

SERVANT LEADERSHIP AS POLITICAL WILL TO PERFORM A NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION IN THE CITY OF TANGERANG SELATAN

Hasanah, Dwi Oktariani, Nur Asni Gani and Andry Priharta

Prodi Manajemen, Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis, Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta, Ciputat 15419

Email: hasanah@umj.ac.id

ABSTRACT. An organization is a place for several people or groups who carry out activities calling for goals with profit and non-profit plans. Organizational development, both profit and non-profit, requires a leader who can show his political will to run the organization. A leader in a non-profit organization still needs to pay attention to the interests of the members and those served. This study discusses servant leadership as political will in running non-profit organizations in South Tangerang City, Banten, Indonesia. The method used is qualitative, with a case study in a non-profit organization in the South Tangerang area. The study involved four informants with focus group discussions. Each informant stated the questions submitted. This study looks at five categories of servant leadership or servant leadership as the political will to run non-profit organizations, through the categories of servant leadership namely (1) delegation, (2) integrity, (3) motivation, (4) human resource development, (5) Remembering to communicate, that leaders in non-profit organizations in South Tangerang City are politically aware that servant leadership is a form of self-will in running an organization. Leaders in non-profit organizations are passionate about developing teams and meeting members' needs in a disinterested organization, not for the personal needs of a leader.

Keywords: Servant Leadership; Communication; Leadership; Non-profit Organizations

INTRODUCTION

Humans are social creatures that encourage them to gather, and one of the places for humans to gather is an organization. Robbins and Hampton stated that an organization groups humans in a structured and developing system (Gani et al., 2022). This grouping becomes a social unit that is coordinated consciously and continuously to achieve goals. This goal is achieved through organizational efforts organized in a dynamic environment. Politically, in organizing these efforts, there will be various dynamics due to the differences in the characteristics and views of each individual in the organization.

The definition presented above has three main elements: (1) human collectivity with sustainable arrangements in a system with a particular structure. (2) business coordination with a goal orientation that distinguishes it from other groups, such as crowds or families. (3) interaction with the environment in that the organization influences the environment and vice versa. It is closely intersected politically with the organization's and the environment's mutual interests. In achieving its goals, the organization consists of profit and non-profit organizations, often called non-profits.

Gani et al. (2022) conveyed three main elements in an organization that can realize organizational goals, namely: (1) people, (2) cooperation and (3) common goals. People, in this case, are all individuals who are members of the organization, from members to leaders who contribute to power relations within the organization itself. The leader is the main

element that brings the organization to achieving its goals; Leadership and authority can influence every individual to move and achieve organizational goals.

Several leadership models, such as transformational, strategic, and servant leadership, can be applied in various organizations to achieve goals. The political process in which leaders produce decisions or policies or provide direction for members of the organization in achieving these goals requires the formation of good communication from various existing units. The correct way of communicating with a leader's members accelerates the organization's efforts to achieve its goals.

Servant leadership is a concept that has the potential to change organizations and society because it stimulates the emergence of metamorphosis or change mechanisms at the personal and organizational levels (Russell & Stone, 2002).

Several experts present several definitions of communication. Communication, according to Hovland, Janis and Kelley (1953), Forsdale (1981), Ruben (1988), and Seiler (1988) (in Awaru et al., 2019) states that communication is the process of conveying stimuli or signals to other individuals in groups, within organizations and in society creates, transmits, and uses the information to coordinate its environment and other people. The process of communication can be done verbally and non-verbally.

Communication as a process of delivering information or stimulus to recipients of information can be carried out by other individuals, groups, organizations or masses. This research will discuss

the process of conveying information in an organization to influence individuals in it together to achieve organizational goals. Some experts express opinions about organizational communication.

According to Goldhaber, Pace and Faules (in Awaru et al., 2019), organizational communication states creating and exchanging messages in a network of relationships mutually dependent on one another to cope with an uncertain or ever-changing environment. Interpretation of exchanging messages in a network of relationships is the unit within the organization.

According to George et al. (2005: 363), “leadership is the exercise of influence by one member of a group organization to achieve its goals”. Leadership influences group members within the organization and helps organizational members to achieve goals. Meanwhile, Schermerhor Jr. (2011) explained, “Achievement-oriented leadership encourage subordinates to strive for higher performance standards and to have more confidence in their abilities to meet challenging goals. For subordinates in ambiguous, non-repetitive jobs, achievement-oriented leadership should increase their expectations that effort demands to achieve desired performance”.

