set of items, each of them with an answer format identical to the previous one. These items are taken from the content analysis of the open answers given by the students during the first phase of the questionnaire development process.

At the beginning of the questionnaire, information was gathered from the student on the following variables: age, sex, year in which studies were begun for the degree, role within the group (coordinator, secretary, or other), and preliminary evaluation that the teacher group, hereafter “rating obtained by the work,” had given to the project at the end of each presentation made by the students, according to the following:

- Good: for those with final rating between 8 and 10 (on a scale from 0 to 10).
- Improvable: for work with rating between 5 and 8.
- Unsatisfactory: for work with rating lesser than 5.

During the term object of the study, none of the works was considered unsatisfactory by the teachers.

3.4. Reliability and validity of the questionnaire

Regarding the psychometric properties of tests, the design of the development process itself must aim particularly at guaranteeing and analyzing its reliability and validity.

Reliability refers to the degree to which measurements are relatively free of random error. Reliability, understood as “internal consistency,” can be estimated using Cronbach’s α coefficient.

In all the scales of this questionnaire made up of items (scales nos 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, and 10), internal consistency may be considered good, since, in every case, the values of Cronbach’s coefficient exceed 0.7 (Nunnally 1978).

Validity can be defined as “the degree to which the test measures what it is intended to measure” (Anastasi and Urbina 1997). Presently, the most commonly used model for establishing validity is that offered by the combined assessment of the validity of the content, construct, and criteria (Sartori and Pasini 2006).

201 Content validity refers to the existence of a sample of questions in the test representing content,
202 the relevant skills, or behaviors of the area of interest; that is, if the items of the test are pertinent,
203 exhaustive, relevant, and representative of the construct, we intend to measure.

204 In this questionnaire, content validity is endorsed by the identification and content analysis
205 process of the variables object of the study, by means of the opinions of a representative group of
206 “experts” (the students themselves).

207 Construct validity refers to the notion that a test must measure what it has been devised to
208 measure. This type of validity is usually determined using factor analysis techniques and struc-
209 tural equations. In order to check construct validity, what was studied in the first place was the
210 discrimination of the items of the scales numbered 1, 2, 3, 4, 8, 9, and 10 of the questionnaire,
211 performing the “item-total correlation” analysis in each of the previous scales with the aim of
212 assessing the integration of each item within the scale as a whole. The criterion employed for
213 inclusion of an item has been to obtain a correlation index of 0.25 or higher (Nunnally and Berstein
214 1995). One last criterion for inclusion of items in the questionnaire was determined when per-
215 forming exploratory factor analyses in order to check the factorial structure of each of the scales,
216 on verifying communalities (the % of variance of an item explaining the factorial model made up
217 by the remaining items), following the criterion of excluding an item from the model whenever
218 a value of <0.3 was obtained. The result of the preceding analyses makes it possible to establish
219 the structure and content of the scales and items of the final questionnaire (Lidón *et al.* 2007).

220 Finally, the criteria of a test are valid if it is useful in predicting a person’s behavior in a specific
221 situation. The results obtained (to be discussed in the following section) regarding the criteria
222 variable “rating obtained by the work,” which amounts to a measurement of the “success” met
223 with by each project group, are an indicator of the predictive validity of this questionnaire.

224 225 226 **4. Results**

227 228 **4.1. Relation between the variables “rating obtained by the work” and “perceived quality 229 of the work performed”**

230
231 As has been noted, the teachers of the course carried out an evaluation of the projects, using a
232 three-tier classification: unsatisfactory, improvable, and good work. As has been mentioned above,
233 none of the works presented during the term object of the study was marked as “unsatisfactory,”
234 and therefore, the grading of the projects may be considered dichotomic for all practical purposes.
235 On the other hand, the students of the course graded the quality of their work as they perceived
236 it, on a scale of 0 (very low) to 10 (very high).

237 In order to study the relation between these two variables, the choice was made to dichotomize
238 the second, taking as criterion the value of the median ($Mdn = 8$). When studying the relation
239 between the two variables, a statistically significant positive correlation was observed between
240 rating obtained by the work and quality as perceived by students regarding their final work
241 ($\phi = 0.397$, $p < 0.001$).

242 Such a result seems to support the idea that the criterion used by the teachers in assessing the
243 work agrees with the individual appreciation of its quality of the students themselves.

244 245 246 **4.2. Relation between the variables “rating obtained by the work” and “quality of 247 performance as a project group”**

248
249 Throughout previous terms, teachers have observed that aspects such as lack of coordination or
250 faulty teamwork were among the most frequent causes of faulty work (Cano *et al.* 2006).

251 It was decided to study the perception of the teachers with the student group of the 2006–
 252 07 term. To that end, the non-parametric Mann–Whitney test was used to analyze the possible
 253 differences between the evaluations of “quality of performance as a project group” of students
 254 marked as “improvable” (i) vs. the group of students whose work had been rated as “good” (g).

