

Enhancing Team Performance: How Personality Tests Optimize the Composition of Small Teams

Lucie Martinkovičová¹, Jaroslav Vrchota², Martina Kubešová³, Petr Řehoř⁴, Zdeněk Štefek⁵

Abstract: The article discusses the critical role of project management in the success of team-oriented tasks. The study explores how personality tests, particularly the Belbin Team Roles test, optimize team composition and improve team performance. The article distinguishes between groups and teams, highlighting that effective teams possess shared goals, complementary skills, and strong collaboration dynamics.

The article also presents a study comparing two project teams: one formed naturally and the other structured based on Belbin test results. Through the analysis of performance metrics such as productivity, adherence to budget, and communication efficiency, the research demonstrates that diverse and well-balanced teams perform better, as identified through personality tests. The conclusion recommends that organizations integrate personality assessments into team formation processes to enhance efficiency and collaboration in project-based environments. The main contribution of the paper is to highlight the importance of the variety of methods used in the formation of work teams, as after the study was conducted, the use of solely the Belbin test was proved to be limiting. The article also supports the importance of the combination of methods in monitoring team performance. Likewise, the article considers it important to emphasize the continuous deepening of knowledge of communication, collaboration and enabling career growth in leadership positions.

Keywords: Project management, Human resources, Team roles, Modern work approaches, Belbin test

JEL Classification: M21, J11

1 Introduction

Project management is critical to successfully implementing complex tasks and goals with a clearly defined beginning and end. It is specific in that it involves planning, managing and controlling resources, time and costs to ensure the project achieves the set goals within given time and financial limits (Svozilová, 2016). Each project brings unique challenges, from risks to changes in requirements, which require a flexible approach and the ability to adapt quickly. In this context, a good project team is essential, as the success of a project depends not only on the technical skills of individual members but also on their ability to collaborate, communicate effectively, and solve problems. A quality project team can better allocate roles, leverage the strengths of individuals, and thus maximize productivity and the quality of results, which is essential for successful completion of the Project (Doležal, 2016).

The text perceives the differences between a team and a group, although these terms are sometimes used synonymously. A team is characterized by cooperation, shared identity and belonging, where each member contributes to achieving a common goal (Doležal, 2023a). The main characteristics of a team include a shared goal, complementary skills, collective norms, a proactive approach and responsibility to achieve quality results. On the contrary, a group is a more permanent structure where individuals focus on their tasks and are interchangeable, often formed based on physical or cultural proximity (Plamínek, 2018a). The teams can be divided according to formal or informal structure and duration.

¹ University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice, Faculty of Economics, Management Department, Studentská 13, České Budějovice, Czech Republic, martil22@jcu.cz

² University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice, Faculty of Economics, Management Department, Studentská 13, České Budějovice, Czech Republic, vrchota@ef.jcu.cz

³ University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice, Faculty of Economics, Management Department, Studentská 13, České Budějovice, Czech Republic, kubesm12@ef.jcu.cz

⁴ University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice, Faculty of Economics, Management Department, Studentská 13, České Budějovice, Czech Republic; rehor@ef.jcu.cz

⁵ University of South Bohemia in České Budějovice, Faculty of Economics, Management Department, Studentská 13, České Budějovice, Czech Republic; stefez00@ef.jcu.cz

Another division includes action, consulting, project, production and virtual teams (Korecký & Trkovský, 2011). Action teams focus on repetitive tasks, but they do so in different conditions each time. Advisory teams provide information to the company's management and may sometimes have decision-making powers. Project teams are the leading executive link in the implementation of projects and are characterized by a high level of expertise. Manufacturing teams are relatively stable and less complex, while virtual teams allow for remote collaboration, which is becoming increasingly popular. The main benefits include a more comprehensive range of knowledge, stimulating creativity, reaching solutions faster, and meeting the social needs of team members. Also significant is the synergy effect, in which the team's performance is higher than the sum of the individual performances (Plamínek, 2018b). Disadvantages include suppression of individuality, potential conflicts, groupthink, social laziness, and the need to accept a common goal (Křivánek, 2019). Groupthink can manifest itself in well-functioning teams and leads to the suppression of opposing opinions, which can negatively affect decision-making.

