

TAWARIKH

International Journal for Historical Studies

YUSUF WAHYUDIN

Leadership Values in the Life of Traditional and Modern Society: An Historical Study

ABSTRACT: Leadership values are values associated with the actions conducted by a leader. In terms of leadership behavior, there are “essential values” or values of faith, kindness, intelligence, proficiency, and so on, in which a leader must naturally have. In addition to the “essential values” sourced from religious teaching, there are also essential values sourced from local wisdom. However, leadership values have undergone transformations with time. It is inseparable from the growth of the advanced civilization that causes the leadership values rooted from religious teaching and local wisdom to shift to leadership values rooted from worldly teaching. In other words, all of the leadership values rooted from religious teaching and local wisdom will eventually erode and shift to processed value. This scientific article analyzes leadership phenomenon occurring in the life of a society. In general, society leadership values have shifted with time. It is inseparable from the growth of the advanced and developing civilization, of which the results affect all aspects of life, including leadership. The article describes several models of leadership values prevailing in traditional, modern, and post-modern society, which in fact has dynamically moved. In order to understand it, descriptive study with library research method is used. Meanwhile, the study aims to reveal the changes in leadership models existing in traditional, modern, and post-modern society to allow the result of this study to be used as a learning tool for public.

KEY WORDS: Leadership values, essential values, religious teaching, local wisdom, traditional, modern, and post-modern societies, and learning tool for public.

INTRODUCTION

Leadership values are values associated with the actions conducted by a leader. In terms of leadership behavior, there are “essential values” or values of faith, kindness, intelligence, proficiency, etc. a leader must naturally have. However, leadership values have undergone transformations with time. It is inseparable from the growth of the advanced

civilization that causes the leadership values rooted from religious teaching and local wisdom to shift to leadership values rooted from worldly teaching.

According to Sutrisno Muslimin (2012), the “essential values” here are the basic values humans use as a guidance in searching for kindness, harmony, and justice. Therefore, those essential leadership values are basically

About the Author: Yusuf Wahyudin, M.M.Pd. is an Educator and a Principal at the SDN (Sekolah Dasar Negeri or Public Elementary School) Banjarsari, Jalan Merdeka No.22 Bandung, West Java, Indonesia. For academic interests, the author is able to be contacted via e-mail at: tsaryusuf@gmail.com

How to cite this article? Wahyudin, Yusuf. (2015). “Leadership Values in the Life of Traditional and Modern Society: An Historical Study” in TAWARIKH: International Journal for Historical Studies, Vol.7(1) October, pp.121-130. Bandung, Indonesia: Minda Masagi Press, ISSN 2085-0980.

Chronicle of the article: Accepted (May 7, 2015); Revised (August 17, 2015); and Published (October 28, 2015).

taught and passed on through generations since the past (Muslimin, 2012). For example, the values taught by the Prophet Muhammad SAW (*Salallahu Alaihi Wassalam* or peace be upon him) are the essential values every leader must follow.

The essential values taught by the Prophet Muhammad SAW are not only recognized by Muslims, but also by people all over the world. Therefore, it is quite reasonable if the Western researcher, Michael H. Hart (2009), has named Prophet Muhammad SAW as the most influential figure in the history of mankind in regard of these “essential values” (Hart, 2009).

In addition to the “essential values” sourced from religious teaching, there are also essential values sourced from local wisdom. According to Daeng Arifin & Pipin Arifin (2011), there are some concepts of leadership behavior based on local wisdom, such as Sundanese culture-based values. Local wisdom based on Sundanese culture taught the noble values of a leader, stating that a leader must be “*handap asor*” or humble and not arrogant; a leader must be “*ulah getas harupateun*” or not rushing in making decisions or taking actions; a leader must be “*landung kandungan, laer aisan, leuleus jeujeur, liat tali*” or flexible in acts; a leader must be “*nete taraje, nincak hambalan*” or able to work systematically; and a leader must behave like “*nyiruan*” or bee, in which for bee would always perch on a place on top of beautiful flowers and be the honey for human life (Arifin & Arifin, 2011:64).