255 Those analyses reflected that the students who had obtained higher ratings perceived a better
 256 quality of performance as a group when compared with those with lower ratings ($U = 551$,
 257 $p < 0.05$; $Mdn_i = 7$, $RI_i = 2$; $Mdn_g = 8$, $RI_g = 2$).

258 The result points to the fact that adequate teamwork is an essential feature for the end result
 259 of work.

260 4.3. Factors influencing the variable “perceived quality of the work performed”

261 In order to study the variables implied in “perceived quality of the work performed” (scale no. 1
 262 of the questionnaire) the relation between the general evaluation of this variable and each of the
 263 specific contents or items that make up this scale was analyzed (Table 1).

264 What can be learned from these results is that all items of the scale “perceived quality of the
 265 work performed” show a statistically significant positive relation with it.

266 In order to gain a deeper knowledge of this relation, the influence of the evaluation of each
 267 item on that of the variable “perceived quality of the work performed” was studied. The ordinal
 268 regression analysis performed shows good adjustment of the model ($\chi^2 = 222, 097$, $p < 0.01$),
 269 allowing for explanation of 83.5% of cases (students, in this instance).

270 4.4. Factors influencing the variable “quality of performance as a project group”

271 As in the case described before, the relation between the specific contents of the variable “quality
 272 of performance as a project group” and its general evaluation was studied. The results are shown
 273 in Table 2.

274 All items, except “the members of the group had worked together before” have a statistically
 275 significant relation with the variable “quality of performance as a project group”. Noteworthy are
 276 the negative relations existing between the items “time allocation for the work has been uneven
 277
 278

282 Table 1. Analysis of the relation between the “perceived quality of the work performed” and the items of this scale.

285 Items related with the variable “perceived quality of the work performed”	r_s	p
286 All aspects of the project have been considered in great detail	0.682	0.000
287 All members of the group showed a good predisposition for the work	0.315	0.002
288 Tasks have been distributed according to the knowledge and skills of each member	0.213	0.035
289 The group has functioned in an adequate, coordinated way	0.377	0.000
290 The most has been made of the project	0.609	0.000
291 The project has been an original one	0.221	0.029
292 The expected results/objectives have been achieved	0.645	0.000
293 The project has been well planned	0.606	0.000
294 The client’s satisfaction has been sought	0.263	0.009
295 The members of the group have made a great effort	0.391	0.000
296 The client is satisfied	0.398	0.000
297 Work has concluded successfully	0.357	0.001
298 The objectives have been fulfilled	0.569	0.000
299 The project had great scope	0.321	0.001
300 The project is useful for the client	0.496	0.000
All initial problems have been solved	0.364	0.000
Everything necessary to develop the project without difficulty is included	0.471	0.000
The results of the project are interesting	0.558	0.000

Table 2. Analysis of the relation between “quality of the Performance as a Project Group” and the items of this scale.

Items related with the variable “quality of the performance as a project group”	r_s	p
All members of the group had a clear idea of what was to be done	0.480	0.000
The group was united by a common goal	0.624	0.000
There has been a pleasant working environment	0.550	0.000
Time allocation for the work has been uneven throughout the project	-0.376	0.000
There have been differences among members	-0.438	0.000
Communication within the group has been good.	0.598	0.000
Work has been performed as a team	0.634	0.000
Timetable incompatibility has been solved	0.399	0.000
All members of the group have worked hard	0.647	0.000
All members of the group have worked well	0.664	0.000
Each member of the group had a clearly defined role	0.408	0.000
The work has brought the group together on a personal level	0.450	0.000
A positive attitude has prevailed in the group	0.741	0.000
The members of the group had worked together before	0.127	0.226
The meetings held led to steady work	0.502	0.000
Although hard in the beginning, day by day things improved	0.424	0.000
The group has held together even in moments of difficulty	0.490	0.000
There has been even distribution of tasks	0.458	0.000
All members of the group have fulfilled their part	0.597	0.000
Coordination within the group has been good	0.672	0.000
Before the group was formed, its members were friends	0.220	0.000

throughout the project” and “There have been differences among members” and the variable. In the groups where such problems arose, evaluation of the variable “quality of performance as a project group” has been worse. Therefore, preventing such situations will result in better work as a group and, consequently, in better results, as has been stated before.

As in the case of Section 3.3, in order to gain a deeper knowledge of this relation, the influence of the evaluation of each item on that of the variable “quality of performance as a project group” was studied. The ordinal regression analysis performed, excluding those items that showed no statistically significant correlations, shows good adjustment of the model ($\chi^2 = 299, 013, p < 0.01$), allowing for explanation of 73.3% of cases.