In team management, personality tests are increasingly used for optimizing team performance and efficiency. Some of the most well-known personality tests include the MBTI (Myers-Briggs Type Indicator) (Siakas & Siakas, 2014; Tennant et al., 2011), which categorizes personalities based on four dimensions, such as extraversion vs. introversion, senses vs. intuition, and more (Armstrong et al., 2015). This test is famous mainly due to its ability to reveal individual preferences in thinking and decision-making, allowing for better understanding among team members. Another renowned test is the Big Five (five-factor personality model), which examines personality according to five essential traits: openness, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism. This model provides a comprehensive view of the human personality and allows you to identify how an individual reacts to different situations, which is crucial in managing team dynamics (Löhken, 2014). In the corporate environment, the DISC test is also often used, focusing on four basic styles of behaviour: dominance, influence, constancy, and conscientiousness. This test is used to understand better individual team members' communication styles and preferences, which can significantly facilitate collaboration and conflict resolution. Other tools include the Hogan Method, which measures personality in the context of the work environment, and the 16-personality test, which is a simplified version of the MBTI. Each of these tests has its own specific value and helps managers and HR specialists better understand workers' personality traits. Although all of these tests offer useful insights into individuals in terms of teamwork effectiveness, it is advisable to focus on the Belbin Test of Team Roles. Unlike other tests that focus on individual personality traits, the Belbin test focuses on team dynamics and how different personalities work together. It identifies nine team roles that reflect the individual's natural contribution to the team, helping to create a more efficient group. This test allows you to optimize the distribution of tasks and ensure that the team uses the full potential of all members, which is key to achieving success in projects and team goals.

The Belbin Test of Team Roles (Flores-Parra et al., 2018; Gutiérrez et al., 2019), developed by British management expert Meredith Belbin, is one of the most widely used tools for identifying team roles. Its main idea is that the effectiveness of a team is not only determined by the expertise and skills of individual members but also by the roles each of them occupies in the group. According to Belbin, the team works best when it comprises people with complementary roles. The test identifies nine primary roles, including the innovator (the one who comes up with new ideas), the former (the person who energetically pushes the team to achieve goals), the coordinator (the one who takes care of the smooth running of the team), or the team player (the person who ensures harmony and support among members) (Khelerová, 2010). Each role has its strengths and weaknesses. For example, an innovator may be great at generating new ideas but sometimes lacks attention to detail or practicality. The Belbin test is a helpful tool for better understanding team dynamics, identifying weak points, and optimizing the composition of teams to achieve the best possible results. Although the Belbin personality test has long been considered an effective instrument, its limitations must not be overlooked. Its static view of personality and its limitation to 9 basic roles can be considered as bottlenecks. Despite several authors are adding to the roles, such as Plamínek's addition of the role of dictator or recluse, Belbin's view of human diversity is considerably simplistic. Another limiting factor for validity may be context, corporate and national culture, which may give different roles different weight in different settings, or ignoring situational factors. The Belbin test is available in many countries, including the Czech Republic, where its use is licensed and subject to training. This tool is often used in the corporate environment when building and evaluating teams.

For the needs of the article, the monitored criteria were defined based on authors (Aparicio Fenoll & Zaccagni, 2022; Junker et al., 2022; Paros et al., 2022; Pavez et al., 2022) and at the same time to enable the transfer of data into numerical form and subsequently their graphic display. Each of the criteria reflects the level of teamwork, which is closely related to the effectiveness of communication, the atmosphere within the team and the commitment of its members. If the team communicates appropriately, it can plan accurately and meet the set deadlines, which usually leads to staying on budget—

such cooperation results in an effective and successful team that can be considered well-composed. The first criterion is productivity. Within the scrum approach, this is expressed by the number of completed user stories during individual sprints. Each sprint is scheduled according to the complexity and difficulty of the team's tasks. Productivity is therefore not only measured by the absolute number of completed tasks but, above all, by how the team can deal with work difficulty during the sprint. The second criterion concerns the budget, which is critical in the business environment. It is monitored whether the teams can meet the set financial framework. The budget is expressed as a percentage to make the financial data comprehensible. Any deviations in the budget may arise for various reasons, such as savings when borrowing tools from another department or, conversely, increased costs due to overtime, which represents additional person-hours. For graphical processing, the values are converted to decimals, improving the visualisations' clarity and accuracy.

