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Abstract

The aim of the research is to compare teamwork competencies in the matters of school administration and educators in the aspects of groupthink (avoidance) and social loaﬁng.

The article focuses on the following research question: what essential differences and similarities of teamwork competencies could be highlighted between the educators and school administration in the aspects of groupthink (avoidance) and social loaﬁng; can we treat the team affected by the groupthink and social loaﬁng as a team? The three parts of the article aim to answer these questions. The first part focuses on the features of activity of effective team and potential obstacles. The second part introduces the methodology on research of teamwork competencies from the point of view of school environment and administration and the activity of educators. The third part summarizes the data of the research, highlighting teamwork competencies of school administration and educators, helping to avoid the phenomenon of groupthink and social loaﬁng in team work.
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Introduction

Development of team work and building effective teams is important for modern organizations, as the results of team work are considerably better than those of work results of persons working individually. Evident advantages of the team work are: the quality of work is higher, the results are better, individual skills have more chances to be revealed; ﬂexibility and capability of adopting the changes are also important. Overseas (Dubrin, 1995; Stoner, 1999; Levi, 2001; Stephen, 2003) and Lithuanian (Tamošiūnas, 1999; Vijeikienė and Vijeikis, 2000; Želvys, 2001; Barvydienė and Kasulis, 2001) researchers have focused team work and its importance, analyzing the differences of the team and the group, the formation of the team, roles and the features of effective team. The researchers pay less attention to the analysis of the lacks of team work (e.g. groupthink, social loaﬁng, etc.) disturbing the common team work, while seeking for better and more effective work results.

Today, people are apt to gather into groups while seeking for common goal, more effective work, using the knowledge, skills and experience of other people. However, only properly organized team work and the competencies of the members of the team may condition effective team work and the realization of its goals in seeking for minimal groupthink and social loaﬁng (as elements of negative expression of team work).

Groupthink decreases the efficiency of team work, as opposite opinion is often rejected. As a result, the members of the team conceal their ideas or alternatives agreeing with the majority of the team. Concealing opposite opinion prevents formation and discussion of possible alternatives, decreasing the efficiency of team work; consequently, wrong problem solution is elected.

Social loaﬁng decreases the efficiency of team work, as individual work of every member in the team is worse than in the case when the person works alone, as the members reduce individual efforts in the team. With the phenomenon of social loaﬁng in the team, the members stimulate conﬂicts, as the social loafer ‘puts’ the least efforts.

The research problem includes the following questions:

1. What essential differences and similarities of teamwork competencies can be highlighted between the educators and school administration in the aspects of groupthink (avoidance) and social loaﬁng?
2. Can we treat the team affected by the groupthink and social loaﬁng as a team?

The aim of the article is to compare teamwork competencies of school administration and educators in the aspects of groupthink (avoidance) and social loaﬁng.

The article consists of three parts: the ﬁrst part focuses on the features of activity of effective team and potential obstacles. The second part introduces the methodology of research of teamwork competencies in the attitudes of school environment and administration and the activity of educators. The third part summarizes the data of the research, highlighting teamwork competencies of school administration and educators, helping to avoid the phenomenon of groupthink and social loaﬁng in team work.

The Features of Effective Team Work

The analysis of research literature that showed effective team combines the elements of cooperation and competition (Stephen, 2003). The members of such team help each other to reach the best personal results. Tamošiūnas (1999) points out that the activity of the team is only effective when the group capable of focusing and
using the abilities of all members while fulfilling the tasks. Their descriptions of the team are very similar. Stephen highlights cooperation while aiming for the common goal, whereas Tamošiūnas (1999) underlines togetherness of the team, as only concentrated teams reflect cooperation, help and respect to the other members of the team; concentrated team is the only capable of reaching perfect work results. Žydiūnaitė (2003), on the contrary does not dissociate the effectiveness from the goal of the team, which is implemented with the commonality of interests of the team members.

Stephen (2003), Law et al (2001), Robbins et al (1995) analyzed the factors determining the effectiveness of team work. In this case, the effectiveness of the team is estimated according to the quality of work of the team, estimation by the leaders and the satisfaction of the members of the team with work in the team. Although the teams are very different, these researchers made a list of main factors determining the effectiveness of team work and divided them into four categories: design of work, structure, content and process.