However, all of the leadership values rooted from religious teaching and local wisdom will eventually erode and shift to “processed value”. The term “processed value” refers to leadership values deliberately created by a leader, so that he/she could obtain good image and gain respect from his/her subordinates. Thus, there is a fundamental difference between “essential value” and “processed value” in leadership. “Essential value” is leadership value sourced from God’s teaching and local wisdom; while “processed value” is leadership value deliberately created for particular purposes (Fronidizi, 2014). Deploying groceries or money during political campaigns are good examples of “processed value” usually conducted by leaders for political purpose.

From the explanation above, it can at least be concluded that since long time ago, essential leadership values have been passed down in traditional societies, where every tribe in the nation always undoubtedly has essential value sourced from religious teachings and local wisdom. Daeng Arifin & Pipin Arifin (2011) again explained that all regions in the nation have leadership custom based on local culture, such as Javanese, Minang, or Aceh culture-based leadership culture (Arifin & Arifin, 2011:60-157). Other than that, the main foundation very important in building leadership values is the teaching of Islamic values, which basically have already taken deep root in traditional society life since long time ago.

Meanwhile, in the modern society life, the leadership values are more emphasized on rationality or based on the thinking rationale of a modern society, where it works not by relying on irrational things in accordance with belief norms, but more by emphasizing on rational things. For example, in a traditional society, a leader must come from religious circle, a noble or *saehu* (shaman) descendant, whereas those things are not applicable for modern leaders. Modern era leaders hardly even have the understanding on religious and cultural values since degree, high education, skill, intelligence, and dedication are considered more important. Thus, there is a fundamental transformation of leadership values, from traditional leadership values to modern leadership values (Sztompka, 2010).

Based on the above explanation, it is important to study the phenomenon. There are conspicuous differences between the two types of leadership values, as each of them has different cultural background: the traditional leadership values come from traditional cultural background, while the modern leadership values come from modern cultural background. Due to the differences in cultural background, leadership values emerge with adjustments to current time. Therefore, in order to gain comprehensive study results, historical approach and library research method are used (Kuntowijoyo, 2003; Ismaun, 2005; and Sjamsuddin, 2007).

The purpose of the research is to reveal the form of leadership values prevailing in

traditional society and leadership values prevailing in modern society. In order to objectify the purpose, there are three subjects of analysis, namely: (1) the nature of leadership values; (2) leadership values in the life of traditional and modern society; and (3) the relevance of leadership values in Indonesian society development.

THE RELEVANCE OF LEADERSHIP VALUES

According to Risieri Frondizi (2014), the “value” in its relevance cannot stand alone since its nature is parasitic or is attached to an object. Therefore, before it is embedded to a particular thing or object, a value does not have any concrete existence (Frondizi, 2014:10). An example to this is a piece of bamboo found on roadside. It does not have any value except for firewood. However, when a value is given to it through cleaning, peeling, weaving, and coloring (painting), the bamboo would finally acquire the value of beauty and sales.

Another example can be seen from the journey of a person into becoming a leader. Before one becomes a leader, he/she would certainly first live, a life as a mediocre. Everything changes when he/she becomes a leader and is given “value”. For instance: trained to always comply with the nation and the state or any higher governance, always behave properly, his/her attitude and acts must be in accordance with the law, must be pious, must always pay attention to the people they lead, etc.

All of these are the “value system” a leader must follow to allow his/her leadership to the value that is good not only for the nation and the state, but also for him/herself, the society, and for God. This is the relevance of “value” that, according to Risieri Frondizi (2014), a philosopher of values from Latin America, is always attached to objects and contains the value of “goodness”, even when the goodness itself is always subjective (Frondizi, 2014).

Subjective goodness is a goodness measured from a personal point of view. For example, the value of outfit of Papuans, *koteka* (penis sheath), is very high when seen from the point of view of Papuan culture. However, when seen from the perspective of Sundanese,

Javanese, Minangnese, or Acehnese cultures, the outfit may be considered of low value as it not in accordance with the religious values adopted there (Koentjaraningrat, 2004).

This is actually of no difference to comparing between authoritarian and dictatorial leadership value. An authoritarian leader, though not an ideal one, have its good side because he/she has the goal of developing its subordinates and institutions under his/her leadership. A dictator leader is also similar as he/she also has a good purpose of enabling his/her subordinates and institutions to achieve success even if it is done in the wrong way.

