The Leadership of Public Bureaucracy in Soppeng

Harbani Pasolong[1], Aisyah[2] Andi Yahya[3]

[1,2,3] *Department of Business Administration, Politeknik Negeri Ujung Pandang, Indonesia*
harbanip@gmai.com, aisyahmuchlis66@gmail.com, yahyaandibahtiar@gmail.com

Abstract

The result of the research aimed to described the application of leadership style in public bureaucracy. The method used is the combination of quantitative and qualitative research (triangulation) by using the surfeited sampling of the whole population with 48 people. The result showed that the dominant leadership used in Soppeng is "sarong pawo" where all the decisions or policies were determined by the elite/leader, in this case the leader tends to give instruction to the subordinate. The implementation of sarong pawo influenced by the environment and cronology of the royal traditional culture which adopted the royal culture system into the government system. The internalitation of royal cultural values into the birocraty brings the character that tends to put himself to the higher degree than any other people and also in the relationship hierarchy influenced by the patterns of client patron relationship with the leader. The sorong pawo leadership takes place for 657 years, because no one dare to resist or refuse even they're right or wrong because the truth as tradition in royal system.

I. Introduction

Reformation era has become a gate to the change of paradigm of buraucracy from the centralization into the decentralization, so the regional autonomy is the key. The change of paradigm means the transformation in the complex structure of bureaucracy to become simpler and slimmer so, it needs a reduction in bureaucracy system. In the transformation of bureaucracy, the most important thing beside a mature concept is the bureaucratic leadership. In the context of bureaucrat leaders and in the connection the of leadership style applied, the most leadership style wanted was the effective one. To create an effective situational leadership accordingly, the leaders are expected to apply the situational leadership given the rapid changes in situations and conditions in social life now is "multi-complex" and "mega-competition". The leadership of bureaucracy becomes very important as the main prerequisite and the critical factor of the succes in public service. The official career in organization must have a vision to the future Widodo (2016:145), and the vision including their ability to see towards the national and global scale. The leader will be able to reach or see the organization in the future when they have a broad knowledge, insight and view to the future. Organization must have a goal to be achieved by the organizational members (Niati et al., 2021). The success of leadership is partly determined by the ability of leaders to develop their organizational culture. (Arif, 2019).The leader with a future vision must know where the organization will be carried and the tasks assigned to him. So, the carreer official needed is the leader that is able to transform values into action, visions into reality, hurdles into inovation, differentitaion into solidarity and risks into appreciation Kouzes & Posner (2020:xiv).

22752

Bureaucratic leadership means a process to influence the subordinate to finish task given and direct the organization to make it unified and condusive by implementing concept, ethic, character, knowledge and skill through their authority. The legitimation of the authority was also used by Weber when he made the model of bureaucratic leadership. The Weberian bureaucratic leadership model such as bureaucratic institutional characteristic Weber (1947), tends to oriented to the rational power, legal, hierarchy and rigid supervision.

Public bureaucratic leadership all this time tends to implement only one style of leadership to all the maturities there is the the style of instruction which affect to the low performance Sartono (2014:103). The official leadership is nothing more than just as a sovereign figure that is fettered by formal rules that not allowed appreciations. The implication to the human resource aparatur is the attachment with the formal rules so there will be no space to do the innitiative and inovative step or even a significant development. Therefore, it's time to change the bureaucratic leadership in one style into the situational leadership based on the situation and condition of the staff maturity.

The feodal bureaucratic leadership pressed to power, "top down" approach and based on formal relationship was not relevant anymore because the challenge faced today is no longer internally but also globally. Lantu et al (2017:4), found that in the government bureaucrat. "if we can make it difficult, then why we should make it more simple". In Indonesia we need 150 days to get a permission in export business, but in Thailand and China we only need 30 days to get the permission. The same condition we can find if we see the lower bureaucrat structure. Apparently, to get the identity card (KTP), Birth Certificate, Death certificate, Job Seekers card, Building Permits, and other important documents still take long time and high cost.

The important reason in the research to the bureaucratic leadership are (1) leadership is the main element in organization because good or bad behaviour of the subordinate depends on the behaviour of the leader in directing the subordinate Waluyo (2017:173), (2) then Creech (2016:292), said that there would be no bad teamwork, but only a bad leader. Therefore, Peneliti feel interesting to do research about what style implemented by the bureaucrat leader.

