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Abstract: The objective of this study was to determine the relationship between teachers’ organizational obligation and distributed leadership in secondary schools of Baiyun district in Guangzhou city, China. This study was conducted using the quantitative survey approach. The respondents comprised of 98 teachers were selected through random sampling. The data of the study were collected using 22 items from Distributed Leadership Inventory and 15 items from Organizational Commitment Questionnaire. The data analysis used independent sample t-test, one-way ANOVA and Pearson correlation with SPSS version 22. The findings of the study showed that there was no significant difference between gender and teaching work experience based on organizational commitment. However, there was a positive relationship between school distributed leadership and teachers’ organizational commitment.
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1. Introduction

Education has a vital function in the modern technological world. Teachers or educators contribute greatly to the education field and are creators of responsible citizens in the world. Besides that teachers develop professionals that will help in developing the nation. Thus, developing a teacher indirectly helps in improving the school and students’ level of foundation. It is undeniable that most teachers of high-quality will produce students of high-quality. Block, Crochet, Jones and Papa (2012) agreed that educators are necessary for the educational development.

Many studies reveal that educators’ working conditions definitely have changed a lot in recent years. First, the teacher's task, the number of students they face and secondly, teaching is more instrumental, expressive and effective, reducing the teaching satisfaction and professionalism (Lee, Wang & Liu, 2015).

Richards (2012) reported five sources of stress among teachers in California. The most stressful reason for these teachers was to teach high demand students without sufficient support. Teachers also felt too committed, have too many responsibilities and obligations, and often have to take work home. Teachers pointed out that lack of control over school decisions was another source of stress. Richards reported that students who were taught to have no motivation also felt the pressure of responsibility to those teachers. Richards also explored how community poverty enters the classroom. Teachers found themselves dealing with social problems, such as students’ poverty, gangster issues or even drug dealings. These factors were incorporated into the structure of teachers’ day, where higher level of stress reported nationwide was among teachers from less prosperous schools.

To solve the problems faced by teachers, Devos and Hulpia (2010) pointed out that organizational commitment of an educator is an important predictor of teachers’ work performance, because when dealing with complex requirements, it is essential for them to be professional motivated and in pursuit of change. Research showed that the organizational commitment of employees has positive relationship with organizational leadership practice.

According to a Beijing-based study piloted by the Institute of Basic Education of the Beijing Research Institute of Education, 93.1% of people believed that the job as teachers is becoming more and more difficult and stressful. 50.8% of the educators said they would contemplate moving to different jobs. A joint survey conducted by the Shanghai Teacher Training Center, the Shanghai Mental Health Center and Shanghai Normal University showed that the detection rate of teacher's mental disorder was as high as 48%. Of these, 12% had significant mental disorders, 2% were severe, with symptoms such as anxiety, depression, irritability, neurasthenia, and memory loss. Career stress is indeed a double-edged sword (Bao & Wang, 2012).
Professional pressure on teachers' negative impact is mainly reflected in: first, mood disorders and mental health of teachers, often appear inexplicable anxiety, anxiety, depression, helpless, often angry, low self-efficacy, lack satisfaction and job burnout. Secondly, it leads to the increase of teachers' physical diseases. Studies showed that constant stress can damage people's blood circulation and digestion, leading to diseases of the heart, lungs, muscles and joints, and speed up the aging process. Third, it leads to an increase in teacher negative behavior: loss of control, insomnia, loss of appetite, smoking and alcohol abuse. The above three aspects are interrelated and influence each other, forming a vicious circle, which aggravates the psychological crisis of teachers, leading to many teachers changing jobs and retiring early (Wu & Yu, 2014).

**Problem Statement**

School enrolment expansion in recent years has resulted in Chinese teachers’ free time to be very limited, it was difficult to keep up with the massive growth of students, teachers' workload has increased dramatically, many teachers have to juggle several tasks at the same time, and these have inevitably increased the pressure of work (Jiang, 2016). In addition, studies by Berjaoui and Karami-Akkary (2019), Hulpia and Devos (2010), Kılınç (2014) also elaborated the correlations between organizational tasks and distributed leadership. This shows that teachers have various commitments in the institution despite the core job function which is teaching.