Niccolo Machiavelli (1992) had discussed the authoritarian and dictator leadership values, which had been used to achieve power. Up until now, the book remains widely discussed and used as a reference, though it contains many undiplomatic leadership values. However, what Niccolo Machiavelli had taught still has its good side, even if it is only for himself, not for other people’s sake (Machiavelli, 1992).

This is referred to as the “value” which basically always contains “goodness”, even though the goodness itself is only for themselves and particular groups. The kind of coherence between “value” and “goodness” is the result of Risieri Frondizi (2014)’s thinking that basically “value” is the “good” significance of nature and quality owned by certain objects (Frondizi, 2014:9).

Based the above explanation, it can be concluded that every leader must own leadership values. The meaning of leadership itself, according to B.J. Avolio *et al.* (2003), can be formulated as the ability and readiness owned by a person, so that he/she can influence, encourage, persuade, guide, drive, direct, and, if needed, force someone or groups to accept the influence; and, henceforth, do something useful to achieve particular purpose that have been set (Avolio *et al.*, 2003). Rests on the idea, there are times when a leader may also need to adopt authoritarian attitude, so that what is about to achieve and desired can be realized.

In addition to B.J. Avolio *et al.* (2003), there are some experts who have also defined the meaning of leadership. According to R.M.

Stogdill (1974), leadership is the process of influencing group activities organized towards the determination and achievement of objectives (Stogdill, 1974). Sondang P. Siagian (2012) also explained that leadership is the motor or propulsive force of any source and tools provided for an organization (Siagian, 2012).

Thus, leadership, according to Thomas J. Sergiovanni (1984) and Tony Bush & Marianne Coleman (2009), is said to have five power of leaderships, those five power are: *technical power*, because leader is a motor that triggers the movement of management; *human power*, because a leader moves people; *educational power*, because a leader serves as a clinical practitioner; *symbolic power*, because a leader is the one who leads; and *cultural power*, because a leader is also a spiritual figure (Sergiovanni, 1984; and Bush & Coleman, 2009:66-67).

While Robert Dubin (1979) defined leadership in organization as the power utilization and decision maker (Dubin, 1979). Fried E. Fiedler (1993) also explained that leadership is like an individual in a group, who is assigned with providing guidance and management relevant with the group activities (Fiedler, 1993).

The whole above definitions of leadership highly correlate with a leader's behavior in determining the leadership values he/she adopts. If a leader has good work capability, mentality, and dedication, then the achieved result will also be good and successful. On the contrary, if a leader does not have any capability, then the things he/she desired would be hard to achieve. In this context, Daeng Arifin & Pipin Arifin (2011) explained that good leadership is any organization's expectation. Through good leadership come smooth implementation of organization programs and an effective and efficient embodiment of the organization's goal (Arifin & Arifin, 2011).

Slamet Santoso (2010) argues that the success, as well as the failure, of an organization is determined by a leadership style that is based on *Trait Theories* of leadership. What is meant by a leadership style that is based on *Trait Theories* of leadership is a leadership style, which can be

analyzed from the background of the leader him/herself. In other words, there are some prominent traits of a leadership generally found on a leader which are not found of members of the group, such as: intelligence or and skills; vast knowledge; mature sociability; possession of great power in motivating others; delightful behaviors; and charisma (Santoso, 2010:235).

Therefore, the success of an organization can be seen from the leader's characteristics. In S.P. Robbins & M. Coulter (2007)'s theory of leadership, the characteristic of a leader can be divided into the following three approaches: characteristic approach or thing theories; behavioral approach or behavioral theories; and situational approach or contingencies theories (Robbins & Coulter, 2007). Hence, if linked to characteristic theories, it can be seen that a leader's capability is highly determined by his physical condition, intelligence, capability, personality traits (anti-schism, aggressiveness), duty-related characteristics (initiative, encouragement of participation), and characteristic in how to communicate (social relations).