II. Review of Literature

2.1 The Leadership Style

Basically, the leadership style was from an English word "Style" means one's model that always visible and characterizes the person. Style is a habit that is inherent in one person in carrying out the tasks of leadership. Stoner (1996:165), said that leadership style is patterns of behavior prefered and used by a leader in the process of directing and influenting the labors. While a leadership style according to Thoha (2004:49), is a norm used by someone at the time he tried to influence one's behaviour. Leadership style according to Hersey & Blanchard (1982:152), were patterns of consistent behavior applied when they work with and through others as perceived by those people. The patterns come out to the people at the time they start to response in the same way and in the same condition, the patterns create a habit that at least can be predicted by those who work with the leader.

From the expert's opinion above, we can conclude that leadership style is a way or technic used by a leader to influence, direct, motivate, and control the subordinate to gain the organization goals efficiently and effectively.

2.2 Leadership Bureaucracy

Leadership Bureaucracy means a process to influence the subordinate to finish the tasks given and direct the organization to make it more condusive and unified, by implementing concept, value, ethic, characte, knowledge, and skill through their authority. The authority legitimate also used by Weber when he made the bureaucratic leadership model. The Weberian bureaucratic leadership model such as the Weber bureaucratic institutional characteristic tends to be oriented to the power rationally, legally and hirerarchis and rigid supervision.

Bureaucratic leader is a 'spinal column' in public service and as a servant of the state and a servant of the society, Said (2017:331). Therefore, the career official has a direct subordinate to give a service to public. While, the institution gives a service directly to public is official, which is official duty. Official duty is the implementer of regional government element lead by the head of department that under and responsible to the head of region through the Secretary of The Region.

Bureaucratic leadership is a special case that must be solved and settled by implementing an approach and leadeship style. Lantu (2017:27), said that today we need a new leadership philosophy, there is the leadership of servant by Jakob in Lantu (2007: xi), called a "posmodernist" leadership, which simultaneously raised the personal growth of the employee, improved the bureaucrat quality and the bureaucratic service through the involvement of the employee in decision making and also their behavior ethics and responsibility.

In common bureaucrat and especially in public buraucrat, the leader has a very strategic main role, whether it success or not in doing their duties in public service, was determined by the quality of the leader itself. Therefore, all the activities dominated by the bureaucrat leader.

In the context of the public bureaucracy which is very paternalistic and all the staff always work depends on the official. When the official doesn't have a leadership capability, then the tasks given which are very complex wouldn't not be finished well. In reality today, in different hierarchy (level) no so many public bureaucrat leader has a capability to lead well. That's because the recruitment system was not based on the competence.

Various research about public bureaucracy showed that there are still many weaknesses in leadership in various level or grade. Level of mastery of the leadership is still low. Beside that, the awareness and capacity of a leader in doing their duty to serve public was very limited, in fact many from those who always want to be served. A formal authority become an effective weapon in directing the staffs. The consequence is the staff doing their duty not because their own awareness but only because a pressure from the official, so there would be no harmonious relationship between the official and the staff. Whereas, both official and staff is one unit of team work maintained in perform the mission and goal of bureaucracy.

III. Research Method

3.1 Location and Time of Study

Location in the research is the Public Buraucracy in Soppeng, while the focus of the research is the leadership style implemented by the bureaucrat in public service. The research done in Januari 2019.

3.2 Population and Sample
a. Population
Population is a generalization area consists of object and subject with certain amount and characteristic determined by the researcher to be analyzed and to get the sample for research Harbani Pasolong (2019: 162). The population in the research are all employees which understand representatively the leaderhip style applied by the bureaucratic elit leader in Soppeng Regency consist of 48 people.

b. Research Samples
The amount of sample used in the research are 48 people from 55 populations. The number of samples or respondents based on classifications: Class IV 6 people, class III 24 people, Class II 18 people, so the whole numbers would be 48 people. While, the key informant in in the research are the Regional Secretary, members of parliament, members of Social League for Society/Non-Governmental Organization (LSM), Cultural Observers, Journalists and former staff in Soppeng consisted of 10 people.