The third criterion is the dates, divided into three consecutive sprints. Each sprint lasts three weeks, with a standard time allowance of 40 hours each week. The total time for the completion of the project is, therefore, nine weeks. However, teams can complete sprints earlier if they complete all assigned tasks. The remaining days are not considered downtime but are used to start the next sprint immediately, which increases work efficiency. Another criterion is the success of testing intermediate results. The quality of the delivered outputs is essential for the team's success, so testing is carried out twice a week during each sprint. A well-functioning team should be able to deliver usable and high-quality outputs. The overall success rate of the tests performed by each team during the sprints is measured. The fifth criterion focuses on communication in the team. Daily meetings are crucial to maintaining team coordination and effective planning within the Scrum methodology. This criterion, therefore, monitors how often teams hold these meetings and how they meet within a maximum of 15 meetings per sprint. The last monitored criterion is planning accuracy, referred to as throughput. This indicator evaluates how well the team can estimate the scope of individual user stories. Effective communication and feedback are signs of good planning. If the estimates are accurate and agree among team members, it shows their high knowledge of the issue and understanding of the assignment. On the other hand, low throughput can mean that the team does not understand the task well enough, leading to inefficient performance. The team leader, called the scrum master, can also use this metric to validate members' attention by assigning illogical guesses and observing whether the team critically evaluates and adjusts these evaluations or accepts them without thinking. The main aim of the paper is to compare two selected teams, one of them was formed naturally and the other one was formed on the basis of Belbin's personality test. The aim was to explore how the effectiveness and performance of these teams would differ and what the key areas of success or setback would be.

2 Methods

The article's main objective is to prove, based on the research of small teams, that it is possible to achieve higher results of the monitored criteria by appropriate selection and with the help of personality tests when assembling teams. Data collection occurred in the spring of 2024, specifically from early January to early March. The data was obtained based on cooperation with the HR department, where the company itself monitored some of the criteria for a long time, and others were added to the monitoring for the needs of the work. For the needs of the research, two small project teams (8 people) were created. The primary sample consisted of employees of a company focused on industrial technologies. They used deliberate methods, i.e., non-random selection, and approximately 20 potential members were addressed. The final teams consisted of eight members each, as the work required different professional specializations and knowledge. At the same time, the team size also corresponded to the recommendations from the professional literature (Doležal, 2023b) about team size and interpersonal relationship management. The main characteristic of Team A was its natural formation when colleagues who are used to working together have already done some everyday activities and can be said to be able to work together. The five-member core of the team was supplemented by three other employees who were finishing their work in other positions during the preparation of the project. On the other hand, Team B was created completely anew and artificially, using the results of the Belbin test of team roles to cover individual positions as best as possible. The main limiting factor for the formation of Team B was the availability factor. The project, which was used to monitor selected criteria and compare teams' performance, dealt with software optimization of industrial robots. Therefore, when assembling the team, emphasis was placed on sufficient representation of technically oriented roles. A total of six critical criteria were determined, including productivity measured by the number of user stories completed, adherence to the budget, adherence to the time allocation, i.e. deadlines, the success of testing, the number of daily meetings held, i.e. the criterion of communication efficiency, and the parameter of planning accuracy, which make it possible to monitor the performance of the team and assess whether its composition has an impact on its success. The selected criteria are loosely based on the KPI or Key Performance Indicator methodology. This methodology collects indicators that express the quality, efficiency or performance of an enterprise or its department.

Tools from the field of decision analysis were chosen as the critical methods of data processing. As a part of the broader scientific field of statistics, decision analysis focuses primarily on comparing and determining the usually best or most advantageous variant of the options offered, i.e., processing the decision problem. A decision-making problem is a situation where either criteria are compared concerning one fundamental piece of information or criteria against several pieces of information, i.e. variants. The data obtained were processed in the second way, i.e. multi-criteria analysis (Plzáková, 2023). The criteria are characterized by unambiguous formulation, logical interconnection with each other and for the goal under investigation, limitation of the number of phenomena monitored concerning the difficulty of the decision-making problem and, last but not least, evaluation using assigned weights. Weight means the significance of a given criterion, i.e. a criterion of very relevance will be evaluated with 10 points on a scale of 1 – 10. In contrast, a criterion of lower to negligible significance will be evaluated, for example, with only 2 points (Plzáková, 2023). Three weighting tools were used to maintain the most remarkable possible objectivity when monitoring the teams. These include 1) the scoring method, the interval of which depends on the discretion of the questioner and consists of the distribution of points according to the most objective consideration; 2) Metfessel allocation, which is based on the principle of simply assigning 100 points between the criteria, i.e. the weight is the ratio of the awarded points to the whole, 3) Saaty's method, which is based on Fuller's paired comparison, which he further specifies (Fotr et al., 2003). The main stage of data processing consisted of a calculation using 1) the weighted sum method, 2) the base variant method and 3) the utility sum method. Each of the variants of the calculation looked at the data in a different way, so the combination of 3 different approaches aimed to increase the validity of the conclusion. The main intermediate result was always to find the team order in the area of the given criterion in the sprint. From these intermediate results, a purpose function was calculated, which expressed the result for a given sprint. A team whose purpose achieved a better rating in 2 out of 3 methods used was always mentioned as more effective.

