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Distributed leadership is a practical necessity in the education system as teachers and school leaders can establish cooperation and interaction to improve student achievement. Study on distributed leadership is still in its infancy and needs to be increased. The aim of this study is to identify the relationship between distributed leadership and commitment of teachers based on cohort of generations in secondary schools. This study involved 298 respondents that consisted of teachers and was conducted using the cross-sectional quantitative survey approach. The study used the Spillane (2006) distributed leadership theory that connected the interaction among leaders, followers and situation. The Distributed Leadership Survey (DLS) which was introduced by Davis in 2009 consists of 37 items which are divided into 7 dimensions, are used in this study. Meyer and Allen’s (1997) Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment Scales (ACNCS) instrument was used to measure teachers’ commitment level. The selection of schools and respondents were random and also used the purposive sampling. Three hypotheses were built and tested using statistical methods of Pearson correlation test, independent sample t-test, ANOVA and calculated using SPSS version 21. The findings showed a significant relationship between distributed leadership and teachers’ commitment towards the organization. The principal’s dimensions of leadership and dimensional vision of the school were found to be frequently practised. In terms of commitment towards the organization, normative commitment dimension was the highest. There was no significant difference between distributed leadership and commitment of teachers based on cohorts of generations and gender of the teachers. Based on these findings, it is proposed that school leaders should practice distributed leadership to teachers in addition to share the school's vision clear and easily understood by the school community, regardless of the gender and cohort of generations.
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INTRODUCTION

Malaysia Education Blueprint (MEB) 2013-2025 is moving towards its second wave which is implemented for a period of 5 years from 2016 until 2020. The main agenda of Ministry of Education (MOE) in upgrading the quality of education in Malaysia is to focus on enhancing the quality of teacher leadership at every school in Malaysia. The basis has been clearly stated in the fifth shift of MEB 2013-2025 that is: “To Ensure High Performing School Leaders In Every School”.

In 2009, several research papers, concept papers and also reflection papers were presented in the 16th National Proceeding Seminar of Education Leadership and Management, organized by Institut Aminuddin Baki (IAB) with the theme: ‘Distributed Leadership’. Seven
years have passed and now, in the second sub-wave of MEB which focuses on teachers and school leaders, the education system should be prepared to shift towards distributed leadership in 2016-2020.

According to Rosnarizah Abdul Halim and Zulkifli Abdul Manaf (2009), school principals are no longer considered as principals who bear all responsibilities in schools and such trend has changed towards a common culture of shared responsibilities. Hopkins and Jackson (2002) stated that an idle leadership can be shown in an individual, and needs to be fully utilized by an organization. Spillane, Harvenson and Diamond (2001) defined clearly that distributed leadership is a group of individuals who leads and drive the other members of the organization in various stages for an instructional change. Baharuddin Yaacob (2009) argued that if distributed leadership can be practised in schools, improvement in school performance can be achieved and thus can identify new and capable leadership ability among teachers. Rosnarizah Abdul Halim and Zulkifli Abdul Manaf (2009) concluded that the effectiveness of distributed leadership is dependent on the willingness of an organization to accept changes in its organizational development. Such leadership does not only depend on relationships and trusts between members of the organization, it also depends on the dissemination pattern and its purposes.

According to Spillane and Diamond (2007), studies on distributed leadership are still in its infancy. Jamalul Lail Abdul Wahab, Aida Hanim A. Hamid, Surayati Zainal & Md Fuad Md Rafik (2013) confirmed the opinion of Spillane and Diamond (2007), by stating that relevant studies on distributed leadership in Malaysia are still in its infancy. Although the idea of distributed leadership has long existed (Gronn, 2008), a wider and thorough study should be implemented carefully on the influence of distributed leadership. Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, OECD (2008), stated that there is still lack of study on the implementation of distributed leadership, in accordance with the opinion of Hulpia, Devos and Rosseel (2009).