However, leadership responsibilities held by teachers can be one of main aspect in affecting teacher’s commitment. Teachers’ obligation and enthusiasm will be affected by the rise of responsibilities that they need to do in the school leadership undertakings (Akdemir & Ayik 2017; Bano, Ishrat, & Mishra 2019). Jamalul (2013) pointed out that “distributed leadership (DL)” is still under investigation, and secluded from school officers, and therefore there should be more in-depth researches to comprehend the method of how to optimally develop DL in schools. Hence, it is anticipated that this article will provide applicable data and experimental results for the distributed leadership requirements of Chinese schools, so as to ensure the excellent leadership in each school.

**Distributed Leadership**

According to Bush, (2011) and Crawford (2012) sharing, cooperative and distributed models substitute the restrictions in ‘One Man” based leadership representations. Lately, distributed leadership method has been gaining popularity and it has been taken into consideration as a replacement for conventional leadership theories. Distributed leadership is an idea applied to signify a leadership approach that goes beyond one individual and changes the board of the management in schools (Bush, 2018; Harris, 2010). Thus, Harris (2010) classifies DL as “growing of leadership responsibilities other than the official managerial experts”.

Harris and DeFlaminis (2016) stressed that although DL is a fluid notion where this leadership approach has some important aspects that differentiate it from other models. Firstly, in DL approach, the leaders’ tasks are to practice the responsibility rather than just taking it as a role. Leaders, supporters and situations must have collective communication and these are the predominant aspects for the practice in DL.

Secondly, authority is given to workers through the distribution of tasks and influences. Thirdly, in DL there is an equally significant interchange between group interactions and individual. Finally, the fourth aspect is where structured is focused. DL approach is extremely different from the bureaucratic model because in DL, workers with many areas of expertise will be gathered and they are interdependent between several ranks of administrative hierarchy (Harris &DeFlaminis, 2016; Spillane & Anderson, 2019; Tam, 2018).

In addition, Hartley (2010) and Spillane (2006) stated that in DL method, school principals’ reduced their responsibilities by allocating some workloads to other workers. This means that some of the decision making obligation in institutional activities are shared with other workers. Distributed leadership has been receiving a huge support in the management literature. Supovitz, D’Auria and Spillane (2019) pointed that distribution leadership contributes to the schools’ development and also teachers’ self-efficacy in a positive way.

**Organizational Commitment**

Blau and Boal (1987) defined Organizational Commitment (OC) as how far an individual wants to be a member of the organization. According to Allen and Meyer (1990), OC consists of three aspects; affective, continuance and normative commitment. In affective aspect, workers would commit to the organization willingly and happily. Second, continuance commitment means staffs oblige themselves because of the advantages and the need in the institution. Normative OC happens when workers sense that they have to stay committed to the association because of other people’s pressure. The main predictor of teachers’ work performance is OC (Dee,
Finally, studies have revealed that OC impacts employees’ commitment towards institution’s goals positively, where it decreases the non-attendance and workers’ wish to leave their jobs (Newstrom& Davis, 1993; Valentine, Godkin, & Lucero, 2002).

### Principals’ Distributed Leadership and Teachers’ Organizational Commitment

Akdemir and Ayik (2017) stated that a great level of distributed leadership and a high level of educators’ organizational commitment exist. Meanwhile, supervision is one of the sub-areas of distributed leadership and there is a positive relationship between them. It is found that teacher's organizational commitment is higher when there are regular supervisions by the principals. Principal related practices are lacking in guidelines, materials and instruction books. Meanwhile, Hulpia, Devos and Keer (2011) stated that there is a high level of DL and a moderate instructors’ institutional commitment in some organizations. Besides that, a study by Kajisho and Lodisso (2020) identifies that educators’ responsibilities also have certain influence on school’s beliefs.

### Gender and Organizational Commitment

According to Voloshin (2016), male and female trainers have the same OC in school. He also emphasized that gender should be a deciding factor in the commitment at the college level as well. Para (2017) concluded that the average male teachers' organizational commitment was 170.81, while the average female teachers' organizational commitment is 1.077. Therefore, this study found that there was no difference in OC between male and female educators. Jamal and Don (2016) studied the connection between DL and teachers’ obligation to the organization. The findings showed that the independent sample t-test was not statistically significant. The results showed that there was no difference in the organizational commitment of educators. Simultaneously, the average educators' organizational commitment to male tutors was greater than that of female tutors. Getahun, Tefera and Burichew (2016), in their research found that there was no difference between male and female teachers’ obligation levels. This shows that there is no difference in organizational commitment based on gender educators in schools.