3 Research results

Team A was created naturally and without the use of any above-standard personnel management tools. In retrospect, the roles represented were determined to be represented by the team consisting of 1. resource finder, 2. team player, 3. team player, 4. team player, 5—specialist, 6. implementer, 7. implementer and 8. evaluator. From the view of the team composition, the absence of the finisher and innovator is noticeable, where the role of the innovator is especially critical due to the nature of the project with a focus on software optimization. At the same time, there is not a single role in the team that would be dedicated to team management or delegation of tasks, i.e. the role of coordinator or former. On the contrary, a team player is represented several times, which predicts a pleasant and friendly working atmosphere but can lead to inefficiency. To maintain objectivity, it is necessary to highlight the coverage of the role of the specialist and evaluator, together with the two implementers who can work on testing and implementing new solutions. The aim of assembling Team B with the help of the Belbin test was to fill the individual roles in the team as optimally as possible to achieve the best possible work results. Three main limiting factors consistently worked in the composition of Team B: the availability of suitable workers on time, the technical knowledge required for the project, and Trying to cover roles as diversified as possible. Due to working in a natural environment with limited human, financial and time resources, it was not possible to fill all the roles as presented in the theoretical part, but there was a natural overlap between them, which brought a positive synergic effect in the end. The newly assembled team consisted of: 1. coordinator, 2. innovator, 3. specialist, 4. specialist, 5. implementer, 6. team player, 7. evaluator and 8. finisher.

The actual work with the data was divided into two directly related steps. In the first step, weights were assigned to the individual criteria on the basis of the above-mentioned methods, i.e. the significance of the individual criteria was determined. As part of the interaction with the members of the project teams, scoring, i.e. determining the weights, was entrusted to them. Workers in each team were given 25 points, which they were to divide among six criteria according to their own notability preference. The sum of the individual points of each criterion is then determined by its significance. To give you a better idea of the character of the team, the absolute difference in the distribution of points was also calculated, where the most minor point difference between the teams was given to the productivity criterion, which both teams had in the first place. On the other hand, the lowest level of agreement was in the significance of the planning criterion, where the difference was 16 points. Team B collectively considered the planning parameter to be essential and assigned it second place, while Team A ranked the criterion 6th, i.e. last. During the conversion of weights using the scoring method, Metfessel allocation and Saaty method, the correctness of the calculation was confirmed. Since it was necessary to unify the opinions and preferences of both teams in a certain way, the calculation was performed by the classical arithmetic mean. These values are further used in all calculations.

The monitored project consisted of 3 consecutive sprints, where one sprint consisted of three consecutive working weeks, i.e. 15 days. Information about the sprint was always recorded in the appropriate table of input data. It summarized the criteria, their planned scope and the actual values fulfilled by both teams. The table was the basis for calculations according to the base variant method, the utility sum method and the order-weighted sum method (Zmatlík, 2024).

Figure 1 1: Table of input data, sprint no. 1.

	Productivity	budget	terms	Testing suc- cess rate	communica- tion	planning
Team A	16	97%	13	5	13	8
Team B	14	104%	15	6	15	10
Extent	16 user stories	100%	3 weeks	6 tests	15 daily mee- tings	Accuracy 1- 10

Source 1: Own processing.