Jamalul Lail Abdul Wahab et al. (2013) suggested that studies on distributed leadership in Malaysia should be increased, in order to contribute valuable findings on distributed leadership in schools. This is in line with the recommendations made by Harris (2008) which stated that although there have been empirical studies on distributed leadership through certain mechanisms that influence organizational commitment, they are still insufficient. Spillane, Camburn and Pareja (2007) mentioned that there are vast developments of literature reviews on distributed leadership. However, empirical studies on the basic research are still in short supply. The concept of distributed leadership is still in its early days (Davis, 2009). Lack of such studies in the context of distributed leadership in Malaysian education is also supported by Rosnarizah Abdul Halim and Hussein Haji Ahmad (2015) as well as Shakir, Issa & Mustafa (2011).

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Since the term distributed leadership is still new and isolated to the school administrators, further research should be conducted in depth to see how far the approach of distributed leadership can be developed optimally at schools (Jamalul Lail Abdul Wahab et al., 2013). Therefore, it is hoped that this study can contribute relevant data and empirical findings to the needs of
distributed leadership in Malaysian schools, to achieve the fifth shift in MEB 2013-2025, which is to ensure high performing school leaders in every school.

Without the undivided commitment and dedication from teachers and school leaders, the objective of the education system in Malaysia which is to have a world class education, will be difficult to realize. Several findings from organizational commitment studies have shown positive relationship on organizational efficiency and work performance, and negative relationship with the staff absenteeism (Mowday, Porter & Steers, 1982). Relevant exposures and methods should be given to teachers and principals in order to make changes in fostering a culture of excellence in schools.

According to Hulpia, Devos and Rosseel (2009), the relationship between distributed leadership and organizational commitment still remain unexplored by scholars. Therefore, this study is taking the opportunity to meet gaps in research needs for empirical data on distributed leadership and organizational commitment. This indirectly will meet the expectations to the aspiration of MOE for empowering teachers to the fourth and fifth shifts in MEB 2013-2025. This should be viewed from the perspective of strengthening distributed leadership among teachers, and to enhance teaching profession through organizational commitment.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The selection of a charismatic and capable leader has often become the criteria in improving the quality of an organization. That is a current example of heroic leadership which is no longer relevant to be applied in schools. Although such selection is proven to be able to enhance the quality of an organization, unfortunately it cannot sustain long enough if the leader is transferred to other organization. Indirectly, it will also affect the organizational commitment which has been fostered by the leader.

Spillane (2006) provided a perspective that distributed leadership is categorized into two main aspects: leader-plus aspect and practice aspect. Leadership is not centralized on a sole individual anymore. Gronn (2002) suggested that it may become necessary to switch from a genre of heroic leadership model towards distributed leadership. Harris (2013), on the other hand, stated that the practical distribution of task should be widened to more individuals in an organization through distributed leadership. Currently, leaders in schools began to seek for a new leadership approaches such as distributed leadership (Hartley, 2007).

Distributed Leadership

Distributed leadership is a debatable leadership issue (Harris, 2008; Gronn, 2000). It is proven to be effective in enhancing the development and achievement of a school (Gronn, 2003; Harris, 2008; 2009; Spillane, Halverson & Diamond, 2004; Spillane & Sherer, 2004). It is being greatly discussed in the context of education, even in Malaysia (Baharuddin Yaacob, 2009; Yusof Boon & Yahazon Tahir, 2013; Jamalul Lail Abdul Wahab et al., 2013; Nurulaim Asyikin Zakaria & Suhaida Abdul Kadir, 2013; Siva Rabindarang, Khuan & Khoo, 2014; Rosnarizah Abdul Halim & Hussein Ahmad, 2015). Harris (2008) stated that the recent empirical study on distributed
leadership practice is the result of a study done by Spillane et al. (2001). In addition, there are studies which confirm that distributed leadership is able to enhance organizational commitment (Hulpia, Devos & Rosseel, 2009; Nguyen, 2013; Yusof Boon & Yahzanon Tahir, 2013; Hairuddin Mohd Ali & Salisu, 2015).