Chen (2010) who studied the relationship between gender and teacher’s organizational responsibilities found that in terms of overall commitment, there was no difference based on teacher’s gender, but female teachers valued harmonious interpersonal relationship and good school atmosphere and showed a higher school atmosphere commitment. In terms of employment and work, which usually exist unfair phenomenon for women in society, and higher proportion of female teachers in school, due to respect and fair treatment, therefore, female teachers prefer good interpersonal and respect school atmosphere and retention. Most studies of organizational climate have found that men and women teach. There is a difference in the perception of organizational climate, which also explains the difference in the atmosphere commitment based on gender among teachers. According to Wang (2015), the main factors of individual organizational obligation include individual factor, work factor and institutional factor. Among them, individual factor mainly refers to members' ages, seniority, sex, capability, interest, and education level. The study found that the higher the age or the lower the educational level, the higher the organizational commitment level.

### Teaching Work Experience and Organizational Commitment

Hulpia, Devos and Keer (2011) found that gender and teaching experiences are important predictors towards organizational commitment. More specifically, male teachers seem to have a greater level of organizational obligation than female teachers. They also stated that teachers with many years of teaching experience have less organizational commitment. On the other hand, teachers with less teaching experience have more organizational commitment.

Moreover, Gholipour, Faghiharam and Araghieh (2012) in their research, have drawn the inverse relationship between organizational obligation and job loss. However, there was no significant correlation between teacher's organizational commitment and organizational work experience.

According to Lee (2016), the organizational commitment of middle school teachers and their scores in different dimensions were not significantly different in gender, but they were significantly different in teaching age. The following two years’ experience and 11 years of teaching experience of teachers’ organizational commitment, emotional commitment and normative commitment score was significantly higher than 3-5 years’ experience of teachers, and 3 to 5 years’ experience teachers’ continuance commitment was significantly higher than the following two years of teaching teachers.
Principals’ Support and Organizational Commitment

Hulpia, Devos and Kerr (2011) stressed that the school principals’ support in their organizational commitment to the teachers is more important compared to the principals’ supervision. Regarding the allocation of leadership roles, their study showed that the formal allocation of school principals’ support has an encouraging influence on educators’ responsibilities to the school. It is understood that the teachers who were backed up by the school principals, possessed a greater organizational obligation than those who have lower levels of support from the school principals. According to Akdemir and Ayik (2017), support is one of the sub-areas of DL behavior and organizational obligation of school principals, and there is a positive relationship. As for this finding, the more school principals support increased behavior will result in teachers’ organizational commitment increases.

Principals’ Supervision and Organizational Commitment

Hulpia, Devos and Keer (2011) pointed out that their results showed that principals’ supervision has a negative influence on OC. In other words, fewer obligations are displayed by teachers who are observed regularly by the school principals. They stated that educators may favor explicit supervision over potential contradictory opinions and conflicting responses from numerous school members. Daniels, Hondeghem and Dochy (2019) emphasized the increase in school principals’ job function and role they attached to have attracted the attention towards leadership. This article’s central attention would be on the DL and leadership for learning. Secondly, the study explored the features of effective school management and finally, the discussion in this study provided professional improvement activities for school principals in secondary schools.

Cohesive Leadership Team and Organizational Commitment

Ross, Lutfi and Hope (2016) stated that principals who practice DL permit educators to be in charge of teams. This is to provide them with leadership experiences and get them ready for future managerial positions. Furthermore, Hulpia, Devos and Keer (2011) stated that teachers’ cognitive and maximum support for leadership team cooperation was the most significant indicator of teacher OC. From these studies, it was found the connection between educators’ views and leadership teamwork. Based on the results, the teacher believed that their school was made up of a collaborative leadership team, and the leadership team has the characteristics of cohesion. The members of leadership team shared the same goal and were more committed to their school.

Theoretical Framework

The consequence of DL on teachers’ organizational obligation can be explained by distributed leadership theory developed by Elmore (2000, 2002). Elmore developed his DL theory based on the loose-coupling theory. Elmore (2002, 2008) stated that everyone in the same organization has the chance to lead in their expertise areas. This means that commitments are distributed so that members work together to share a common beliefs and activities. He goes on saying that to bring change or better results, leadership roles and activities should be shared or distributed.