Achievement-oriented leadership can be expected to motivate teams to achieve higher performance standards and have more confidence in their abilities to achieve set goals. Another thing about leadership is stated in Morrill 2010, “Leadership is a fundamental and relational term. It describes the dynamics of forms of unavoidable social interaction by naming relationships between specific individuals (and groups) who influence each other. The relationship is reciprocal between leaders and the individuals they lead. This study is about the relationship between management and hospital employees.

Wren (2005) states that leadership is a process of mutual influence between the leader and the members he leads. This influencing process occurs when the leader has a shared relationship with group members or members of his organization. This mutual influence occurs together to achieve mutually agreed goals between leaders and members.

Greenleaf (2002) stated, “The servant-leader is the first servant who has a natural feeling that he wants to serve and be the first to serve.” Then a conscious choice leads one to aspire to lead. This leader is very different from the person focused on leading, in which the need to serve assuages unusual power drives or acquires possessions. Main-master and first-servant are two extreme types. Between them, nuances and mixtures are part of the infinite diversity of human nature.”

Greenleaf (2002), “a leadership style and philosophy in which an individual interacts with

others—whether in a management capacity or fellow employees—to achieve authority rather than power. This system embodies a decentralized organizational structure. Leaders who follow this style include customer-facing employees in organizational decision-making. These employees have close relationships with customers and can make better decisions about retaining those customers and acquiring new ones.

This leadership focuses on the growth and well-being of the followers around it. In traditional leadership, the exercise of power is generally at the top of the pyramid. Leaders serve this, share power, put the needs of others first and help people develop and perform as high as possible. From the concept of servant leadership, it can also be defined that servant leadership is leadership that places kindness on the people they lead by respecting, developing, building community, showing authenticity, giving and sharing. The dimensions and indicators of servant leadership refer to the dimensions of servant leadership explained by Laub (1999), namely respecting people, developing people, building community, displaying authenticity, providing leadership, and sharing leadership.

The characteristics of servant leaders are disclosed by Spears (2010) identifies ten characteristics of servant leadership: “listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, philosophy, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community”. This characteristic makes leaders prioritize others in their team to develop and perform better.

Servant leadership can predict the task performance of subordinates, which makes the servant leadership style attract much attention (Rifa'i et al., 2022). Servant leadership contributes to individual performance (Saleem et al., 2020). Servant leadership also influences sales performance (Cahyono et al., 2020) with indicators of listening, empathy, healing, and community and a significant positive effect on sales performance. Tomigolung's research (2015) results show that the servant leadership dimension has a partially significant effect on employee performance at the Southeast Minahasa Regional Government office. The study of Ratnasari et al. (2020) has research results which show that the leadership style of the servant leadership model has a significant effect on performance. As previously defined, servant leadership is a concept that can potentially change organizations and society because it stimulates a process of metamorphosis at the personal level and within the organization itself (E. J. Russell, 2012; R. F. Russell & Gregory Stone, 2002).

Several studies stated that the success or failure of a government is also influenced by conditions of

lack of political will or political will (Kapoutsis et al., 2017; Post et al., 2010; Treadway et al., 2005). The importance of the political will variable also must be addressed in achieving performance goals for the organization or at the individual level of the organization. As evidenced by research conducted by Harris et al. (2007), where it was concluded that political will could affect work efficiency. When discussing the success or failure of a government, it is often discussed about the effect of a lack of political will (Kapoutsis et al., 2017; Post et al., 2010; Treadway et al., 2005). Individuals with high political skills show a positive linear relationship between increasing work output and political will. On the other hand, individuals with low political skills actually show the opposite phenomenon. Individuals with low political skills show increasingly negative results as political will increases. These conditions provide a basis for continuing research on these two constructs, especially concerning empirical testing (Harris et al., 2016).