Distributed leadership, as defined by Spillane (2005), is a result of an interaction between leaders, followers and situation. Harris, Brown and Abbot (2006) stated that distributed leadership, in terms of its practicality, is a transition from top-down organizational hierarchy leadership model to a leadership form that emphasize on shared leadership by members of the organization. Teachers play a great role in sharing leadership with the principal, which will enhance their organizational commitment and motivation. This in turn can improve students’ achievements in schools.

Spillane (2005) stated that distributed leadership is the current antidote or more accurately, a series of antidotes to the genre concept of heroic leadership. Heroic leadership refers to a leader who is able to implement and administer every task individually through charismatic characteristics. It is already considered as obsolete and outdated. The scope of educational management which is vastly developing cannot be managed efficiently by a principal who is individually charismatic. This is why Hartley (2007) explained the reason for the emergence of distributed leadership in schools’ organization. Hartley (2007) identified two main factors of why distributed leadership has become a major focus. Firstly, the failure of a charismatic hero and secondly, the complex demands and expectations placed on the shoulders of school leaders. Fullan (2001) also confirmed that an established institution has leaders in every level of the organization. Harris and Muijs (2003) found that leadership should involve every member of the organization.

Teacher leadership is one of the dimensions in distributed leadership. A teacher can lead other teachers in the effort of developing situational participation and cooperation in all activities as well as instructional programs. Studies have proven that a principal plays a vital role in developing the capacity of teacher leadership ability in schools. This is related to the teacher leadership factor which is able to influence the existence of effective schools (Harris & Muijs, 2003; Katzenmeyer & Moller, 2001; Frost & Durrant, 2002; Leithwood, Jantzi, & Steinbach, 1999).

Hailan Salamun (2010) stated that power does not refer to the position of an individual in an organization. It is actually an individual’s ability to influence other people to work together in achieving given objectives. Recognizing an individual’s expertise is also a type of power that can be used to achieve organizational objectives. Teacher leader is a teacher who manages to influence the behaviors, beliefs or actions of other individuals and is able to enhance the capacity of achievement and success of students (Lester, 2008). Katzenmeyer and Moller (2001) named such teacher leadership ability as ‘the sleeping giant of teacher leadership’ and it only exists if the principal pays great attention to teacher leadership.

School organizations should explore various ways in order not to be too formal and teachers should be given more opportunities to lead (Davis, 2009). According to Mayrowetz,
Murphy, Louis and Smylie (2007), a leader in an organization will remain in one position of a formal organizational structure and it is difficult to change. Changes in organizational structure from bottom to top will make teachers feel uncomfortable (Copland, 2003; Macbeath, 2005; Neumann & Simmons, 2000). It can lead to conflict when it comes to decision-making about school matters (Hulpia, Devos & Rosseel, 2009). Therefore, Davis (2009) stated that it is the main responsible of a principal to know his organizational situations and act on it continuously in order to develop the capacity of the teachers. Teachers should be given more opportunities to become leaders in various fields in schools so that they can cross over the knowledge boundaries on leadership practices in schools.

Jamalul Lail Abdul Wahab et al. (2013) mentioned that in distributed leadership, not everyone will make a decision. However, each individual can contribute to the process of decision-making through their knowledge and expertise. The subordinate involvement concept in decision-making is one of the significant principles in a practice of total quality management (Karia & Ahmad, 2000). Distributed leadership can be seen as an effective leadership practice which can be implemented in schools. This is due to its positive relationships with various aspects of school effectiveness. Jamalul Lail Abdul Wahab et al. (2013) found that studies related to distributed leadership in Malaysia are still in its infancy. It requires further study in order to determine the extent of distributed leadership approach that can be optimized.