**Design of work** consists of autonomy, the variety of skills, common tasks of the team. Independence and autonomy are the most important concepts for the design of work, as it enables various skills and knowledge to be used (Stephen, 2003). In order to reach effective team work, the members of the team must work together and be responsible for fulfilments of important tasks. The work of the team members must be motivated, as it enhances responsibility for implemented tasks, but the implementation of designated tasks must answer individual needs of the worker. Skills and competence are extremely important while implementing team tasks.

**Structure** consists of variety of competencies, personalities and the size and flexibility of the team. This category comprises of features that should be the indicators while choosing the members of the team. The competence of the team members is very important: the variety of roles must be ensured for the members of the team, considering the size of the group, the flexibility of the team members, as this is the only situation when the team members fulfill their tasks and the tasks of other team member (when it is necessary for a certain assignment). The size of the team is very important for its effective work: DuBrin (1995) claims that the team consisting of 6-8 members is the most effective. The members of such a team have better conditions in reaching common goals of the team, as the team experiences less stress and has more agreement, respect and responsibility.

**Content** consists of adequate resources, management, work assessment and reward. The features of this category define the aspects influencing the productivity of work. The team must have necessary work instruments and a leader or manager, trust each other and especially the leader, get the evaluation of work and reward for fulfilled work. These are the conditions for effective functioning of the team.

**Process** is the dedication of the team members for a common goal, identification of specific tasks, manageable level of conflicts and the participation of all members of the team in common activity. Motivation is extremely important as the team members are striving for a common goal – common goal of the team meets individual goals and needs of a person (as a team member). The goal of the team should not be too difficult to reach in order not to worry or scare the members of the team.

Robbins et al (1995) highlights the homogeneity and heterogeneity of the team members. The members have vital influence on the effective team work. The more similar the personalities of the members of the team, their values, attitudes and their qualification are, the stronger homogeneity of the team is guaranteed. Therefore, ‘homogenous’ members of the team are more subject to effective and balanced work than those heterogeneous, as people with different opinions, values, personalities can be an important inconvenience for the communication of the team, i.e. various conflicts related to tasks or emotions may occur. The authors of this article claim the opinion that only “homogenous” personalities must form effective team is subjective, as various difficulties may complicate this case, such as incapability of analyzing alternative solutions.

The teams are dynamic and rapidly changing, they mature, strengthen and in many cases even become more productive. Still the danger of failure team always remains, i.e. friendly relations may become more important than the tasks. Law et al (2001) highlights the reasons that may condition the failure of the team:

- the prominence of the task is too high;
- too little attention for the process;
- too little time for discussions and debates;
- too little attention for the solutions of problems;
- too little attention and time for the evaluation of achievements;
- too little attention for developing competencies and relationships.

Law et al (2001) draws on the features highlighted by Coolican (1996) – the features making the team ineffective. Law et al (2001) claims that the members of the team must be chosen very carefully, as they must certainly strive for a common goal and represent the whole organization not just the team. Uncertain goal may also be a feature of inefficiency, when the members of the team do not understand their tasks and how they should be done. Internecine distrust may also harm effective team work. It disturbs the process of fulfilling provided work and is an obstacle while reaching the goals, as various misunderstandings relating communication and cooperation may occur.

Seeking to gather an effective team, attention must be paid to the goal of the team – it must be clear and intelligible to all members of the team: 1) the goal of the team must answer individual needs of every member of the team; 2) the team should not be big, as it is an environment for common agreement, respect and responsibility; 3) the team must be concentrated – it is a condition for effective communication and cooperation; 4) the members of the team are reliant to each other, therefore they are responsible for their own activities and functions and also for effective work of every member of the team.
The Factors Causing Decrease of Work Efficiency: Groupthink (Avoidance) and Social Loafing

Working in teams, their members meet difficulties causing inefficiency of team work. The pressure for the members of the team to agree with other members is one of the biggest problems in the team. One of the difficulties of team work is groupthink.