According to the views of Hulpia, Devos and Rosseel (2009), the connection between DL and organizational commitment remains unknown. Hence, this research was taking the prospect to bridge the gap in the need for experimental data on DL and organizational obligation. This will indirectly satisfy the Chinese ministry of education’s expectations for the empowerment of teachers. This problem was observed from the viewpoint of establishing teachers’ DL and improving the teaching career through OC. The objective of this research was to determine the differences between gender and teaching work experiences towards organizational commitment and connection between DL (support, observation, cohesive leadership group) and teachers’ OC based on secondary schools in in Guangzhou city at Baiyun district, China.

2. Methods

Population and Sampling of Study

This study emphasised on connection between distributed leadership and teacher’s OC. This was a quantitative study Questionnaire was used to investigate the connection between independent and dependent variables. The target population was secondary school teachers in Baiyun districts in Guangzhou city. According to the Ministry of Education in China for the 2016-2017 School Years, there were 896 teachers in Baiyun districts in Guangzhou city. This study selected 98 teachers by using simple random sampling which comprised
of 22 (22.4%) male teachers and 76 (77.6%) female teachers.

Research Instrument

The questionnaires consisted of three parts. Part one was the demographic information: gender and teaching experience. Part two was the Distributed Leadership Inventory (DBI). DBI was created by Hulpia, Devos and Rosseel (2009) to elicit educators’ opinion about their school principals’ usage of DL in the school which included three scopes namely support, supervision, and cohesive leadership group. The dimensions of DL were mainly measured by 22 items. The first section has 9 items which measured the principle support. The second section was school supervision (3 items), and the last section was cohesive leadership team (10 items). Part three was to gather data on school teacher’s organizational commitment with 15 questions of the Organizational Commitment Questionnaire developed by Mowday (1979). This questionnaire was used to measure their employees’ acceptance of the organization’s goals, willingness to work for the organization, and desire to stay with the organization. In this questionnaire teachers needed to choose from strongly disagree to strongly agree based on five point Likert scale. In addition, this questionnaire items were presented in dual-language, English and Chinese, to make sure the respondents really understood the items. The items from English to Chinese used back to back translation method. The high score meant that the level of recognition, belonging, organization support and work performance of the teachers was also high.

Pilot Study

Different scholars of different disciplines have different sample sizes for pilot study. Creswell (2014) recommended 10% of the expected sample as a sample of the pilot study. Hertzog (2008) recommended that the size of the pilot test should be between 10 and 30. Therefore, this study piloted 30 employees based on Herzog’s suggestion. The pilot study was conducted in secondary schools in Guangzhou city which was not part of the sample for the study. All the 30 questionnaires were distributed and returned. The analysis of the pilot study was done using Cronbach Alpha. This is because, the instrument for this study was adopted from previous studies and as such, Cronbach Alpha analysis was required and suitable for the pilot study. Secondly, Cronbach Alpha is good for handling little number of responses. 22 items in the instrument were tested and reported. The result of the analysis for construct for 9 items was 0.93, Supervision for 3 items was 0.91 and Cohesive Leadership Team for 10 items was 0.95 (Table 1). The single item measure of distributed leadership and teacher’s organizational commitment showed that the reliability above 0.70 is acceptable (Cronbach, 1951). Therefore, the alpha value justified that the instrument was valid and reliable. In addition, the questionnaire was given to experts in the field of educational management who evaluated and the amendments were included in the final draft of the questionnaire based on content and face validity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Total item</th>
<th>Corrected Item-Total Correlation</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.59, 0.86, 0.69, 0.69, 0.78, 0.76, 0.082, 0.73, 0.82</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.82, 0.87, 0.81</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesive Leadership Team</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.57, 0.83, 0.59, 0.84, 0.72, 0.83, 0.79, 0.88, 0.84, 0.79, 0.78</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The secondary school teachers in Guangzhou city who were willing to participate received an envelope including a cover letter and a copy of the survey mailed by the coordinator. The survey was also displayed on an electronic link via internet. The cover letter explained the aim of this study, guaranteed that anonymity and confidentiality were ensured for the participants, and also explained why they were invited to participate in this study.