Organizational Commitment

Organizational commitment can be referred to as how far a commitment level is displayed to be measured by its belonging to the organization. Mowday, Porter and Steers (1982) defined commitment as the determination of an individual to identify himself with the organization and its involvement in the organization. They also stated that employees who have high commitment level, usually able to reduce the exchange-rate of job-hopping, lateness, absenteeism and able to enhance work satisfaction in an organization. These factors will directly or indirectly increase work performance and achievement as well as being committed continuously with the organization. Such employees will strive harder in order to achieve the objectives of the organization.

A committed teacher has a very close relationship with not only to students’ achievements, school effectiveness, teacher satisfaction, job performance, but also to teacher absenteeism (Singh & Billingsley, 1998). Commitment is very important because a teacher with a low commitment level often puts his own interest first instead of his duties and responsibilities (Abdul Ghani Kanesan, 2009). Hussein Mahmood (2005), on the other hand, found that highly committed teachers and communities are able to enhance the achievement of organizational objectives and its effectiveness.

Meyer and Allen (1997) referred commitment as a psychological state that according to the individuals in an organization. Meyer & Allen (1997) divided organizational commitment into 3 dimensions: affective commitment, continuous commitment and normative commitment. Allen and Meyer (1996) stated that highly committed employees have a positive outlook to the
organization, consistent with his behavior to avoid misunderstandings or to develop his own positive self-perception.

Hulpia, Devos and Rosseel (2009) who studied the relationship between teachers’ perception of distributed leadership and teacher leadership towards job satisfaction and organizational commitment, found that the relationship between these variables has not been permanently studied in the area of distributed leadership. Hulpia et al. (2009) stated that distribution of functional leadership has a weak relationship with organizational commitment and also with job satisfaction. The more supervision is being disseminated amongst leadership teams, the lower organizational commitment level is displayed by teachers and teacher leadership.

Teacher involvement in decision-making will increase teachers’ organizational commitment. More significantly, the integration of leadership teams and the number of support towards teacher leadership are highly correlated to organizational commitment. Also indirectly, it is closely related to job satisfaction of the teachers. Hulpia et al. (2009) stated that a school principal has the biggest influence on these two dimensions which have a significant relationship with distributed leadership: integration of leadership teams and number of support towards teacher leadership.

Hairuddin Mohd Ali and Salisu (2015) conducted a study entitled “Distributed Leadership and Empowerment Influence on Teachers Organizational Commitment” and found out that there was a significant effect between distributed leadership and teacher organizational commitment. The findings are in line with those of Hulpia, Devos and Keer (2010) that distributed leadership has a high significant level with teacher organizational commitment. The study also found that there is a strong medium which can determine distributed leadership with teacher commitment: teacher empowerment. The findings from this study are in line with studies conducted by Bogler and Somech (2004), and Gaziel (2009). The teacher empowerment can be improved by involving teachers in decision-making at schools and this can certainly enhance teachers’ organizational commitment (Firestone & Pennel, 1993; Bogler & Somech, 2004).

Generation

According to Kupperschmidt (2000), generation is defined as a group (cohort) that shares the same year of birth, age, location and several developmental stages of important events that happened in their lives. Mannheim (1953) had long defined generation as a group of people who were born and brought up at the same period of time chronologically, socially and also historically.

(2003) were where cohorts of generations were widely used: Baby Boomers (born in 1945-1964), Generation-X (born in 1965-1980) and Generation-Y (born after 1980). Therefore, this study used cohort generation of teachers based on the findings made by Eisner (2005), Martin and Tulgan (2001) and Raines (2003).

Studies on the psychological contract between employees and employers of old and new generations, had shown various effects, such as effects on organizational commitment. Alessia and Regina (2008) found that new generation of employees showed a high level of organizational learning but a lower level of organizational commitment from the generation before them. Tulgan (1996) stated that it is important for a leader to identify job differences between several cohorts of generations in order to ensure an effective and productive performance in an organization, based on appropriate leadership styles. Miller (2006) found that there are significant generation differences in organizational commitment, job satisfaction, intrinsic and extrinsic rewards, as well as the need to leave the organization. The organizational generation differences normally will influence their work status, the desire to be recognized, workplace commitment and also the desire to get an ideal workplace (Bush, Venkitachalam & Richards, 2008). Therefore, this study uses the generation differences in studying the differences found in distributed leadership and organizational commitment.