IV. Result and Discussion

4.1 Description of Maturity Level
The maturity level in situational leadership can be formulated as an a capability and willingness of people so they can be responsible in directing their own behavior. The maturity variables are concerned in the connection with specific task given. Therefore the staff or group is not adult or mature in common definition, but everyone tend to be more or not adult in the connection with the specific task, function, or goal that will be achieve by the the leader through their efforts, Thoha (2017:322).

An employee tends to be the in the different level and depends on his duty, function, or certain goal. The organization or institution might be improved. Capability and willingness to do some technical aspect of the job, but it doesn't show the same maturity level in the aspect about the job facility. Therefore, the situational leadership focused on the the appropriate or the efective of leadership style in accordance with the maturity level of the staff. The maturity level of the staff in public bureaucratic can be explained as :

Table 1. The Score of The Maturity Level of The Staff

THE MATURITY LEVEL OF THE STAFF	EXPECTED VALUE	RESULT VALUE	THE AVERAGE VALUE	%
Low Maturity (M1)	1680	747	106.71	44,46
Middle Maturity (M2)	1440	947	157	65,76
Middle to High maturity (M3)	1200	925	**185**	**77,08**
High Maturity (4)	1440	823	137	57,15

Source: Primary Data, 2022

Based on the tabel 1, showed that the maturity level or the the performance measured that the maturity level of the public bureaucrat in Soppeng is in medium to high category (M3), with capability but low willingness and it can be seen from the value of the highest grade with scores 925 and average of 185 (77,08%).

While staffs categorized as low maturity (M1), are those with no capability but have a willingness with scores 747 and average 106 (44,46%). Then, staffs categorized as low to medium maturity (M2), are those with no capability but have a willingness categorized as "not good' with scores 947 average 157 (65,76%), and staffs categorized as high maturity (M4), are those with no capability and have a willingness categorized as " not good" with scores 823 average 137 (57,15%).

The result of the research showed that the maturity level in Public Bureaucratic in Soppeng is in the category of "Medium to High maturity (M3)", with a capability but have a willingness or high motivation in accordance with the interview results with the Former Head of the Department of The Civil Documentation and Demography by saying that : 'I have seen the average staff in Public Bureaucrat, but their motivations are troubled that they're lazy to do the task given, for example late for work, late start to work, chatting with friends while working, and always come home quickly. But he can do a good job if he wants to, because on average they're highly educated and alumni of the state university, with quality in not in doubt, but they're just lazy".

Also, from the analysis of interview with informants about the low capability and willingness which influenced by the increasing of their own awareness. Then, in line also from the analysis of interview with various informants abaout the low willingness or motivation to do the tasks given. Here are some conclusions of interview with several informants that can be seen as follow. *"I've seen staff in public bureaucrat, as government official/civil servants, attention to enhance capability or maturity were determined by his own conscience. Impression arises that employee is capable and capable to have the same salary for the same class, not because of the same performance of work. Then, there are staffs repeatedly joined the education and training programmes but no progress in the way they work. Then there are staffs rarely involved the education and training programmes or had never even participated in the education and training programmes but the performance quite satifactory. Then, the tight absence, satisfactory discourse of the leader, has not been able to make the employees well motivated. Because, they still lazy to go to work on time and come home not in time. The low of willingness or motivaton will affect to the performance which is not satisfied".*

The unappropriate of application of leadership style in public bureaucracy caused more by the classification of employee in capability and willingness only in two levels, there are 1) The Employee is capable or incapable, 2) The employee is lazy and discipline. This is accordance with result of the interview with a member of parliament whose said that : *"I have noticed from the former leader and the leader now, they only classified the capability of employee into : 1) employee with capability and incapability, 2)Employee with motivation and no motivation therefore the official only know two kinds of capability or maturity of the employees there are employee capable or incapable (mature and inmature). It can be done by few considerations for example : one of the concept/material in leadership when we join the leadership training therefore we only know two styles of leadership there are instruction and democracy".*