3. Findings

Secondary school teacher’ based on Teaching Work Experiences

In this study, 68 (69.4%) teachers have between 1-5 years of teaching work experience, 23 (23.5%) teachers have between 6-10 years of teaching work experience, and 7 (7.1%) teachers have between 11-15 years of teaching work experience. The most number of teachers were of teaching work experience between 1-5 years in service.
The Level of Principals Distributed Leadership and Organizational Commitment

Based on Table 2, the secondary school principal’s supervision showed the mean (M= 3.80, SD=0.74) of principals’ supervision which was very high followed by the mean (M=3.43, SD= 0.71) of cohesive leadership team, and the mean (M=3.42, SD= 0.73) of principals’ support was very close to cohesive leadership team. In addition, the mean (M= 2.98, SD= 0.34) of teachers’ organizational commitment was very low. It means that the level of teachers’ OC among this two secondary schools were very low.

Table 2. The level of principals distributed leadership and organizational commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principals’ support</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principals’ supervision</td>
<td>3.80</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohesive leadership team</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>0.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers’ organizational commitment</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences between Gender and Teachers’ Organizational Commitment

Based on Table 3 Levine’s Test was not significant (p>.05). The result showed that there was equal assumption between male and female secondary school teachers on organizational commitment. In addition, the independent sample t-test was statistically not significant (t (96) = 0.78, p > .05). There was no significant difference between male and female teachers on organizational commitment among secondary school teachers.

Table 3. Independent t-test between gender and organizational commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Differences between Teaching Work Experiences and Teachers’ Organizational Commitment

The result in Table 4 shows that there were equal variances assumed between teaching work experience towards teachers’ organizational commitment. The one-way ANOVA was not significant F (2, 95) = 2.53, p > .05) between teaching work experience towards teachers’ organizational commitment. Hence, there was no significant difference between teaching work experiences and teacher’s organizational commitment.

Table 4. Differences between teaching work experience on organizational commitment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teaching Work Experience</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relationship between Principals’ Support and Teachers’ Organizational Commitment

Based on Table 5 the finding indicated that the Pearson correlation was positive and has significant relationship between support and teachers’ organizational commitment (r = 0.47, p < .01). High level of support from school principle in the school resulted in high teacher organizational commitment, while low level of support from school principle resulted in low teacher organizational commitment. There was a low positive relationship between Principals’ Support and Teachers’ Organizational Commitment.

Relationship between Principals’ Supervision and Teachers’ Organizational Commitment

Table 5 also shows that there was a positive relationship between supervision and teacher’s organizational commitment (r = 0.21, p < .05). It means high supervision resulted in high teachers’ organizational commitment and low supervision resulted in low teachers’ organizational commitment. There was a very low positive relationship between Principals’ Supervision and Teachers’ Organizational Commitment.

Relationship between cohesive leadership team and Teachers’ Organizational Commitment

According to Table 5 the result implied that was a positive relationship between cohesive leadership team and teacher’s organizational commitment (r = 0.64, p <.01). The school whose leadership team is more cohesive showed high organizational commitment. On the contrary, the low cohesive leadership team showed low
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teachers organizational commitment. There was a very moderate positive relationship between principals’ supervision and teachers organizational commitment.

Table 5. The relationship between distributed leadership and teacher’s organizational commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Distributed Leadership</th>
<th>Teachers Organizational Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supervision</td>
<td>0.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cohesive leadership team</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Discussion

The Level of Principals’ Distributed Leadership and Teachers’ Organizational Commitment

The results showed that the level of principal’s DL in schools was modest. Teachers’ OC was also reflected as low. It meant that schools with moderate level of DL showed low level of organizational commitment. This result is in line with study of Chen (2010) that the distributed leadership among school principals in Ningxia province was in moderate level and the teachers showed low commitment.

In terms of principals’ supervision, it was found that the level of principals’ supervision was very high followed by the cohesive leadership team. It indicated that the teachers in these two schools highly agreed with the supervision among principals. Supervision is the most important part in distributed leadership. Through supervision, school leaders can understand the needs of teachers better and give support to teachers when necessary. Similarly, Chen’s (2010) study in Ningxia province also supported this result.