Murphy, Olivas-Luján and Greenwood (2009) pointed out that generation differences should be put in line with other demographic variables. This is because it can provide a long view study on the values, attitudes, culture, behaviours, generations, organizations, group or sub-group of members of organizations. Haeberle, Herzberg and Hobbs (2009) found that the generation cohort differences within an organization provide a direct effect towards the communication styles, technological needs, priorities in professional development, work environment expectations, benefit and compensation requirements, the needs for leadership styles as well as reward and recognition effectiveness. Wagner (2007) affirmed that leaders should not isolate the generation differences, but should provide opportunities for each cohort of generation to develop and compete healthily.

Chun Yu and Miller (2005) also stated that leadership styles which suit the present modern work environment should avoid the hierarchical organizational structure leadership styles. They should shift to leadership styles which focus more on knowledge-based leadership. Leadership that stretched over several individuals is one of the important components displayed in distributed leadership (Elmore, 2000; Gronn, 2002; Spillane et al., 2001). Also, through such distributed leadership, organizational learning culture will increase the Professional Learning Communities (PLC) among teachers.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Research Design

The study design was in a form of descriptive-quantitative method. Its purpose was to study the relationship between distributed leadership and organizational commitment. Descriptive study was used to identify the level of distributed leadership and organizational commitment of
teachers. Correlation study was conducted to measure the strength of relationship between independent variables (seven dimensional of distributed leadership) and dependent variables (three dimensional of organizational commitment). The data were analyzed by using the software Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 21.0.

**Research Population and Sample**

For this study, the population consisted of all teachers from the national secondary schools in the district of Baling Sik, Kedah. The research samples involved 298 respondents and were reviewed using the sample size determination tables by Krejcie and Morgan (1970). Samples were selected through stratified random sampling method out of 1358 teachers from four different zones. In the selection of the sample of teachers, researcher used unproportionate stratified random sampling to ensure that the number of selected samples was adequate for each category. The researcher also used purposive sampling in order to ensure that selected samples of teachers fulfilled the cohort of generation required.

**Research Instrument**

This study used the Distributed Leadership Survey (DLS) instrument which was modified by Davis (2009) in his study, to measure the level of distributed leadership practiced in schools. The questionnaires on organizational commitment of teachers used the Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment Scales (ACNCS) instrument, which was developed by Meyer and Allen (1997).

**RESEARCH FINDINGS**

The research findings show that principal leadership dimension is a practice which stays at a very high level with mean value 4.31. This is followed by the school vision dimension at a very high level with mean value 4.29.

The analysis shows that every dimension in distributed leadership displays a high mean value where the highest mean value is 4.31 at the principal leadership dimension. Analysis for the level of teachers’ organizational commitment shows a high mean value 3.63 at normative commitment dimension. Overall, distributed leadership and teachers’ organizational commitment are practiced at a high level in this study.

Table 1 illustrates Pearson correlation test where distributed leadership shows a significant relation ($r = .31, p < .01$) with teachers’ organizational commitment. However, the findings show a very weak relationship ($r = .31$) between distributed leadership and teachers’ organizational commitment.

**Table 1: Pearson Correlation Test: Distributed Relationship with Teachers’ Organizational Commitment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Distributed Leadership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Table 2 shows the one-way ANOVA test was not significant \([F(2, 276) = 1.24, p>.05]\) between cohort of generations and distributed leadership. While the one-way ANOVA test was not significant \([F (2, 276) = .86, p>.05]\) between cohort of generations and teachers’ organizational commitment. Therefore, there is no significant difference in distributed leadership and teachers’ organizational commitment based on cohort of generations. However, mean (4.03) distributed leadership practice for Baby Boomers generation is higher than mean (3.93) for Generation-X. Mean (3.51) of teachers’ organizational commitment for Baby Boomers generation is higher than mean (3.43) for Generation-Y.