Q4

4.5. Lessons learned by the students

In the questionnaire, students are asked what they would change given the chance to begin work all over again, in order to improve its quality, as well as that of teamwork.

On the basis of that information, it was studied whether any difference existed between the lessons learned by the students, according to their evaluation of the variable “perceived quality of the work performed”.

4.5.1. Relation between evaluation of the variable “perceived quality of the work performed” and the items of the scale “advice for improving the quality of the work performed”

To study this relation, Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient was employed. From a list of 19 items, statistically significant relations were found only in 2, as reflected in Table 3.

A negative correlation is shown with the item “Greater degree of organization when contacting suppliers,” that is, students whose valuation of the variable “perceived quality of the work performed” is lower tend to recommend a greater degree of organization when contacting suppliers.

Table 3. Analysis of the relation between valuation of the variable “perceived quality of the work performed” and the items of the scale “advice for improving the quality of the work performed”.

Items	r_s	p
Greater degree of organization when contacting suppliers	-0.349	0.000
Would do the same	0.476	0.000

A positive correlation appears with the item “Would do the same,” that is, students whose valuation of the variable “perceived quality of the work performed” is higher would do the same as they had done.

4.5.2. *Relation between evaluation of the variable “perceived quality of the work performed” and the items of the scale “advice for improving teamwork”*

To study this relation, Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient was employed. From a list of 20 items, statistically significant relations were found in 5 of them, as reflected in Table 4.

In the first place, a negative correlation is observed with the item “Greater coordination,” students whose evaluation of the variable “perceived quality of the work performed” is lower recommend a greater degree of coordination within the group.

Secondly, the positive correlations indicate that students whose evaluation of the variable “perceived quality of the work performed” is higher recommend: having clear ideas from the start; getting things done as soon as possible; having a good rapport within the group; holding more meetings.

What follows from these results is that the students who perceive a lower quality in their projects recommend aspects to do with improving functioning within the group. On the other hand, the advice of groups perceiving a higher quality in their projects has to do with specific points such as relations with suppliers, or getting things done as soon as possible, which are aspects more related to the development of the subject than with how the group works.

4.6. *Satisfaction of the students*

When studying the relation between valuation of the variables “satisfaction with work in a project group,” “perceived quality of the work performed,” and “quality of performance as a project group,” a statistically significant correlation is observed between these three variables (Table 5).

The results point to how, by means of an improvement in one variable of the process such as “quality of performance as a project group,” two result variables such as “satisfaction with work in a project group” and “perceived quality of the work performed” can be improved. This amounts to an opportunity for improvement in teaching, through control of the mentioned variable of the process.

Table 4. Analysis of the relation between evaluation of the variable “perceived quality of the work performed” and the items of the scale “advice for improving teamwork”.

Items	r_s	p
Greater coordination	-0.317	0.001
Having clear ideas from the start	0.208	0.040
Trying to have everything ready as soon as possible	0.253	0.012
Good rapport within the group	0.206	0.043
Finding more time for meeting	-0.234	0.021

Table 5. Analysis of the relation between evaluation of the variables “satisfaction with work in a project group”, “perceived quality of the work performed” and “quality of performance as a project group”.

		Quality of work	Quality of group performance
Quality of group performance	r_s	0.398**	–
Satisfaction	r_s	0.269**	0.342**

5. Conclusions

This article has presented the development process and the results obtained from a questionnaire aimed at measuring the relevant variables implied in freshman teamwork. The specific conclusions drawn are as follows.

- The psychometric properties of the questionnaire make it a valid and reliable measuring device.
- The results obtained show that the mentioned questionnaire is a valuable tool that can be employed for decision-making and advising teachers and students in an academic context, namely that of college learning. Therefore, throughout the 2007–08 term, this tool will be used to identify groups that perceive faulty teamwork, with the aim of facilitating preventive work on the part of the teachers.

The use of the questionnaire developed in this research as a measuring device is exclusively indicated for the specific subjects and context with which it has been carried out. In this sense, it is necessary to take the usefulness of assessment by means of this questionnaire further, both for the assessment of the student’s learning process and the quality of teaching, as well as the effect of the teaching initiatives aimed at modifying these variables.

6. Notes on contributors

Juan L. Cano: MSc and Doctor from the Engineering Faculty of Madrid Polytechnic University. He has held different positions at private companies (Mech. Engineer, Consultant, Project Manager) until 1982 when he took up the Chair of Project Engineering of University of Zaragoza. Since 1993, he has been involved in different EC educational projects (SIM, CAESAR I, CAESAR II, GEM) connected with Commet, Leonardo and IST. His research topics are project management, experiential learning and product development.

Iván Lidón: MSc from the Engineering Faculty of Zaragoza University. He has worked as Assistant at the Design and Manufacturing Engineering Department of the University of Zaragoza since 2004. His current interests are project management and product development areas.