In groupthink, Plotnik (1998) highlights acceptance of ideas without critical analysis. Janis (2003) understands groupthink as a psychological constraint, depressing the alternatives. Huffman (2003) claims that groupthink appears when the group is very cohesive and attractive and is seeking for agreement, avoiding contradictory opinions; consequently, it results in a wrong decision making. Janis (2003) agrees with this opinion claiming that the more the members of the team are responsible for the goal of the team, the less they begin to hide behind someone's back. The main consequences of the groupthink syndrome making the team work ineffective are: unvalued alternatives of the members of the team, lack of necessary information, the members of the team are incapable of choosing important information for executable work. Other important consequences of groupthink are incapability of the team to analyze the risk of chosen decision in advance and preparing the plans of avoiding the unexpected (Janis, 2003).

Groupthink discourages the team from finding optimal solution: (some) of the members of the team, appreciating unity, adjust to the opinion of one or a few other members, concealing their opposed opinion and not accepting responsibility. Thus, possible alternatives are not formed and discussed, thereby reducing efficiency of the team work. In order to avoid the consequences of groupthink, every member of the team must have a chance to express his opinion and every member of the team must be prevented of passivity. Opinions of every member of the team must be heard, analyzed and evaluated rather than rejected right away (Nevid, 2003).

Groupthink emerges as a consequence of group pressure and negation of different opinions (Huffman, 2003). The members of the team change their opinion, attitude, accepting the opinion of the others; consequently the decision made may be poor and wrong. In making the decisions, people are apt to support unity rather than worry about a better decision. Groupthink often appears as a consequence of the team valuing relations more than fulfillment of tasks (Nevid, 2003). The members of the team admire the search of coincidence of opinions; striving for consensus overwhelms realistic evaluation of alternative actions and prevents the expression of unpopular and disagreeing with the majority attitudes, thus lacking critical analysis of the opinions.

Another factor depressing the team work is social loafing. This concept means people being part of the team waste less efforts than they would waste working alone (Nevid, 2003). Researchers (e.g., Nevid, 2003; Stephen, 2003) note that social loafing relates to team work, as in the case of a few people working together, some of the members of the team start simulating, not wasting individual efforts.

The size of the team is a crucial factor for the concept of social loafing. Levi (2001) claims that the teams of approximately seven people are capable of effective actions. Thus, the more members are in the team, the less the input of every member of the team, as social loafing appears. Garrison et al (1997) admits social loafing decreases the efficiency of team work, as individual work in the team of every member is worse than individual work alone. This is a result of the members working in the team decreasing individual efforts.

Psychologists (Garrison, 1997; Wortman, 1999) claim that social loafing appears when individual work in the team can not be evaluated and the members of the team do not seek for hard and effective work. Stephen (2003) highlights another problem, often found in the teams, related to social loafing – avoidance of personal responsibility.

Levi (2001) claims that social loafing is one of the greatest motivation problems in the teams. When there are no strict work allocations for every member of the team, motiveless person often ‘beats’ without input into the team work. In order to avoid social loafing between the members of the team while making decisions and achieving common goals, attention must be paid to the input and efforts of every member of the team. The members of the team must be evaluated, as this enables individual efforts of every member to be used effectively, thereby meeting individual needs of the members of the team.

Large team is a favourable environment for social loafing, as the larger the group, the less responsibility and individual efforts are expressed – the members believe someone else should help while reaching common goals (Levi, 2001). If the number of the members of the team is too big compared to the efforts needed for the task, the members of the team have less willingness in taking part in the fulfilments of the task and taking responsibility for the future of the team, compared to the teams with a number of members that is too small for fulfilments of the task.

Thus we can claim that in order to work effectively in the team and seeking to avoid social loafing, the members of the team must be responsible for the goal of the team, work process and results, or else some members of the team may begin ‘hiding behind someone’s back’. The efforts and work of every member of the team must be evaluated. Effective teams are the only preventing this tendency, taking responsibility both for the whole team and its every member. The whole team is responsible for the common goal of the team, but every member of the team must realize what specific activity he personally is responsible for.