Table 2: ANOVA Test Results on Differences of Distributed Leadership and Teachers’ Organizational Commitment between Cohorts of Generations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generations</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Sp</th>
<th>Dk1</th>
<th>Dk2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributed Leadership</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Organizational Commitment</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation X</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation Y</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .05

Table 3 shows the Levene test was not significant \((p>.05)\). The result has fulfilled the variance homogeneity of variance between distributed leadership based on gender. Independent samples t-test was not significant \((t (277) = -.188, p >.05)\) statistically. Therefore, there is no difference in terms distributed leadership based on gender. Independent samples t-test was not significant \((t (277) = 1.743, p >.05)\) statistically. The result shows that there was no difference on teachers’ organizational commitment based on gender. However, mean (3.96) distributed leadership for female teachers is higher than mean (3.95) for male teachers. Meanwhile, mean (3.50) teachers’ organizational commitment for male teachers is higher than mean (3.42) for female teachers.

Table 3: Independent Samples T-test Results: Differences on Distributed Leadership and Teachers’ Organizational Commitment Based on Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Sp</th>
<th>Dk</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributed Leadership</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.41</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>-.188</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ Organizational Commitment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>277</td>
<td>1.743</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>279</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p < .05

DISCUSSIONS

Leadership of the 21st century is no longer seen only one leader as the only individual who is capable to lead his organization successfully. According to Hartley (2007), the failure of heroic leadership in the 21st century has made distributed leadership gained a huge attention from the academicians / scholars. It is also a series of various tasks of school leaders which are getting more complex and burdening. A theory concluded by Spillane (2006) suits the findings of this study because it shows a significant relationship towards organizational commitment of teachers. Spillane’s (2006) theory clearly increases organizational commitment of teachers regardless of the cohort of generations and the gender of the teachers. Hatcher (2005) pointed out that distributed leadership has become significant in school management discourse in order to increase the participation and capability of teachers in developing a more democratic school.

From the results of this study, principal leadership dimension and school vision dimension are the most frequently practiced in distributed leadership. Therefore, the findings of this study can become a source of useful information resource to the NPQEL programme that trains school leaders especially principals and headmasters. Due to the stigma of teachers who still consider the principal as the only leader with empowerment and a power source in schools, it is vital for MOE and IAB through NPQEL programme to emphasize on the role of the principal in the practice of distributed leadership itself. Principal plays an important leadership role in enhancing the commitment, motivation and improvement of teaching environment in schools (Leithwood, Day, Sammons & Harris; 2006). Hulpia et al. (2009) stated that teacher commitment can be increased if distributed leadership is not too formally practiced. School organizations should explore more ways not to become too formal and teachers should be given more opportunities to lead (Davis, 2009). In addition, sharing the school visions should be given greater attention to enhance distributed leadership practices at school levels. Meyer and Allen (1997) mentioned that shared visions amongst members of organizations are based on school goals, particularly, the ones in line with the goals of the leaders is expected to give a positive impact on employee satisfaction and commitment. The results of this study showed a significant
relationship between distributed leadership practices and organizational commitment of teachers, regardless the cohort of generations and gender of teachers.

CONCLUSION

In order to fulfill the aspiration of MOE through the education blueprint which has been thoroughly outlined, distributed leadership practice should definitely be made an established platform to be implemented widely in every school. Thus it will at once make the PPPM 2013-2025 a reality through its fifth shift: “To Ensure High Performing School Leaders In Every School”. This is the most appropriate time to spur the enhancement of the system because the education blueprint is now in the second wave (2016-2020). The second wave is raised clearly in the PPPM 2013-2025: “To empower teaching profession and shift towards distributed leadership”. The distributed leadership should be given adequate space for teachers to lead the schools alongside school management leaders, in order to make the school visions a success in line with the visions of MOE.
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