Ruben Rebollar: MSc and Doctor from the Engineering Faculty of University of Zaragoza. He is Associate Professor in the Design and Manufacturing Department at this university. In his present academic career, he is focused on teaching and researching in the areas of project management and product development.

Fernando Gimeno: Ph.D. has held different positions at public and private organizations in the sport and health scopes (Human Resources Consultant, Sport Psychologist). Since 2001, he is Assistant Doctor Professor in the Psychology and Sociology Department at the University of Zaragoza. His research topics are psychological variables implied in the Sport and Academic performance contexts.

References

- 451
452
453 Anastasi, A. and Urbina, S., 1997. *Psychological testing*. 7th ed. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- 454 Brewer, W. and Mendelson, M.I., 2003. Methodology and metrics for assessing team effectiveness. *International Journal*
- 455 *of Engineering Education*, 19 (6), 777–787.
- 456 Cano, J.L., et al., 2006. Students groups solving real-life projects. A case study of experiential learning. *International*
- 457 *Journal of Engineering Education*, 22 (6), 1252–1260.
- 458 Cano, J.L., Lidón, I., and Rebollar, R., 2008. Learning Project Management through working for real clients. *International*
- Q6 459 *Journal of Engineering Education*, 24 (6), 1199–1209.
- 459 Capuin, G., et al., 2006. *ICB – IPMA competence baseline*. International Project Management Association.
- 460 Davidovitch, L., Parush, A., and Shtub, A., 2006. Simulation-based learning in engineering education: performance and
- 461 transfer in learning project management. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 95 (4), 289–299.
- 462 De Graaff, E. and Kolmos, A., 2003. Characteristics of problem-based learning. *International Journal of Engineering*
- 463 *Education*, 19 (5), 657–662.
- Q7 464 Felder, R.M. and Brent, R., 2007. Cooperative learning. In: *Active learning: models from the analytical sciences*. ACS
- 465 *Symposium Series 970*.
- 466 Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L., 1967. *The discovery of grounded theory: strategies for qualitative research*. Chicago:
- 467 Aldine.
- 468 Kolb, D.A., 1984. *Experiential learning: experience as the source of learning and development*. New Jersey: Prentice
- 469 Hall.
- 470 Korhonen-Yrjänheikki, K., Tukiainen, T., and Takala, M., 2007. New challenging approaches to engineering education:
- 471 enhancing university–industry co-operation. *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 32 (2), 167–179.
- 472 Lidón, I., et al., 2007. Proceso de Elaboración de un Cuestionario de Evaluación de Variables Implicadas en el Fun-
- 473 cionamiento de Grupos de Proyectos de Ingeniería. In: *Presented at XI Conferencia Española y Primer Encuentro*
- 474 *Iberoamericano de Biometría*, 20–22 June, Salamanca, Spain.
- 475 López-Aranguren, E., 2001. El análisis de contenido tradicional in *El análisis de la realidad social. Métodos y técnicas*
- 476 *de investigación*. 3rd ed, Madrid: Alianza.
- 477 Markes, I., 2006. A review of literature on employability skill needs in engineering. *European Journal of Engineering*
- 478 *Education*, 31 (6), 637–650.
- 479 Nunnally, J.C., 1978. *Psychometric theory*. 2nd ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- 480 Nunnally, J.C. and Bernstein, I.J., 1995. *Teoría psicométrica*. Madrid: McGraw-Hill.
- 481 Oakley, B., et al., 2004. Turning students groups into effective teams. *Journal of Student Centered Learning*, 2 (1), 9–34.
- 482 Oakley, B.A., et al., 2007. Best practices involving teamwork in the classroom: results from a survey of 6435 engineering
- 483 students respondents. *IEEE Transactions on Education*, 50 (3), 266–272.
- Q8 484 Pascail, L. 2006. The emergence of the skills approach in industry and its consequences for the training of engineers.
- 485 *European Journal of Engineering Education*, 31 (1), 55–61.
- 486 Prince, M.J., Felder, R.M., and Brent, R., 2007. Does faculty research improve undergraduate teaching? An analysis of
- 487 existing and potential synergies. *Journal of Engineering Education*, 96 (4), 283–2947.
- Q7 488 Project Management Institute, 2004. *A guide to the Project Management Body of Knowledge (PMBOK® guide)*. 3rd ed.
- 489 Sartori, R. and Pasini, M., 2006. Quality and quantity in test validity: how can we be sure that psychological tests measure
- 490 what they have to? *Quality and Quantity*, 41, 359–374.
- 491 Tonso, K., 2006. Teams that Work: Campus Culture, Engineer Identity, and Social Interactions. *Journal of Engineering*
- 492 *Education*, 95 (1), 25–37.
- 493
494
495
496
497
498
499
500