Meanwhile, the level of principals’ support was very close to cohesive leadership team in the current study. They were followed by the principals’ supervision. It means that the principals in these two schools did not always support teachers and the leadership team was not performing well. This result is opposite to the study findings by Hulpia and Devos (2010), where in their study, the level of principals’ supervision and leadership team was higher than principals’ support in Belgium.

Gender on Teachers Organizational Commitment

In this study, the organizational commitment among male and female teachers showed no difference. The male teachers and the female teachers have the same perception on commitment in Guangzhou city. This study concurred with the finding of Voloshin (2016), in New York city where there was also no difference in organizational commitment between male and female during school. On the contrary, Getahun, Tefera and Burichew (2016) found that there was a difference between male and female teachers/commitment level in Ethiopian primary schools and it was statistically significant. The male teachers felt more committed than female teachers.

Teaching Work Experience on Teachers’ Organizational Commitment

The findings showed that teaching work experience did not influence the teachers’ perception on organizational commitment among these two schools in Guangzhou city, China. The result concurred with finding by Gholipour, Faghiharam and Araghihe (2012), that there was no significant connection between educator's OC and organizational work experience in Tehran province, Iran. However, Lee (2016) stated there was a significant difference in teaching working experience in Shenzhen city, China. The teachers whose teaching experience was more than 11 years felt more committed than the teachers who have been working between 3 to 5 years, and the teachers whose teaching experience was below to 2 years have a very low commitment.

Principals’ Support on Teachers Organizational Commitment

In the current study, the support of school principals showed a low level in Guangzhou city. But the support from principals also has influenced teachers’ organizational commitment. The more support from principals the more committed the teachers felt. The result concurred with finding Hulpia, Devos and Kerr (2011). Similar finding by Daniels, Hondeghem & Dochy, (2019) highlighted that the effective professional development activities for school principals in secondary schools. The number of principals’ support for teacher’s organizational commitment was more important in Belgium. Also, Akdemir and Ayik (2017) found that in Turkey, principals’ support was one of the sub-dimensions of distributed leadership behavior and organizational
commitment of school principals, and there was a positive and significant relationship between them. As for this finding, many school principals support increased behavior and thus, teachers' organizational commitment increased.

**Supervision on Teachers Organizational Commitment**

The result in current study showed that there was a very low positive connection between supervision and educators' OC in Guangzhou city. This result indicated that the level of supervision in these two secondary schools was low. This finding supports the statement by Akdemir and Ayik (2017) that supervision was one of the sub-dimensions of distributed leadership behavior and OC of school principals, and there was a low positive and significant relationship between them in secondary schools of Erzurum in Turkey. In this finding, the more the school principal's supervised, the more the teacher's organizational commitment increased. But this finding opposed the results of Hulpia, Devos and Kerr (2011) where there was a significant negative impact of principals' supervision on organizational commitment in Belgium. As a whole, teachers who are always supervised by school principals are less committed to the school.

**Cohesive Leadership Team on Teachers Organizational Commitment**

The result showed that when the school leadership team was more cohesive, the organizational commitment among teachers increased. In other words, if the school leadership team did not work well, the teacher will have low organizational commitment to school. This finding is supported by the research by Akdemir and Ahmet (2017) in Turkey, where there was a positive connection between leadership team and, which was one of the sub-dimensions of the distributed leadership behavior and organizational commitment of school principal. As for their finding, more school principals' team work has increased and teachers' organizational commitment has increased.

Overall the findings of this study are in line with the study findings by Kajisho and Loodisso (2020), where Distributed Leadership and Teachers’ Organizational commitment has a strong positive relationship. Furthermore, this study also found that DL was ineffectively used due to reasons such as lack of references and handbook. These findings recommend that school leaders, in addition to sharing the clear vision, should also conduct decentralized leadership for teachers, regardless of gender or teaching work experience.

5. **Conclusion**

Managing schools in current era is a complex and difficult task. Due to this issue, principals could not lead the organizations by themselves. Thus, a group of people with different expertise should work together for a shared vision. Decision making matters are done collectively, because everyone has valuable ideas. Leaders also identify leadership qualities within others and boost them to improve these skills. Keeping this in mind, growing awareness and assisting abilities of educational authorities on this subject, such as board of schools and the Ministry of Education should organize pre-training courses and that in-training programs must take into account DL. In addition, policy makers and higher administrators can be the guide for principals in schools to employ distributing leadership approach in their organization.
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