Result of the interviews were in appropriate with the vision of the former head of department in Soppeng (67 years) by saying that : *"Based on my experience as a leader of public bureaucrat, i tend to use the style of instruction because i've been used to with the pattern of leadership in the style of instruction in our family and as we know that this place/regency is still tight up with local culture there is "sorong pawo" that was a descent from the leader of royal, coloring the leadership style of the bureaucracy in this regency, named "pammali" againts decison from the top leader".* The low motivation of employees usually caused by the lack of faith. But, if they have faith in their capability but still don't

want to do the task given then the main problem is motivation than their own safety. In a case like this, leader have to open the two way communication actively by hear and support the initiative of employees to use their capability. Therefore, the style to support but with no direction. Thus, the force supporting, without directing, "participation" (G3) has a high succes. Thus, the force supporting, without directing, "participation" (G3) has a high success rate to be applied to the employee with such maturity level.

4.2 The Description of Bureaucracy Leadership

The Result of the research showed that the dominant leadership style applied is the style of instruction with score 1068 or in the average 178 (74,16%) (see table 4). It's mean that the situational leadership has been applied in the department but not maximum in result because still less adapted to the maturity level of employees. This is consistent with the result of interviews with informant agency, Head of Department (72 tahun), who said that : *"As long as i became a head in the Department i always give instructions or commands verbally to the employee about what to do and how to do and give an important information related to the job. Then, i also give instructions to the employee in order to carry out tasks given and can provide the best service to public, because it's an obligation to satisfy the public"*.

From the interview we can see that the official or the head of department tends to give a command to the staff than involve them in decision making. In the thoretical case of employees with medium to high level maturity or employees who have a capability to work but don't have the motivation to do a job will be better applied the participation style. This is justified or explained by the informant, a member of parliament (age 58 years), by saying that : I have became an employee in public bureaucracy for about 28 years, i always noticed that the leadership style applied both to the former officials and officials present more dominant use the style of instruction or command to the employee because we have regarded as children or not capable in doing the job. This is due to the influence of the pattern of the "Andi"leadership (Datu) *"sorong pawo" is all kind policies or decisions coming from above (datu) where those in below were only receive and execute, because it would be wrong if it's not implemented and it would be a big mistake if we fight the order from above"*.

If the leadership style which is dominantly applied, connected with the level of maturity which is dominant in bureaucracy there is have an ability but no willingness (M3), then the leadership style applied "is not appropriate " or "not good ". Because of the right leadership applied is the participation style (G3) in this kind of maturity.

The implementation of the style of instruction based on the result of research can be explored by the main characteristics that the leader always have an orientation to power, authority, obedience to the official leader, one way communication, depends on the leader. The orientation to power is prominent phenomenon in the behavior of the bureaucrat leader. Power is an instrument to actualize himself as the resource management of bureaucract. The bureaucrats are very obedient to the official or leader influenced by the lines of authority within the bureaucratic hierarchy as proposed by Weber. Every bureaucrat should be obedient and loyal to the official or leader. The obedience arise simultanously with the desire to keep the power and position. The higher obedience then it would be more imperishable the position which held by the bureaucrat official. The obedience to the hierarchy of positions on it causes dependence upon a person to his leader quite high.

In the public bureaucracy culture symbols can be seen in the tittle of Duke like, Datu, Bau, Petta, Andi attached to a person who occupied positions in tghe bureaucracy and

society at large. So, the person occupying was called "Pak Andi", "Bau" "Petta", and Puang. Not be called "Bapak" as commonly someone whose positions are generally called "Bapak".

The leadership above persisted since a long time ago, it was in the year of 1300 until now. It can be seen since the first regent until now, still dominated by the nobles. The eternity of royal leadership was influenced by local culture. From the royal era in 1300-1940 the regency was lead by the king and lead only by the descents of royal/nobles for three times.

So, it can be understand that the leadership style was influenced by culture where he assigned. Then, it can be understood that leadership style is influenced by culture in which a person becomes a leader, is no exception to the Public Bureaucracy in Soppeng influenced by local culture is the culture of kinship. This is made clear by an open questionnaire given to the respondents and informants, the leader always use the style of kinship/relatives in doing their duties and authority. Behavior of the leader can be seen when they engage employees for training, seminars, study which is always sent out are those who have a kinship relationship. Similarly, when there are vacant positions to be filled are those who has an alliance with the leader who actually sufficient competence to occupy the position.