In addition to the leader's character, another factor important in creating a successful organization is the social behavior. According to Daeng Arifin & Pipin Arifin (2008), a leader's behavior will bring a great impact to the organization's success. Leader's behavior is classified into two categories: consideration and initiation or initiation structure. Consideration is leader's behavior that adopts more concern in the subordinates' interest. The traits of the consideration leader are courteous, supportive, and willing to defend the subordinates, thoughtful about people's welfare, treats subordinates as he/she would treat him/herself. On the other hand, initiation leader is the behavior of a leader that puts organization's interest above subordinates' interest in terms of prioritization (Arifin & Arifin, 2008:6).

According to Wahjosumidjo (1987), a good leader is a leader who is able to read the prevailing situation, change his behavior accordingly, and treat the subordinates based on various needs. Therefore, a situational leader must notice the time factor, task

demands, organization's climate, expectation, ability, colleagues, and subordinates (Wahjosumidjo, 1987:117).

THE LEADERSHIP VALUES IN THE LIFE OF SOCIETY

In history, the leadership values have always had a connection with the respective society's culture (Kartodirdjo ed., 1984). The life of traditional society obviously inherits the leadership values that are in accordance with the teachings of the ancestor of the traditional society. So is the life of modern society, which also inherits the leadership values in accordance with the teachings of the modern culture (Jones, 2009).

According to N.J. Smelser (1991) and Piotr Sztompka (2010), culture experiences changes in the following terms: science and technology; commercial agriculture; replacement of animals and humans by machines; and the development of urban settlements and manpower. As such, it is almost certain that such transformation will affect the entire values of life, not to exclude the leadership values (Smelser, 1991:747-748; and Sztompka, 2010:153).

At first, before the society of a nation develops into a modern society, leadership values are always set by the customary rules. For instance, as happened in the Sundanese society, when holding an election for indigenous leader of *saehu* (sheikh) or *kuncen* (caretaker of a sacred place), undoubtedly the candidates will be selected from those inheriting the bloodline of a *saehu* or *kuncen*. In addition to that, the candidates must comply with the criteria set forth by the applicable customs (Ekadjati, 1984 and 1995). The phenomenon has actually been a common practice throughout the nation, where people still embrace traditional values in most of their life aspects, for the examples are the society of Bali, Badui in Banten, Tengger in East Java, Minang in West Sumatera, Batak in North Sumatera, and Kaili in Central Sulawesi (Koentjaraningrat, 2004).

From the above explanation, it can be explained that there are two types of leadership values growing in people's life. *First*, leadership values that live and

thrive within traditional society; and, *second*, leadership values that thrive in the life of modern society. Furthermore, for the leadership values growing in the life of traditional and modern society to be understood as a whole (holistic) and comprehensive, the writer will explain the phenomenon as follows.

The Leadership Values of Traditional Society. The terms traditional can be interpreted as the attitudes, way of thinking, or acting that always holds to the norms and customs existing and applied hereditarily (Badudu, 2009). As such, when associated with the opinion of Piotr Sztompka (2010), who explained that tradition is always connected to the past and present, then the term traditional itself means the attitude, way of thinking, and acting based on the teachings of traditions or customs of the past, to be passed on to the next generation (Sztompka, 2010:67). Hence, the term traditional highly correlates with the society's life customs that still refers to the ancient teachings.

Traditional society, in the view of C.A. van Peursen (1988) and Jacob Sumardjo (2008), is said to be a society living in ontological stage, a stage which to be the disengagement of human from the *mistis* or mystical stage. In ontological stage, humans began to understand nature based on logical reasoning. The scope of ontological stage develops within the ancient cultural environment highly affected by philosophy and science. Furthermore, after the end of the ontological stage, comes the functionalism stage on which the thinking of modern society is based (van Peursen, 1988:18; and Sumardjo, 2008:319).

In order to understand the traditional leadership values taught by the traditional society, the leadership culture inherited from the people of Java, Minang, and Aceh in the past can be studied. According to Daeng Arifin & Pipin Arifin (2008), the influence of local culture to the leadership behavior can be seen from the custom's background, the norms developed in a society group (Arifin & Arifin, 2008:62).

In Minang culture, for example, the leadership values are always related to the teachings of Islamic values and local wisdom.