Research Methodology

The scope. The scope of the research is convenient – close and easily found persons were chosen. Selection criteria of the convenient scope – the administration and
educators of comprehensive schools of Kaunas and Kelme towns and regions. One hundred and ninety respondents were questioned – 12 school principals, 32 vice-principals, and 146 teachers. Thirteen schools took part in the research executed in April, 2005.

Women are the majority (85%) in the sample of written survey. Men constitute only 13% in the sample of the research. The respondents of different age are in the scope of the research. The respondents aged 46-55 are dominating, more than ¼ of the respondents are aged 36-45. The least parts of the respondents are aged over 65, 19-25 and 55-65 years.

The method of data collection. The research was executed using the method of written survey. The research is quantitative, structural, information was collected using a questionnaire made of closed questions – statements. The duration of the research was 3 weeks. The feedback of the research was quite high, 210 questionnaires were handed out and 190 (90%) were given back.

The research instrument. The questionnaire was composed using theoretical conceptions of Robbins et al (1995), Tamošiūnas (1999), Barvydienė and Kasiulis (2001), Lukauskaitė (2000), Smilga and Bosas (1999), Dubrin (1995), Žydžiūnaitė (2003), Stewart et al (1999), Crawley (1996), Coolican (1996); Plotnik (1998); Levi (2001); Huffman (2003); Janis (2003); Nevid (2003). Eight blocks of questions compiled the questionnaire; they consisted of 109 closed statements striving to exclude different groups of capabilities of group members according to the effective features of the team work: togetherness, communication, cooperation, controlling of conflicts, management, the goal of the team, groupthink (avoidance) and social loafing (avoidance). This article introduces one block of statements, striving to determine teamwork competencies of groupthink and social loafing (avoidance). The results of the survey showed the administration (X=3,39; SD=0,72) is more capable of arguing than the educators (X=2,96; SD=0,72). This means the administration is more capable of expressing even opposite opinion or attitude, as it is capable of defending and arguing own opinion. Therefore, we can presume that school administration avoids group cognition in team work more often than the educators.

The results of comparing teamwork competencies in the aspect of group cognition of educators and school administration show that the opinions of administration and educators are more united and related to the following teamwork competencies: capability of analyzing, criticizing, evaluating, motivating. The latter teamwork competencies are less developed in the case of educators than in the case of school administration. Therefore, we can claim the educators are more apt to groupthink than the personnel of school administration, as they strive for agreement avoiding opposite opinions.

The opinion on capability of listening is more unified (educators - X=3,25; SD=0,67, administration - X=3,16; SD=0,81). In order to avoid groupthink in team work, the competence of team work is important – capability of listening; this distribution of results shows both groups of respondents are capable of listening, encouraging the members of the team express their opinions even if they are opposite and find all possible alternatives.

Both educators and school administration have difficulties evaluating the opinions of other members of the team (educators X=2,75; SD=0,76; administration X=2,98; SD=0,82). We should admit that the respondents have difficulties evaluating the opinion or attitude of the other member of the team, therefore we can ambiguously claim the tendencies turn to group cognition, as the ideas, attitudes and opinions of the members of the team are not evaluated. Then, wrong decision may be taken, as the members of the team do not wish to contradistinguish the team and express opposite opinion.

The results of the survey showed the administration (X=3,39; SD=0,72) is more capable of arguing than the educators (X=2,96; SD=0,72). This means the administration is more capable of expressing even opposite opinion or attitude, as it is capable of defending and arguing own opinion. Therefore, we can presume that school administration avoids group cognition in team work more often than the educators.

The results of comparing teamwork competencies in the aspect of group cognition of educators and school administration show that the opinions of administration and educators are more united and related to the following teamwork competencies: capability of analyzing, criticizing, evaluating, motivating. In the sample of school administration and educators, the following teamwork competencies are highlighted: capability of listening, capability of expressing their opposite opinions or attitudes, capabilities of evaluating the ideas, opinions or attitudes of the members of the team. The latter teamwork competencies are less developed in the case of educators than in the case of school administration. Therefore, we can claim the educators are more apt to groupthink than the administration, as they have more difficulties in listening and expressing opposite opinion or attitude, as in this case all positive alternatives are not evaluated. Social loafing (avoidance). In order to avoid social loafing, team members should evaluate the input of each other into the common result, feel responsible and be noticeable.
Arithmetical average of answers of the educators ranges from 2.77 to 3.27, whereas school administration evaluates their capabilities higher—their arithmetical average ranges from 3.02 to 3.61 (Figure 2). School administration evaluates their capability of evaluating the results of the activity of the team \((X=3.61; \text{SD}=0.54)\) and capability of evaluating the input of every member of the team \((X=3.5; \text{SD}=0.63)\). Although the educators give quite high rates to these capabilities, the empirical research showed that their evaluation is a little lower (capability of evaluating the results of the activity of the team \(X=3.21; \text{SD}=0.62\), capability of evaluating the input of every member of the team into the common activity \(X=3.274; \text{SD}=0.67\)).