The application of the style of instruction is not apart from the environment and cronology of the traditional culture of Soppeng Kingdom which is the adoption of royal culture system into the system of government. The internalization of royal culture values brings the caharacter of bureaucrat which is tends to put himsef into the higher place than society at large.

The nobles in public bureaucrat more respected than those who have a higher education, position, the rich and the other status. The value and norm system used in the bureaucrat system using a double standard. In one side the desire of bureaucrat to behave like a powerful king to be served, and in the other side is a bureaucrat whose function is a servant who knows the needs of community it served.

Table 2. The scores of Leadership Style

Style of Leadership	EXPECTED VALUE	PERCEIVED VALUE	AVERAGE VALUE	%
Style of Instruction	1440	1068	**178**	**74,16**
Style of Consultation	1440	996	166	69,16
Style of Participation	1680	1057	151	62,91
Style of Delegation	960	633	158	65,93

Source: Processed questionnaire, 2022

Based from the result of research above then it can be concluded that the application of the leadership style in the Department of Demography and Civil Record in Soppeng is "not maximum" because it is not adapted with the maturity level of employee is not adjusted with the maturity level in the Department. Therefore, the effectiveness of leadership style that are applied heavily influenced by wheter or not the appropriateness of the application of leadership style to the maturity level of employees. As noted by Hersey Blanchard (1982), that: 1) low level of maturity (M1), there are employees that do not have capability and willingness, then the most effective style applied was the style of instruction (G1), where the leader do the one way communication, imposes limits employee rolethe leader tell more to the employee about what, how, when, and where the tasks undertaken.

Low level of suitability of leadership style applied with the maturity level in Department of Demography and Civil Record in Soppeng because it was influenced by royal system occured for almost 657 years. The royal system lead by "Datu" who were hereditary royal control. The reign of Datu to Datu use the leadership style *"sorong pawo"* where all decisions determined by the aristocratic elit or Datu. The process of change in the leadership of Datu/King as written in lontara passed on to offspring. There is no king who ruled the kingdom of Soppeng beside offspring of *La Temmalala Tomanurunnge ri Sekkanyili.* Therefore, all the dukes of Soppeng are come from one ancestors named La *Temmalala.*

At the time of kingdom has been determined: 1) the principles of good governance, strong and democratic, 2) Political culture that upholds the dignity, sel-esteem (sirik) and the honour of the leader and people. Kindness, strenghth, and practice of democratic governance pioneered in the period of *Tomanurung* built upon a foundation of cultural values sirik, and customs that teaches to do good, moral and ethical governance, emphasizing the strenghtening of dignity, honour, and self-esteem by emhasizing the potential of the attitude of behavior : *a)* skill *(amaccangeng), b)* honesty *(alempureng,) and c) courage (awaraningeng)*, as standar of political leadership and bureaucracy.

Although bureaucracy carried out by focused on the social system of relatives, but principles of justice still becomes the main focus in social systemin the form of kinship, but the principles of justice remains a reference in the administration of customary royal era. The kinship system integrates with the bureaucrat system controlled by *sirik* and *pengaderreng*, where the institutionalizaton carried on the family. The implication of implementation of bureaucratic based firmly on the cultural values that are in line with the the social system to build a a pattern of government that is success in progress the regency.

Legacy of political culture and bureaucracy in monarchy era still can be seen in the behavior of bureaucrat including the style of leadership of the official/bureaucrat. But, the meaning now is different than in the past. The orientation of status by maintenance honesty *(alempureng)*, improve ability *(amaccangeng)*, and keep the bravery *(awaraningeng)* in the value of "*sirik*" and *penngaderreng* has change into the orientation of interest.

The combination between values of relatives in the past and the impersonal principles in modern bureaucracy emerged a bureaucracy anomaly, because of the different basic principle which is contradicted to each other and it doesn't regulated in an formal system in bureaucracy era like today. Therefore, emerged behavior implications such as : appearance, ambivalent that have a negative affect to orderliness in bureaucratic relationship and it's hard to be separated and placed precisely between bureaucratic relationship with relatives relationship. We can even say that it is more close the value of relatives than the competence value which is formally signed.