The famous philosophy of Minang people related to the leadership values are: “*adat basanding sara, sara basanding kitabullah*”, which means that “customs must be based on religion, and religion must be based on the book of Allah, namely the *Al-Qur’an*”. In addition to that, there is also a philosophy of “*anak dipangku, kemenakan dibimbing, handai tolan dipatenggangkan*”, which means that family members and relatives are welcome to work in the Padang restaurant under the condition that they must behave honestly, comply with Islamic laws, and willing to learn gradually starting from dishwashing to holding cash. This is to be done until they are able to establish their own restaurant (cf Abdullah, 1966; Dobbin, 1977; and Reid, 2001).

In Javanese culture, many leadership values are taken from books of past great authors, such as the book of *Nagara Kretagama*, the work of Empu Prapanca (cited in Muljana, 2006). According to Slamet Muljana (2006) and Slamet Santoso (2010), there are fourteen characteristics a Javanese leader must have: *wijina* or wise; *mantrawira* or patriotist; *wicaksaningnaya* or experienced and has analytic ability; *matagwan* or trust in subordinates; *satyabaktihaprahu* or loyal to superiors; *wakjana* or skillful in diplomacy and giving speech; *sajawopasana* or not arrogant but humble; *dhirottshasha* or diligent, creative, and initiative; *tan-liana* or happy and jolly; *disyacitra* or open and honest; *tancatrisna* or selfless; *masibisamshatabuana* or compassionate and has love for nature; *ginongpratidina* or diligent in enforcing righteousness; and *ansyaken* or capable of destroying opponents (Muljana, 2006; and Santoso, 2010).

In addition to the leadership values rooted from Sundanese, Javanese, and Minangese culture, the traditional leadership values that is quite phenomenal is the leadership values in the life of Aceh society. In accordance with the teachings Aceh people apply, any leader who is about to make decision must emphasize the five natures of “P”: *Peusiap* or preparation, data collection, and comparison; *Peubanding* or research and discussion; *Peunilai* or assessment; *Peutunyok* or asking Allah SWT (*Subhanahu Wa-Ta’ala* or God Almighty, for

guidance); and *Peuputoh* or making decision (cited in Ahmad, 1972:64; and Arifin & Arifin, 2011:78). The leadership values, according to Zakaria Ahmad (1972) and Daeng Arifin & Pipin Arifin (2011), are inseparable from the Aceh culture rooted from the teachings of the ancestor. One of the teachings running deep in their veins is the values of authority, courage, and obedience. However, all of the inherited leadership values have eventually shifted in the post of independence era (Ahmad, 1972:67; and Arifin & Arifin, 2011:78).

The Leadership Values of Modern Society.

In contrast to the traditional leadership values, in modern leadership values, the rules of customs and faith are not used as the primary basis of assessment. What is considered more important are the ones related to rationale and new values. This is inseparable from the phenomenon of modern culture which, throughout history, has always denied irrational, ancient, and old values (Suwirta, 2005).

As explained by Wilbert E. Moore (1963) that modernization is the total transformation of the traditional society or pre-modern to the type of technological society whose social organization resembles or imitates Western society (Moore, 1963:89). In this context, there is a quite significant cultural leap, where the society who initially adhered to the custom values, that tends to be irrational, now turns to be very rational and new.

According to Piotr Sztompka (2010), there are some criteria that identify the changes from traditional society to modern society, as follows: decreased illiteracy and increased interest in science, skill, and proficiency. In terms of religion, it is identified by secularism. In terms of family life, it is marked with the decreased role of family bond and increased of kinship functional specialization (Sztompka, 2010:153).

While according to Madan Sarup (2013), the basic aspect of modernism can be summarized as follows: aesthetic and reflectivity awareness; rejection of narrative structure; exploration, open nature, uncertain and ambiguous, paradox, and rejection of the whole personality concept; and preference of the “split” concept of subject (Sarup, 2013:204).

Table 1:
A Comparison between Traditional Leadership Values and Modern Leadership Values

No	Traditional Leadership Values	Modern Leadership Values
1.	Irrational.	Rational.
2.	Bound to customs/beliefs.	Independent.
3.	By inheritance/bloodline.	Based on education diploma.
4.	Past time and transcendental values oriented.	Present and future time oriented, also based on reasonable rationale.
5.	Based on the teaching of religious and local culture.	Freedom of religion (secularism).
6.	Authoritarian.	Democratic.