The relationship between servant leadership and political will can be seen normatively from the Regional Budget-APBD determination process. Referring to the Indonesian Ministry of Home Affairs Letter-Permendagri No. 13 of 2006 Article 104 and other Article 108, it can be seen how the regional head leadership has its authority in determining and designing APBD (Chaidir, 2017). The letter shows how transformational leadership influences intrinsic motivation (Charbonneau et al., 2006). Meanwhile, intrinsic motivation is a formative indicator of political will (Mintzberg, 1983, 1985). The lack of supporting studies to empirically prove political will makes Post et al. (2010) conclude that the term's meaning must be more apparent. According to them, the term "political will" is generally used as an all-encompassing concept whose meaning is so vague that it does not greatly enrich our understanding of political processes and policies. However, some researchers try to make it a useful analytical tool, such as Brinkerhoff (2000) and Kpundeh (2000), who use political will more and associate it with anti-corruption.

Post et al. (2010) formulated the sub-concept of political will and its construct validity successfully formulated from Kapoutsis et al. (2017). Findings about political will, political behaviour, and political skills, as well as evidence of political will offered by Mintzberg (1983), consist of intrinsic motivation and achievement needs that influence political behaviour (Treadway et al., 2005). Post et al. (2010) define *political will* as the level of support and commitment among policymakers for a policy solution related to a particular problem.

After looking at previous studies, it was found that there needs to be more-supporting research to

empirically prove the issue of servant leadership as the political will to run non-profit organizations. The current debate is limited to defining, constructing, and measuring political will, political behaviour and skills. However, there needs to be more-supporting research to prove it empirically, including servant leadership and political will. As for the research conducted by Rifa'i et al. (2022) found that political will can mediate the influence of servant leadership on managerial and organizational performance. There is also a direct influence between servant leadership on perceptions of political will, so the three have mutual influence, namely between servant leadership, managerial, organizational performance and political will.

An organization is a gathering place for a group to achieve a common goal. In achieving this goal, the organization is divided into several types. Organizations carrying out operational and organizational goals are divided into profit and non-profit organizations often called non-profit organizations. This research is about servant leadership in non-profit organizations.

The characteristics of non-profit institutions put forward by Anthony and Young (2006) are:

1. The organization is not for profit
2. Having consideration in terms of tax imposition
3. Tend to be service oriented
4. Constraints occur in the goals and strategies of the organization
5. Do not expect benefits from clients who partner in obtaining financial assistance
6. Dominated by professionals
7. Politics is very influential in playing the role of the organization.

Leaders carry out the process of influencing members of their organization to achieve organizational goals. This process of influencing members applies to both profit and non-profit (non-profit) organizations. For this reason, this study focuses on analyzing Servant Leadership Communication in non-profit organizations.

METHOD

This research uses a qualitative method with a case study conducted at a waste management non-profit organization in the Cireundeu area, East Ciputat, South Tangerang, Banten, Indonesia. Data collection was obtained by conducting interviews with four informants using purposive techniques. The informants are four people who are directly in charge of finance and implementing the activities of this organization. The four informants in question are:

1. Financial staff who have responsibility for managing the organization's finances to carry out organizational activities;

2. Community management staff (community liaison) who have responsibility for managing the community to play a role in various activities and communicate activities to the community;
3. Teacher
4. Early childhood education administrative staff responsible for managing early childhood education schools intended for children who are members of this community.

Face-to-face interviews were conducted, and discussions were carried out through focus group discussions. Each question submitted by the researcher was answered in turn by each informant. The researcher submitted 38 questions to the informants and recorded all statements made by the informants on these questions.

Researchers formulate important statements and categorize them in the form of themes and produce a complete description of servant leadership as political will in a non-profit organization. Each informant's statement on the questions submitted by the researcher was given meaning and categorized. These themes were compiled and resulted in a complete description of servant leadership as the political will to run a non-profit organization in South Tangerang. The collected data is then validated by using the source triangulation technique.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Servant Leadership: An Overview of the Political Will of Leaders in Non-Profit Organizations in South Tangerang

Empowerment motivation for new followers has become a vital leadership component for current organizational managers (Arogundade & Arogundade, 2015; Van Winkle et al., 2014). Undeniably, the mobility of subordinates or members for personal and professional reasons places an increasing burden on leaders to integrate and empower them for the good of the organization and the individuals themselves (Mullaney, 2014; Van Winkle et al., 2014). In this context, subordinates or members have the confidence and knowledge to become faithful members and are therefore empowered to make crucial decisions to support the organization's overall mission and maintain career satisfaction (Arogundade & Arogundade, 2015; Hoption, 2014).