The leadership style which is dominant applied in Department of Demography and Civil Record in Soppeng influenced by local culture there is a noble whose in a certain position will receive honour/appreciation from the subordinate and also will be followed by society. Because there are 2 elements in the noble : position and noble/royal descent. Head of official or leader is those who has a royal descent since a long ago (kingdom era). They are the descend of leader who govern or deserve to be followed and the order must be obeyed.

So, the style of instruction implemented to employee or subordinate who doesn't have a family relationship with the leader, while the style of participate and delegate implemented to employee who has a family relationship with the leader. It can be doing easily because : a) In Soppeng those who has a high social status for example "Andi" is written in his/her first name, unlike a calling name such as "Datu", Puang", "Karaeng"

Daeng, "Opu" or any other titles that have the same meaning or class. b) behavior of relatives has become a common thing by society because it's a tradition/habit since long ago until now, and they even thought it's wrong if they don't do that (because no one will make it out as a problem) and acceptable as a habit or tradition since the monarchy era.

The *Andi* leadership (aristocrate/noble) has a positive and negative value. Positive because the subordinate would not be able to fight againts the leaderwheter he's right or wrong, because they believe that the truth is a tradition used since along time ago was the leadership style "*sorong pawo*" (all decisions or policies made by the elit nobles). The negative value if the leader doen't have a a competence to be in one position and it will affect to the subordinates or follower. Then, *the Andi* leadership will give priority to relative then competence, and it would be the main problem to be solved.

Therefore, to make *The Andi* Leadership (aristocratic nobles) become "***Super Leadership***", then the condition needs to be fulfilled beside the 5 things said by Kousez & Posner (2002), there are : honest, have vision, competence, inspirator, fair, then the other one is "**social status**", in this was aristocratic Duke (*Andi*). By reasons that 1) The Duke title "Andi" has an excess than any other Aristocratic title there is "Andi" is written or not written in one's name, unlike the other titles, for example : "Karaeng", "Daeng, "Opu" or other terms that have the same meaning and class with that, 2) the title is still accepted by society as tradition from the kingdom era, it was in the year 1300-1957. Then in the modern era like today we still can find it in bureaucracy management. It can be proved that in modern bureaucracy still dominated by the official with noble status and applied the style of instruction in doing their job and authority as the the leader of bureaucracy. Because in the kingdom era the key factor to carry out the government was by using "the fore finger" which is is dominant than "the thumb" .

The bureaucracy of Soppeng Kingdom in the past known as "*Sorong Pawo*" in decision making. *Sorong Pawo* is all kind decisions about the royal government made from Datu. In modern namelly as *Top-down approach model* (from up/top to down). While in modern government of Soppeng we still can see the model *top-down* is still carry out although the idea about *Bottom-up* model (from down to up/top) has been in bureaucracy were all decisions made depend on the leader, and also in the relationship hierarchy were also influenced by the patterns of patron relationship between client and leader. The culture becomes a part of bureaucracy through the top leader that's because relatives as the cultural line in bureaucracy and the leader appoint, promote and dismiss the head of department (bureaucratic leader). So, it can be understand that there's a political factor in bureaucracy,therefore it would be difficult to be neutral in service.

V. Conclusion

Based on the disscusion of the result of research that has been described previously, It can be concluded as followed. The dominant leadership style implemented in public bureaucracy in Soppeng is "The style of Instruction' which theoretically appropriate to the employees with "low maturity" that is employee who does not have an ability or incompetent and doesn't have a high motivation to do the job given. The implementation of style of instruction influented by few factors such as: a) values and unwritten norms adopted jointly by majority of members of nobility who tend to use the style of "sorong pawo" (all decisions or policies determined by the aristocratic elit, and b) supervisor of the leader which is an official action or behavior is largely determined by the official structural on its or the leader.

References

Adair, John, (2018). Menjadi Pemimpin yang efektif. Jakarta: Pustaka Binaman. Presindo.

Arif, S. (2019). Influence of Leadership, Organizational Culture, Work Motivation, and Job Satisfaction of Performance Principles of Senior High School in Medan City. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal). P. 239-254

Albrow, Martin. (2016). Birokrasi: Terjemahan. Yogyakarta: PT. Tiara Wacana Yogya.