From the above explanation, it can at least be concluded that the shift from traditional culture to modern culture has undoubtedly the values of leadership. The modern leadership values are certainly been adapted to the modernity spirit that promotes reasoning, rational and objective thinking, and science. As for the phenomenon, the leadership values based merely on custom rules and irrational thinking certainly no longer fits the modernization spirit. The phenomena has been explained by Anthony Giddens (1991) and P.I.P. Jones (2009), who stated that modernity is always changing and characterized by new conditions, new forces, and new uncertainty (Giddens, 1991; and Jones, 2009:239).

Therefore, modern leadership values are certainly adjusted to the modern human nature which, according to Alex Inkeles (1976) and Piotr Sztompka (2010), is said to have the following personalities: ready to accept new experience and always open to innovation and changes; ready to form and defend opinion of various problems concerning public interest and constantly support diversity; dedicate its time more for the present and future rather than the past; believe in the ability of self and other people; have a sense of justice; prioritize formal education and school; and have respect for other people's dignity (Inkeles, 1976; and Sztompka, 2010:89).

The personalities of modern society have been the foundation for the formation of modern leadership values. As such, leaders in modern era are bound to set leadership values according to the spirit of modernity, as follows: always open and innovative; prioritize public interest; present and future oriented thinking; respects other people's dignity; have a sense

of justice; and prioritize education (cf Arifin & Arifin, 2008; Bush & Coleman, 2009; and Santoso, 2015).

Nevertheless, from the whole modern personality, there is one missing value that is the religious teaching value as it is replaced by secular modern personality. This is perhaps the fundamental difference between traditional leadership and modern leadership values. The traditional one is bound to religious teachings and customs, the other one loses norms as it has turned to secularism.

Furthermore, in order to understand the analysis, the writer provides a comparison between traditional leadership values and modern leadership values, as shown in table 1.

The Relevance of Leadership Values with the Life of Society. In general, both leadership values inherited by traditional society or modern society basically have goodness in them. Therefore, though they indeed have significant differences, both of them have relevance to the life of universal society, as long as what they give are not against the law and uphold "essential value" inherited by God for human's sake.

Therefore, in order to bring good and right leadership values into reality, every leader shall fulfill all his/her duty and obligations. For instance, as has been established in Government Regulation Number 17 Year 2010 regarding the regulation of Management and Provision of Education, in Chapter I, General Provisions, Article I, Section 25, that the Education National Standards or SNP (*Standar Nasional Pendidikan*) is the minimum criteria regarding the educational system throughout the territory of the NKRI (*Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia* or Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia). Therefore, in relation

with leadership values, it can be concluded that every leader in Indonesia is obliged to understand the educational system in the territory of the Unitary States of the Republic of Indonesia (Setneg RI, 2010).

The requirement is, among others, the obligation to know the function and purpose of education as stipulated in the Government Regulation or PP (*Peraturan Pemerintah*) Number 17 Year 2010 Article 67, on the Management and Provision of Education, among others: inculcate and practice the values of faith, noble character, and noble personality; inculcate and practice the values of nationalism and patriotism; provide the basics of intellectual ability in the form of abilities and skills in reading, writing, and arithmetic; provides an introduction to science and technology; train and stimulate the sensitivity and the ability to appreciate and express the beauty, subtlety, and harmony; cultivate an interest in sports, health, and physical fitness; develop physical and mental readiness, to advance their education to SMP (*Sekolah Menengah Pertama* or Junior High School) / MTs (*Madrasah Tsanawiyah* or Islamic Junior High School), or other equivalent forms (Setneg RI, 2010).

As a matter of fact, the education aspects as explained above are only one example of several other examples a leader must meet since, in addition to the educational aspect, many other requirements are to be met as a manifestation of the relevance of the values of leadership in the life of universal society. For instance, every leader is obliged to eradicate poverty and illiteracy, improve education, not taking part in corruption, speak and act honestly, and maintainance the unity of NKRI, and so forth.