Avoiding the aspect of social loafing in the team work, capability of evaluating the input of every member of the team and the results of the activity is very important; such distribution of the results is a positive indicator, showing that both groups of respondents are interested in striving for minimal possible social loafing in the team work.

In order to avoid social loafing, team members should be motivated as well as evaluated and noticed. This competence of team work is extremely estimated by the administration \((X=3.5; \text{SD}=0.66)\), whereas the educators \((X=2.92; \text{SD}=0.74)\) are less capable of motivating the team members. For the avoidance of social loafing in the team work, the motivation of every member for striving towards common goals of the team is emphasized. The personnel of school administration is more capable of motivating the members of the team, fulfilling team tasks, thus preventing social loafing.

School administration feels more responsible for the results of the team and helps the members of the team...
more often than the educators. Thus we can claim school administration has quite high teamwork competencies. The given teamwork competencies show school administration is capable of organizing the team work striving for efficiency and avoiding social loafing in the team. School administration gives teamwork competencies higher rates. Implementing expert competence of team work is easier for the school administration, as their motivation and evaluation skills are better developed – this is extremely important in terms of avoiding social loafing. Thus, administration is more capable of organizing and coordinating effective work of the team members.

Correlation Analysis: Comparing Teamwork Competencies of the School Administration and Educators

Groupthink (avoidance). In the sample of administration inner relations between capability of listening and capability of analyzing were found. This means that the more often the opinions of the others are heard, the easier possible situations and solutions are analyzed (rho=0,506; P=0,000; p≤0,01). In the sample of educators, capability of listening has less correlation with capability of analyzing (rho=0,408; P=0,000; p≤0,01), capability of motivating (rho=0,452; P=0,000; p≤0,01). Thus, the better the members of the team hear other members, the easier the ideas, suggestions and alternatives of all members of the team are analyzed, offering optimal solution of the problem.

In the sample of educators, weak relations between capability of evaluating and analyzing, motivating and critical cogitation were found. The easier the sources of information are evaluated, the more often possible situations and solutions are analyzed when making decisions (rho=0,404; P=0,000; p≤0,01), the more critical and constructive cognition is (rho=0,365; P=0,000; p≤0,01). In the sample of administration capability of evaluating statistically correlates with teamwork competencies: the more often the sources of information are evaluated, the more often possible situations and solutions are analyzed when making decisions (rho=0,405; P=0,000; p≤0,01), the easier best possible solution of the problem is evaluated and chosen (rho=0,535; P=0,000; p≤0,01). Thereby, teamwork competencies – capability of evaluating, analyzing, finding the best solution of the problem - are important for the members of the team while avoiding groupthink. The more often the alternatives are evaluated and analyzed, the faster better solution of the problem is found.

The members of the team must protect their ideas and be capable of developing their opinion in order to avoid groupthink in the team work. In the sample of educators weak correlative connection between capability of protecting own ideas and capability of evaluating was found (rho=0,433; P=0,000; p≤0,01). Average correlative relation between capability of protecting own ideas and capability of expressing own opinion was found (rho=0,667; P=0,000; p≤0,01). In the sample of administration the correlation of the latter capabilities is similar – the harder the arguing, the easier evaluation and best solution of the problem (rho=0,565; P=0,000; p≤0,01).