Al-Munawar, Said Aqil Husain dan Yusuf Tayar. (2022). Etika Manajamen: Kepemimpinan Pemerintahan Perniagaan dan Masyarakat. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.

Bass, B.M. (2015). Leadership and Performance Beyond Expectation, New York: Free Press.

Bennis, Warren G, & Burt Nanus. (2020). Kepemimpinan: Strategi Dalam Mengemban Tanggung Jawab. (Terjemahan). Jakarta: Erlangga.

Blanchard, Meggy, (2019). Kepemimpinan dan Perilaku Kepemimpinan. Salemba Empat (terjemahan). Jakarta.

Bush, Tony & Marianne Colleman, (2016). Leadership And Management In Education: Manjemen Strategis Kepemimpinan Pendidikan. Yogyakarta: IRciSoD.

Cribbin, James J. (2015). Kepemimpinan: Srategi Mengefektifkan Organisasi (Terjemahan) Rochmulyati Hamzah. Jakarta: Pustaka Binaman Pressindo.

Creech, Bill. (2016). Lima Pilar: Manajemen Mutu Terpadu (TQM) Cara Membuat Total Quality Management Bekerja Bagi Anda. Jakarta: Binarupa Aksara.

David Osborne dan Ted Gaebler. (2019). Mewirausahakan Birokrasi. Jakarta: PPM.

Davis K & Newsrom J.W. (2019). Human Bewhaviour at Work (8 ed) Singapore: Mc Grw-Hill.

Dessler, Gary. (2020). Organization Theory: Integrating Structure and Behavior. Prentice_hall, Inc,. Englewood Cliffs-New Jersey.

Gibson, James L. (2020). Organisasi: Perilaku, Struktur, Proses. (jilid II). Jakarta: Erlangga.

Greenleaf, R. K. (2019). Tracing the Growing Impact of servant-Leadership. In L. C. Spears Insights on Leadership: Service, Stewardsip, Spirit, and Servant Leadership, New York, NY:John Wiley.

Ivancevich MJ. (2020). Human Resource Management. (8 ed). Mc. Graw-Hill.

Jay A. Conger. (2017). Pemimpin Karismatik. (terjemahan). Jakarta: Binapura Aksara.

Kartono, Kartini, (2015). Kepemimpinan: Apakah Kepemimpinan Abnormal itu?. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.

Keating, Charles J. (2016). Kepemimpinan: Teori dan Pengembangannya. (Terjemahan). Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

Kousez, M. James & Barry Z. Posner. (2017). Kredibilitas. Jakarta: Profesional Books.

_____. (2014). Leadership The Challennge: Tantangan Kepemimpinan. Jakarta: Erlangga.

Lantu, Donal, Erich Pesiwarissa. Augusman Rumahorbo. (2017). Servant Leadership. Jakarta: Gradien Books.

Maxwell, Jhon C. (2015). Mengembangkan Kepemimpinan di Dalam Diri Anda. (Terjemahan). Jakarta: Binarupa Aksara.

McClelland, David C. (1987). Memacu Masyarakat Berprestasi: Mempercepat Laju Pertumbuhan Ekonomi Melalui Peningkatan Motif Berprestasi. (Terjemahan). Jakarta: Intermedia.

Moenir, A.S. (2016). Kepemimpinan Karja: Peranan, Teknik dan Keberhasilannya, Bina Aksara. Jakarta.

Nawawi Hadari, & Martini Hadari. (2015). Kepemimpinan dan Supervisi Pendidikan. Jakarta: Bina Aksara.

Niati, D. R., Siregar, Z. M. E., & Prayoga, Y. (2021). The Effect of Training on Work Performance and Career Development: The Role of Motivation as Intervening Variable. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences, 4(2), 2385–2393. https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v4i2.1940

Pamudji, S. (2019). Kepemimpinan Pemerintahan di Indonesia, Jakarta: Bina Aksara.

Pasolong, Harbani. (2019). Kepemimpinan Birokrasi. Cetakan Kedua, CV. Alfabeta Bandung.