CONCLUSION

Every tribe always inherits the teachings of leadership values. The teaching is generally inseparable from the teaching of religion and local culture. Both of the teachings are the main foundation since, in religion and local wisdom, there is the teaching of “essential values” taught for generations since the past. However, in line with the changing of time, all the values of life also change, including leadership values.

Eventually, as the result of the changes, the leadership values that initially are based on religious and local wisdom teachings now have begun to shift to the values that are utilizing rational grounding — a grounding based on rational thinking where, in the modern era, the leadership values are no longer just built upon religious and local wisdom teaching, but are already based on modern personality, where the benchmarks are based on several criteria: diploma, education, skill, intelligent, thinking skills, innovative, open-minded, and present and future oriented.

However, though there is a very fundamental difference between traditional leadership and modern leadership values, both have the same goal of providing something “good” for the society, as the meaning of “value” explained by a considerably well-known philosopher of values from Latin America, Risieri Frondizi (2014), that value is essentially something that contains goodness, even though the goodness itself may be subjective.¹

References

- Abdullah, Taufik. (1966). “Adat and Islam: An Examination of Conflict in Minangkabau” in *Indonesia*, Vol.2(2), October. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, pp.1-24.
- Ahmad, Zakaria. (1972). *Keradjaan Atjeh, 1520-1675*. Medan: Penerbit Monora.
- Arifin, Daeng & Pipin Arifin. (2008). *Teori Emaslim: Peran Kepala Sekolah Profesional*. Bandung: Penerbit Pustaka Al-Kazyaf.
- Arifin, Daeng & Pipin Arifin. (2011). *Kearifan Lokal dalam Kepemimpinan*. Bandung: Penerbit Pustaka Al-Kazyaf.
- Avolio, B.J. et al. (2003). “Leadership Models, Methods, and Applications” in *Handbook of Psychology: Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Volume 12. Hoboken, NJ, USA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., pp.277-307.
- Badudu, J.S. (2009). *Kamus Kata-kata Serapan Asing dalam Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Penerbit Kompas.
- Bush, Tony & Marianne Coleman. (2009). *Manajemen Strategi Kepemimpinan Pendidikan*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit IRCiSoD, Translation.

¹**Statement:** I, hereby, declare that this scientific work is truly the result of the study that I have conducted, not a product of plagiarism or a copy, and has never been published on any national journals or any other international journals. In the future, I am willing to be prosecuted in court, shall any mistake is revealed and found out to be not in accordance with the representation in this statement.