In contrast to the educators, the administration showed better inner relations between the capability of protecting this own ideas and critical cogitation (rho=0,551; P=0,000; p≤0,01) and evaluation of sources of information (rho=0,564; P=0,000; p≤0,01). Thus, the harder the ideas, orientations and activities are protected, the more critical all suggestions and actions are cogitated, the easier the sources of information are evaluated.

In the sample of administration, stronger correlative relations between the following teamwork competencies were found: 1) the more critically the suggestions and activities are cogitated, the more often new ideas related to the new work are suggested (rho=0,615; P=0,000; p≤0,01), the easier possible situations and solutions are analyzed (rho=0,599; P=0,000; p≤0,01); the easier evaluation and choosing best solution of the problem is (rho=0,495; P=0,001; p≤0,01); the easier the arguments are made and the opinion of every member of the team is heard, the easier suggested opinions, ideas or attitudes are evaluated (rho=0,436; P=0,003; p≤0,01). Correlation analysis showed that the personnel of school administration in the team work are more capable of avoiding the phenomenon of groupthink, as they listen to the opinion of the members of the team more often, critically cogitating, analyzing and evaluating all possible alternatives. The research showed the personnel of school administration avoid groupthink in the team work more often, as they have stronger teamwork competencies than the educators.

Social loafing (avoidance). In the sample of educators, average relations between responsibility and help (rho=0,522; P=0,000; p≤0,01), responsibility and capability of evaluating the input of every member of the team into the common activity (rho=0,534; P=0,000; p≤0,01) were found. Weak correlative relations between responsibility and motivation (rho=0,464; P=0,000; p≤0,01), responsibility and capability of evaluating the results of the whole team (rho=0,411; P=0,000; p≤0,01) were found. In the sample of administration correlative relations with the same teamwork competencies were found. The more responsible the personnel of school administration feel for the results of the team work, the more often they help the members of the team as the uncertainties arise (rho=0,545; P=0,000; p≤0,01), the more motivation to the members of the team they give (rho=0,635; P=0,000; p≤0,01), the more often they evaluate the input of every member of the team into the common activity (rho=0,614; P=0,000; p≤0,01).

Correlative relations (responsibility and capability of helping, motivating and evaluating) of the school administration are stronger than those of the educators. Thus we can presume that the members of administration are more capable of evaluating and noticing, helping and better accomplishing their tasks than the educators; thus, we can claim it is easier to the personnel of school administration to avoid social loafing.

In both sample, correlation between capability of motivating and evaluating the input of every member of the team to the common activity was found (educators rho=0,515; P=0,000; p≤0,01; administration rho=0,621;
of personal responsibility of the members of the team may be related to social loafing. Thus commitment and responsibility of the members are necessary for reaching the goal of the team. All members of the team must be avoiding groupthink.

Work have better developed teamwork competencies research showed that people having higher position at work have better developed, than in the sample of educators. Thus we weaker motivation and evaluate every member of the team and their input into the process and result of team work.

Discussion

Groupthink. Capability of criticizing as a competence of team work is important for the avoidance of groupthink (Plotnik, 1998). This research confirmed such theoretical conception, highlighting quite high results of capability of criticizing of both samples of respondents. This means that capability of criticizing is an important criteria, helping to avoid groupthink, as opposite opinions are motivated before rejecting.

Janis (2003) highlights incapability of evaluating and analyzing the opinions or alternatives of the members of the team as one of the sequences of groupthink. This research showed that school administration has more analytical skills (of evaluating and analyzing) than the educators. Thus they avoid groupthink while working in team.

Nevid (2003) emphasizes that all opinions must be heard and the analysis must be made; this is the only way to decrease the phenomenon of groupthink. The research showed that both groups of the respondents are capable of hearing the members of the team, thus encouraging the members of the team express even opposite opinions and choose all possible alternatives. Such results confirm that capability of the members of the team of hearing each other helps avoiding groupthink.

This research showed teamwork competencies of school administration and educators are well developed for groupthink to have minimal appearance in team work. In the sample of administration, teamwork competencies are better developed, than in the sample of educators. Thus we can presume that educators are more apt to adjusting to the team, concealing their opposite opinion or suggestion. Although research literature does not highlight the dependence of teamwork competencies on position, this research showed that people having higher position at work have better developed teamwork competencies avoiding groupthink.