Comparing the first sprint, it is clear that Team A, which was created naturally, did not experience problems in the area of productivity. It even managed to deliver the assigned work two days earlier, even with the absence of the role of the former coordinator. There were no problems, even if the budget criterion was met, and the team was even able to create savings by working effectively with other departments of the company. It is evident that the high success rate of the testing was the result of the presence of two implementers. The bottleneck of the first sprint was communication. The degree of accuracy of planning is acceptable.

Although a representative of the role of the so-called coordinator was also a member of Team B, the team exceeded the budget by 4% and failed to deliver the specified number of user stories on time. However, it is necessary to highlight the active role of the implementer and finisher, who were responsible for testing partial intermediates and supervising the holding of the daily meetings. It can be considered that in the first semester, i.e. the first 3 weeks of the project, the team went through the typical phases of getting used to the team, which include norming and storming, and only then follows the practical performing phase.

In the calculation according to the utility sum method, it is evident that team A was generally more mature and effective in the first sprint.

Figure 2 Table of input data, sprint 2.

	Productivity	budget	terms	Testing suc- cess rate	communica- tion	planning
Team A	17	98,5%	15	6	12	9
Team B	19	102%	18	4	15	7
Extent	19 user stories	100%	3 weeks	6 tests	15 daily mee- tings	Accuracy 1- 10

Source 2: Own processing.

In the second sprint, the number of user stories entered by the company increased, and team A did not deliver all, so the absence of a coordinator is still evident. The absence of the role of the coordinator began to become apparent. In terms of budget, team A managed to stay below the planned limit in this sprint and was also able to increase the number of successfully performed tests. Stagnation or resignation is visible in the criterion of communication, i.e. the number of daily meetings. At the same time, however, it is necessary to highlight the role of the evaluator, who reworked the method of planning based on the data from the previous sprint and thus managed to increase its accuracy. Team A was still well functioning, probably due to the strong representation of team players.

Thanks to specialists, Team B managed to deliver the required number of user stories in the second sprint, but at the expense of a three-day delay. Although the team exceeded the deadline, they were able to coordinate their finances better and only exceeded the budget by 2% over the set limit. The decrease came in the criterion of success of testing when team B fell to only four successful tests out of 6 attempts. However, the company also perceived this result as positive. In the

area of communication, Team B maintained a set regime of 1 meeting per day, but a slight deterioration occurred in the area of scheduling accuracy.

The calculations showed that even in the second sprint, Team A still proved to be more efficient, clearly in all three methods of calculation.

Figure 3 Table of input data, sprint 3.

	Productivity	budget	terms	Testing suc- cess rate	communica- tion	planning
Team A	24	96%	16	4	14	7
Team B	24	100%	15	6	15	9
Extent	24 user stories	100%	3 weeks	6 tests	15 daily mee- tings	Accuracy 1- 10

Source 3: Own processing.

In the last sprint, both teams were able to fill the set number of user stories, but in the case of team A, there was a one-day delay. However, there was no problem in completing and handing over the project due to the previously created time reserve. At the same time, Team A kept expenses below budget and was able to increase the number of daily meetings that employees collectively began to attach more importance to during the project. However, the accuracy in the planning and delegation of work within the team section has decreased.

At the end of the monitored period, the functionality of Team B was fully demonstrated, which clearly recorded the most successful sprint. Team B delivered all the assigned tasks within the set deadline and in high quality, which they believed and confirmed the 100% success rate of testing. For the first time, Team B was able to keep to the prepared budget, where the increasingly precise work of the coordinator in the area of delegation of work and other resources is evident. Team B also maintained its typically high level of daily meetings.

It was not until the last sprint that the internal compatibility and synergy of Team B were fully demonstrated when the calculations clearly marked Team B as more efficient. Team B occupied the position of leader in all three calculation methods, as it achieved the desired values of objective functions. The leading difference that Team B managed to create was 0.49 units.

In addition to quantitative data, qualitative data were also found through group discussions, which were to marginally complement the conclusions obtained by the calculation and possibly reveal other strengths or weaknesses of work in the created teams. The discussion focused on questions such as the strengths and weaknesses of cooperation in the team, how employees perceived the presence and intensity of roles, and whether the composition of the team had an impact on the results delivered.

The discussion showed that the A team especially appreciated the high level of mutual trust, felt the positive synergy effect and was able to complete all the assigned tasks. On the other hand, he perceived as a weakness the loss of objectivity, grouping and a certain degree of neglect of planning and communication duties, which probably arose from a certain indolence and collectively higher self-confidence of the naturally formed team.