Servant leadership theory argues that the leader must first serve the members, and the leader's focus is placed on the members (Burch et al., 2015; Spears, 2010; van Dierendonck, 2011). Greenleaf, a researcher on servant leadership theory, describes the servant leader as someone with character and moral influence who puts people's needs first

while being a good communicator, compassionate team builder, and a systems thinker with vision (Greenleaf, 2002). Van Dierendonck combines the 44 characteristics of the servant leader study into six characteristics of the theory and actions of a servant leader, namely elements of empowerment, humility, authenticity, relational agreement, guidance, and social responsibility (van Dierendonck, 2011). This list of servant leadership characteristics and elements distinguishes this leadership theory from similar leadership theories, such as transformational leadership theory (Ghasabeh et al., 2015). In servant leadership theory, there is, among other things, an emphasis on individual members outside the organization and individual spiritual development (van Dierendonck, 2011).

While leadership is taught throughout the country and is considered important by many, the subject of membership and being a good member is, in many ways, just as crucial as leadership (Hoption, 2014; Leroy et al., 2015). A leader must have members to be considered a leader (Hoption, 2014). Developing and empowering members is a key role for leaders using transformational or servant leadership (Tebeian, 2012; Washington et al., 2014). Transformational leadership and servant leadership emphasize members' leadership styles (van Dierendonck et al., 2014). However, servant leadership focuses on members by member, whereas transformational leadership focuses on members to benefit organizational performance (van Dierendonck, 2011). Transactional leadership is another form of leadership that emphasizes members but in a give-and-take context as opposed to the empowerment focus of transformational leadership and servant leadership (Tebeian, 2012). Transformational leadership and servant leadership styles have proven to be effective for empowerment with advantages in the field of empowering servant leadership in small businesses (Van Winkle et al., 2014), voluntary service organizations (Schneider & George, 2011), and several non-profit organizations (Parris & Peachey, 2013b).

Greenleaf developed servant leadership theory to overcome the ineffectiveness of top-down hierarchical management and leadership approaches (Greenleaf, 2002). Greenleaf developed the ten elements of servant leadership, which are:

1. Listening (listening),
2. Empathy,
3. Relationship and emotional healing (relationship and emotional healing),
4. Consciousness,
5. Encouragement,
6. Conception (conception),
7. Anticipation,

8. Management (stewardship),
9. Personal, unique and nonphysical guarantees for self-development (private assurance to the personal, specialized and nonphysical development of people),
10. Building community (building community).

Servant leadership theory promotes strong members through a process of empowerment, importance is placed on moral judgments, and emphasis is placed on building community outside the specific organization, which results in authenticity in the leader (Leroy et al., 2015; Washington et al., 2014).

In various conceptualizations, servant leadership is focused on empowering (van Dierendonck, 2011), helping subordinates to grow and succeed (Liden et al., 2008), focusing on employee retention and development (Wong & Davey, 2007) as a first step to involve member. Regardless of the elements of the servant leader, the operationalization of the servant leader begins with the idea that a servant leader must serve first (Parris & Peachey, 2013a; van Dierendonck, 2011). The issue is whether the previously mentioned elements of empowerment, fostering growth and success, and development always address engaging leaders who serve new members about Greenleaf's benchmark of leaders serves first.

Servant leadership researchers have distinguished the empowering characteristics of servant leadership (Greasley & Bocârnea, 2014; van Dierendonck, 2011) among several other beneficial characteristics (Greenleaf, 2002; Spears, 2010; van Dierendonck, 2011). Leaders who apply servant leadership theory have been shown to drive positive outcomes in members and organizations (Hunter et al., 2013) and are effective in empowering members in small businesses where leaders have legal authority (Van Winkle et al., 2014). More research is needed to expand knowledge about servant leaders from other types of organizations in building empowering relationships with new members (Hoption, 2014).

Leaders' abilities and tendencies to empower their members have been debated in management studies since McGregor's theory of Theories X and Y (Arogundade & Arogundade, 2015; McGregor, 1960). Theory X states that workers are lazy, and the power of management is needed to boost productivity. At the same time, Theory Y views workers as independent and ambitious and other motivational methods beyond power are needed to increase productivity (Arogundade & Arogundade, 2015).

The existence of members is fundamental because it is only possible for a leader to be a leader

with members (Crippen, 2012; Hoption, 2014). Leader-member relations are important in leadership studies (Leroy et al., 2015; Zou et al., 2015). New members in any organization tend to be passive and withdrawn once the individual understands their role (Leroy et al., 2015; Read III, 2014).