- Dobbin, Christine. (1977). "Economic Change in Minangkabau as a Factor in the Rise of the Padri Movement, 1784-1830" in *Indonesia*, Vol.23(1). Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, pp.1-38.
- Dubin, Robert. (1979). "Metaphors of Leadership: An Overview" in J.G. Hunt & L.L. Larson [eds]. *Cross-Currents in Leadership*. Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Ekadjati, Edi S. (1984). *Masyarakat Sunda dan Kebudayaan*. Jakarta: Girimukti Pasaka.
- Ekadjati, Edi S. (1995). *Kebudayaan Sunda: Suatu Pendekatan Sejarah, Jilid 1*. Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya.
- Fiedler, Fried E. (1993). "The Leadership Situation and the Black Box in Contingency Theories" in M.M. Chemers & R. Ayman [eds]. *Leadership Theory and Research: Perspectives and Directions*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, pp.1-28.
- Fronidizi, Risieri. (2014). *Pengantar Filsafat Nilai*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Pustaka Pelajar, 2nd edition, Translation.
- Giddens, Anthony. (1991). *Modernity and Self-Identity: Self and Society in the Late Modern Age*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Hart, Michael H. (2009). *Seratus Tokoh yang Paling Berpengaruh dalam Sejarah*. Jakarta: Penerbit Pustaka Jaya, 18th edition, Translation.
- Inkeles, Alex. (1976). "A Model to Modern Man: Theoretical and Methodological Issues" in Cyril E. Black [ed]. *Comparative Modernization*. Chicago: American Marketing Association.
- Ismaun. (2005). *Pengantar Ilmu Sejarah*. Bandung: Historia Utama Press.
- Jones, P.I.P. (2009). *Pengantar Teori-teori Sosial: Dari Teori Fungsionalisme hingga Post-Modernisme*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia, Translation.
- Kartodirdjo, Sartono [ed]. (1984). *Kepemimpinan dalam Dimensi Sosial*. Jakarta: Penerbit LP3ES.
- Koentjaraningrat. (2004). *Antropologi Indonesia*. Jakarta: Penerbit Djambatan.
- Kuntowijoyo. (2003). *Metodologi Sejarah*. Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana Yogya.
- Machiavelli, Niccolo. (1992). *Sang Penguasa*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Translation.
- Moore, Wilbert E. (1963). *Social Change*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prectice-Hall, Inc.
- Muljana, Slamet. (2006). *Nagara Kretagama: Tafsir Sejarah*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit LKiS.
- Muslimin, Sutrisno. (2012). "Boarding School: Solusi Pendidikan untuk Melahirkan Pemimpin Masa Depan". Available online also at: <http://sutris02.wordpress.com/> [accessed in Bandung, Indonesia: April 15, 2015].
- Reid, Anthony. (2001). "Understanding Melayu (Malay) as a Source of Diverse Modern Identities" in *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, 32(3), pp.295-313.
- Robbins, S.P. & M. Coulter. (2007). *Management*. London: Prentice-Hall, 9th edition.
- Santoso, Agus. (2015). "Transformasi Budaya dalam Proses Reproduksi Musik: Dari Musik Tradisional ke Musik Modern, Menuju Musik Digital". *Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation*. Bandung: SPs UNPAD [Sekolah Pascasarjana Universitas Padjadjaran] Bandung.
- Santoso, Slamet. (2010). *Teori-teori Psikologi Sosial*. Bandung: PT Refika Aditama.
- Sarup, Madan. (2013). *Panduan Pengantar untuk Memahami Pos-Strukturalisme dan Pos-Modernisme*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Jalasutra, Translation.
- Sergiovanni, Thomas J. (1984). "Leadership and Excellence in Schooling". Available online also at: http://www.ascd.org/ASCD/pdf/journals/ed_lead/el_198402_sergiovanni.pdf [accessed in Bandung, Indonesia: April 15, 2015].
- Setneg RI [Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia]. (2010). *Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 17 Tahun 2010 tentang Pengelolaan dan Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan*. Jakarta: Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia. Available online also at: <http://www.unpad.ac.id/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/PP17-2010-PengelolaanPenyelenggaraanPendidikan.pdf> [accessed in Bandung, Indonesia: April 14, 2015].
- Siagian, Sondang P. (2012). *Human Resource Management*. Jakarta: Earth Literacy.
- Sjamsuddin, Helius. (2007). *Metodologi Sejarah*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Ombak.
- Smelser, N.J. (1991). *Social Paralysis and Social Change*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Stogdill, R.M. (1974). *Handbook of Leadership: A Survey of the literature*. New York: Free Press.
- Sumardjo, Jacob. (2008). *Estetika Paradoks*. Bandung: Penerbit Sunan Ambu.
- Suwirta, Andi. (2005). *Sejarah Intelektual: Percikan Pemikiran dari Dunia Barat dan Islam*. Bandung: Penerbit Suci Press.
- Sztompka, Piotr. (2010). *Sosiologi Perubahan Sosial*. Jakarta: Prenada Media Group, Translation.
- van Peursen, C.A. (1988). *Strategi Kebudayaan*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius.
- Wahjosumidjo. (1987). *Kepemimpinan dan Motivasi*. Jakarta: Penerbit Ghalia Indonesia.



Sundanese Leadership Based on Local Wisdom in Indonesia
(Source: <http://blogs.usembassy.gov/asean/tag/policy/>, 15/4/2015)

Local wisdom based on Sundanese culture taught the noble values of a leader, stating that a leader must be "*handap asor*" or humble and not arrogant; a leader must be "*ulah getas harupateun*" or not rushing in making decisions or taking actions; a leader must be "*landung kandungan, laer aisan, leuleus jeujeur, liat tali*" or flexible in acts; a leader must be "*nete taraje, nincak hambalan*" or able to work systematically; and a leader must behave like "*nyiruan*" or bee, in which for bee would always perch on a place on top of beautiful flowers and be the honey for human life.