In the environment of Team B, the complementary skills of the selected roles and the effort to communicate as effectively as possible, based on a high level of engagement of team members, were significantly evident. At the same time, a positive synergistic effect was manifested here, along with higher objectivity in decision-making. The team perceived the overloading of specific roles as a weakness, while the incomplete use of the work capacities of the roles of others and the associated lower degree of flexibility.

The results of the self observation coincide with the current literature, confirming and supporting its thesis on the importance of cooperation between the HR department and the company's employees. The findings highlight the importance of combining team performance monitoring tools, i.e. quantitative and qualitative methods. They also point to the importance of maintaining a diversity of roles in the team when circumstances allow, since Team B, which was composed on the basis of personality characteristics and had a greater diversity of team roles, was ultimately able to achieve higher results on the criteria monitored. One of the key finding is the necessary communication support, where Team A missed several of the daily meetings, creating "blind spots" that led to delays in the work. Recommendation for the business would be to introduce regular reporting on internal communication and meetings as well as ongoing

performance monitoring. In the absence of a key role, the company should respond by assigning a suitable person to an existing team. Companies could take inspiration from Blebin's team role test when selecting employees, especially in the case of long-term projects where it is desirable to cover diversity. Similarly, companies should not be reluctant to change the composition of the team and, if financial possibilities allow, extend their HR tests to include other forms of personality testing. The more comprehensive information a company can obtain about its employees, the better it can work with human capital and talent development.

4 Conclusions

The results show that although the company provides its employees with quality working conditions, several essential factors have been identified that the company should take into account in the future when creating teams. One of the main findings is the importance of the diversity of roles in the team. The data show that teams that were built on the basis of diverse personality characteristics and that included a more comprehensive range of team roles performed better. The complementarity of individual members contributed to the synergy effect, which led to higher productivity and successful completion of projects. Creating teams with a balanced mix of personality types seems to be a critical factor in achieving better results. Another important aspect is the promotion of communication (Rehan et al., 2024). Although teams approached communication differently, information sharing and regular reporting proved essential to the success of team collaboration. Teams that regularly shared their knowledge and experience achieved better results than those that relied only on informal communication. Therefore, the company should ensure regular meetings and information sharing, even in smaller teams, to avoid information gaps. The last important finding is the continuous monitoring of team performance. This made it possible to identify weaknesses in the work of individual teams and to identify missing roles. In the case of longer-term projects, it would be advantageous if the HR department had the opportunity to respond flexibly to these deficiencies and add a missing member to the team, which would increase the overall efficiency of work. As part of the recommendations, the company should emphasize the selection of employees with suitable leadership and organizational skills for leadership roles in teams. If the company's financial possibilities allow, it would also be appropriate to extend the testing of personality characteristics of team leaders beyond the Belbin test, which would provide the company with a more comprehensive overview of the potential of employees and allow them to use their talents and abilities better.

The article has several limitations that may affect its conclusions. First, the study analyzed only two teams, which limits the generalizability of the findings to a broader population. Additionally, the focus was on a specific industry and project type (software optimization for industrial robots), which may restrict its applicability to other sectors. The use of the Belbin test as the primary tool for optimizing team performance is another limitation, as it focuses on team roles and may not account for other crucial factors, such as specialized expertise or environmental dynamics. Moreover, the team's performance evaluation was based on quantitative criteria, potentially overlooking critical qualitative aspects of teamwork, such as motivation and interpersonal relationships. The results may also be influenced by contextual factors, such as organizational culture (Almarashdah, 2024) or the team members' previous experiences, which were not explored in depth. Due to the limitations mentioned above, the findings are only intended to complement the broader and more extensive studies that are being produced on the topic of the combination of human resources managerial tools and agile management. The findings of the study should serve as background information and insight into the situation and success of the use of HR tools in medium-sized companies in Central Europe.

Acknowledgement

This article was created with the support of the project GAJU 068/2024/S.