Social loafing. Stephen (2003) highlights avoidance of personal responsibility of the members of the team may be related to social loafing. Thus commitment and responsibility of the members are necessary for reaching the goal of the team. All members of the team must be responsible for the decision of common task as well as their own activity; i.e. the members should not be indifferent towards the work of their colleagues. This research showed that the lack of responsibility is visible in the samples of school administration and educators. The educators find it more difficult taking responsibility for complicated tasks of the team and exact realization than the administration. Still the analysis of social loafing in the team work showed that social loafing is avoided in team work, even with the lack of responsibility. Thus, the research reveals that social loafing in the team is affected not only by the avoidance of responsibility of the members of the team, but also by other capabilities (capability of motivating, evaluating and noticing the member of the team and his work). Levi (2001) underlines that social loafing may be related to the lack of motivation. This research revealed the personnel of school administration motivate the members of the team easier than the educators.

Wortman (1999) and Garrinson (1997) claim that social loafing appears when individual work in the team is not be evaluated. However, the data of this research shows that teamwork competencies, related to capability of evaluating all members of the team and their input, efforts into the common team work, are characteristic to both groups of the respondents. Therefore, the capability of noticing, motivating and evaluating the input of team members into the work process and result is a more important factor in avoiding social loafing than responsibility.

Conclusions

- Effective team work is based on four categories (design of work, structure, content and process) highlighting the features of effective team, combining the indicators of productivity of the team, work results, motivation, the indicators of satisfaction of the members of the team. Effective team is seeking for a common goal, keeping to set norms and regulations, using the abilities, skills, knowledge and experience of every member of the team; all members of the team share responsibility for implementation of the goal of the team. Effective team is striving for minimal groupthink and social loafing.

- The team affected by groupthink or social loafing remains a team, but its work is ineffective. Groupthink and social loafing decreases effective and efficient process and result of team work. With groupthink dominating in the team, team work is ineffective, as alternatives of the members of the team are concealed and unvalued, necessary information is missing, thus wrong solution of the problem is often chosen. Social loafing relates to team work, as some of the team members may start simulating while working in a group of people, not wasting individual efforts and harming the result of team work. Groupthink and social loafing decrease the efficiency of team work, disturbing the process of fulfilling assigned
work and preventing the set goal to be reached on time.

- Teamwork competencies of school administration are better developed than those of educators. School administration is capable of working in team more effectively, as the members of such teams help and support each other, commitment and responsibility are easier to understand, the evaluation of ideas and input of the team members into common work is stronger, opposite opinions or attitudes are easier expressed, etc.

- Developing capability of feeling responsibility for the results of team work is purposeful for the personnel of school administration. The results of the research showed evaluation and motivation skills of the administration are better developed, helping to ensure minimal occurrence of social loafing.

- In the samples of both the educators and the school administration, the results of the research revealed the fact that respondents have teamwork competencies of high level, helping to avoid groupthink: capability of analyzing, criticizing, evaluating and listening.

- While avoiding the aspect of social loafing in team work, both matters of the respondents are capable of evaluating the input of every team member and the results of activity.
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svarbu apibrėžti kiekvieno komandos nario užduotis ir atsakomybę bei kiekvieną nari bei jo darbą įvertinti.


Trečiojo straipsnio dalyje pristatomi koreliacinių ir aparašomosios statistikos analizës rezultatai. Empininis tyrimas parodė, kad pedagogų ir mokyklos administracijos komandinio darbo kompetencijos yra stipriausiuose ir šiuolaikiuose pedagogų. Mokyklos administracijos darbuotoja komandos darbe dažniausiai išvengti grupinio mąstymo reiškiniai, nes dažniausiai išklausia komandos narių nuomones, kritikai apmansto, išanalizuota ir įvertina visas galimas alternatyvais. Taip pat mokyklos administracijos darbuotojams lengviau išvengti socialinio dykinėjimo dirbant komandoje, nes stipriausiai išvystytos motyvacijos ir įvertinimo gebėjimai, leidžiantys įvertinti kiekvieną komandos nari bei jo naštą į komandinio darbo procesą ir rezultatą.
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