_____. (2020). Metode Penelitian Administrasi Publik. CV. Alfabeta Bandung.

Pelras, Cristian. (2011). Hubungan Patron Klien pada Masyarakat Bugis dan Makassar di Sulawesi Selatan. Makalah yang disajikan pada Konferensi Sulawesi Selatan Pertama, di Monash University. Melbourne.

Rahmany, Hasan. (2016). Kepemimpinan dan Kinerja. Peningkatan Kinerja Organisasi Melalui Kepemimpinan yang Memberdayakan Karyawan. Jakarta: Yapensi.

Rivai, Veithzal. (2014). Kiat Kepemimpinan Dalam Abad ke 21. Jakarta: Murai Kencana.

Robbins, S.P.. (1995). Teori Organisasi: Struktur, Deain & Aplikasi. Alih Bahasa: Yusuf Udaya. Jakarta: Arcan

Richard I. Dafr. (2019). Leadership: Teory and Practice: The Dryden Press.

Rukmana, Nana. (2017). Etika Kepemimpinan Perspektif Agama dan Moral. Bandung: Alfabeta.

Safaria, Triantoro. (2014). Kepemimpinan. Graha Ilmu. Yogyakarta. Candi Gebang Permai.

Sartono dkk. (2014). Memahami Good Governance Dalam Perspektif Sumber Daya Manusia. Gava Media. Yogyakarta.

Said, M., Mas'ud. (2017). Birokrasi di Negara Birokratis. Malang: UMM Press.

Spears, L. (Ed.) (2015). Reflection on Leadership: How Robert Greenleaf's Theory of Servant-Leadership Influenced Today's Top Management Thinkers, New York:John Wiley & Sons.

Stoner, James A.F. dkk. (2016). Manajemen. Jakarta: PT Indeks Gramedia Grup.

Siagian, P. Sondang, (2014). Patologi Birokrasi: Analisis, Identifikasi dan Terapinya. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.

_____, (2013). Teori Dan Praktek Kepemimpinan. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Singarimbun Masri dan Sofian Effendi (ed). (2015). Metode Penelitian Survai. Yogyakarta: LP3ES.

Sudriamunawar, Haryono, (2016). Kepemimpinan Peran Serta dan Produktivitas. Bandung: Mandar Maju.

Sutarto, (2006). Dasar-dasar Kepemimpinan. Yogyakarta: Gajah Mada University Press.

Syafi'ie Kencana Inu, dkk. (2013). Kepemimpinan Pemerintahan Indonesia. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.

Sudriamunawar, Haryono, (2016). Kepemimpinan Peran Serta dan Produktivitas. Bandung: Mandar Maju.

Sulistiyani, Ambar Teguh. (2014). Memahami Good Governance: Dalam Perspektif SDM, Gava Media. Yogyakarta.

The Drucker. Foundation. (2020). The Leader of The Future (Pemimpin Masa Depan).

Thoha Mifta, 2022. Perspektif Perilaku Birokrasi. Jakarta: RajaGrafindo Persada.

_____, (2014). Kepemimpinan Dalam Manajemen. Jakarta: PT Raja Grafindo Persada.

Wahjosumidjo. (1914). Kepemimpinan dan Motivasi. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.

Waluyo. (2017). Manajemen Publik: (Konsep, Aplikasi dan Implementasinya Dalam Otonomi Daerah). Bandung: Mandar Maju.

Weber, Max, (2015). Konsep-konsep Dasar Dalam Sosiologi. Terjemahan. Jakarta: Rajawali.

Weber, Max, (1947). The Theory of Social and Economic Organization, Translated by A.M. Henderson & Talcott Parson. New York. The Free Press.

Widodo, Joko. (2016). Membangun Birokrasi Berbasis Kinerja. Jakarta. Bayumedia. Publishing

Wijaya. A.W. (2016). Peranan Motivasi Dalam Kepemimpinan. Jakarta: Akademika Pressindo.

Winardi. (2020). Kepemimpinan Dalam Manajemen. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Wirjana, Bernadine R. & Susilo. Supardo. (2006). Kepemimpinan: Dasar-Dasar dan Pengembangannya. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Andi.

Yukl, Gary. (2018). Kepemimpinan Dalam Organisasi.(Terjemahan). Jakarta: Prenhallindo.