References

- Almarashdah, M. A. (2024). The role of organizational culture on the relationship between employee training and job performance in Jordan. *Uncertain Supply Chain Management*, 12(1), 505–512. doi: 10.5267/j.uscm.2023.9.002.
- Aparicio Fenoll, A., & Zaccagni, S. (2022). Gender mix and team performance: Differences between exogenously and endogenously formed teams. *Labour Economics*, 79. doi: 10.1016/j.labeco.2022.102269.
- Armstrong, M., Taylor, S., & Šikýř, M. (2015). *Řízení lidských zdrojů: Moderní pojetí a postupy: 13. vydání*. Grada Publishing.
- Doležal, J. (2016). *Projektový management: Komplexně, prakticky a podle světových standardů* (První vydání). Grada Publishing.
- Doležal, J. (2023a). *Projektový management* (2. vydání). Grada Publishing.
- Doležal, J. (2023b). *Projektový management* (2. vydání). Grada Publishing.

- Flores-Parra, J.-M., Castafon-Puga, M., Evans, R. D., Rosales-Cisneros, R., & Gaxiola-Pacheco, C. (2018). *Towards Team Formation Using Belbin Role Types and a Social Networks Analysis Approach*. 2018 IEEE Technology and Engineering Management Conference, TEMSCON 2018. doi: 10.1109/TEMSCON.2018.8488386.
- Fotr, J., Dědina, J., & Hřůzová, H. (2003). *Manažerské rozhodování* (Vyd. 3., upr.rozš). Ekopress.
- Gutiérrez, L., Flores, V., Keith, B., & Quelopana, A. (2019). Using the Belbin method and models for predicting the academic performance of engineering students. *Computer Applications in Engineering Education*, 27(2), 500–509. doi: 10.1002/cae.22092.
- Junker, T. L., Bakker, A. B., Gorgievski, M. J., & Derks, D. (2022). Agile work practices and employee proactivity: A multilevel study. *Human Relations*, 75(12), 2189–2217. doi: 10.1177/00187267211030101.
- Khelerová, V. (2010). *Komunikační a obchodní dovednosti manažera* (3., dopl. vyd). Grada.
- Korecký, M., & Trkovský, V. (2011). *Management rizik projektů: Se zaměřením na projekty v průmyslových podnicích* (1. vyd). Grada.
- Křivánek, M. (2019). *Dynamické vedení a řízení projektů: Systémovým myšlením k úspěšným projektům* (První vydání). Grada.
- Löhken, S. (2014). *Introverti a extroverti: Jak spolu vycházet a vzájemně se doplňovat* (1. české vyd). Grada.
- Paros, A., Kelly, P. S., & Sprinkle, T. A. (2022). Enhancing project team outcomes despite provisional work: A discussion to leverage cross-generational advantages. *Team Performance Management*, 28(3–4), 191–204. doi: 10.1108/TPM-08-2021-0059.
- Pavez, I., Gómez, H., Liu, C., & González, V. A. (2022). Measuring project team performance: A review and conceptualization. *International Journal of Project Management*, 40(8), 951–971. doi: 10.1016/j.ijproman.2022.11.001.
- Plamínek, J. (2018a). *Vedení lidí, týmů a firem: Praktický atlas managementu* (5., aktualizované a rozšířené vydání). Grada.
- Plamínek, J. (2018b). *Vedení lidí, týmů a firem: Praktický atlas managementu* (5., aktualizované a rozšířené vydání). Grada.
- Rehan, A., Thorpe, D., & Heravi, A. (2024). Project success factors for leadership practices and communication: Challenges in the construction sector. *International Journal of Managing Projects in Business*, 17(3), 562–590. doi: 10.1108/IJMPB-12-2023-0279.
- Siakas, K., & Siakas, E. (2014). A contemporary team process management model to enhance multicultural and multidisciplinary virtual team performance. *International Journal of Networking and Virtual Organisations*, 15(1), 65–79. doi: 10.1504/IJNVO.2015.069299.
- Svozilová, A. (2016). *Projektový management: Systémový přístup k řízení projektů* (3., aktualizované a rozšířené vydání). Grada Publishing.
- Tennant, S., Langford, D., & Murray, M. (2011). Construction site management team working: A serendipitous event. *Journal of Management in Engineering*, 27(4), 220–228. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)ME.1943-5479.0000053.
- Plzáková Lucie and Jiří Fejfar, (2023). E-book: Decision Analysis (online). Prague: ČVUT. Retrieved from: <https://moodle-vyuka.cvut.cz/>
- Zmatlík, Jiří, (2023). *Decision Analysis* (online). Prague: ČVUT. Retrieved from: <https://moodle-vyuka.cvut.cz/>