The main motivation related to servant leadership and discussing empowerment, an important characteristic of servant leadership to be analyzed (Parris & Peachey, 2013a). Much motivation generally flows back to McGregor (1960), whereby worker motivation allows Theory X to suggest that workers are not free thinkers. Theory X must remain in line with Theory Y, which states that workers are free thinkers and must be encouraged and motivated to think about what is best for the organization (Arogundade & Arogundade, 2015).

This concept was highlighted by Adams (1963), who wrote about developing the Equity theory that workers are motivated by the feeling that intrigue in their workplace or other organizations is fair and equitable (Tseng & Kuo, 2014). Equity Theory was founded by Adams (1963) to explain socio-psychological motivation in relational matters, especially in the workplace concerning justice and equity (Burrai et al., 2015). Self-esteem is an early element of self-determination and a contributing factor to empowerment (Arogundade & Arogundade, 2015).

Expectancy theory is defined by Vroom (1964) as individual performance or motivation and is based on their expectation of reward for their actions (Renko et al., 2012). Another element of the Expectancy Theory is that a more significant reward will follow the completion of the wish. The gift, or meaning, needs to be perceived as valuable by the recipient (Vroom, 1964). According to Vroom (1964), the elements of hope are hope, mediation, and valence.

Transactional leadership is a leadership system in which the leader supervises members in a series of transactions or rewards for excellent performance and punishment for bad behaviour (Epitropaki & Martin, 2013). Whenever subordinates perform up to standard or well, the transactional leader does not disturb the workers, adopting a hands-off style despite several active transactional leaders (Washington et al., 2014). Transactional leaders treat workers fairly within the scope of their duties and, in some ways, serve as an extension and reinforcement of impartiality and hope through rewards, clearly being the next step to driving equity motivation and hope motivation (Deichmann & Stam, 2015).

Transformational leadership is considered a continuation of transactional leadership and is considered a better relationship with workers (Hamstra et al., 2014). The transformational theory

was originally developed by Burns in 1978 and expanded by Bass in 1985 to develop methods of increasing collective productivity in an organization with an emphasis on individuals (Ghasabeh et al., 2015). Transformational leaders motivate members to operate in the best way for the good of the organization (van Dierendonck et al., 2014).

Of the seven leadership theories that overlap the most with servant leadership, transformational leadership theory represents the theory most similar to servant leadership (van Dierendonck, 2011). In many ways, servant leadership and transformational leadership mirror each other (Tebeian, 2012; van Dierendonck et al., 2014). Servant and transformational leadership theories were developed within the same timeframe because Greenleaf shaped servant leadership (2002). Transformational leadership theory was first mentioned by Burns in 1978 and fully developed by Bass in 1985 (van Dierendonck et al., 2014).

Transformational leaders and servant leaders become leaders and make decisions until the team is developed and empowered, after which the need for practical direction ceases because team members can discuss the decisions (van Dierendonck et al., 2014). Transformational leaders and servant leaders share characteristics in terms of the connection, caring, and empathy they express to members to encourage task completion. However, transformational leaders focus these efforts on the success of the organization's mission, whereas servant leaders move beyond the organization to the community and members as individuals.

A manager who uses servant leadership may have strong empowerment potential for his members in the context of a larger organization (Sendjaya, 2015), in a smaller business (Van Winkle et al., 2014), and in some non-profit organizations (Parris & Peachey, 2013b; Van Winkle et al., 2014). Not-for-profit organizations and the circumstances surrounding such ventures warrant more research on adopting and cultivating servant leadership elements, such as empowerment in different types of organizations (Parris & Peachey, 2013b).

Servant Leadership as Political Will in Non-Profit Organizations

The research was conducted at a non-profit organization located in the South Tangerang area. The informants consisted of four staff who carry out daily activities in organizational development. To the informants, researchers asked various questions, divided into five categories of servant leadership: delegation, integrity, motivation, human resource development, and openness to communication. Each informant answered questions in these five categories in turn.

In the context of delegation, organizational leaders who are politically and hierarchically at the top of power relations can initiate communication by giving directions to team members. Leaders provide trust to communicate activities to the community. They give flexibility according to the job description. Leaders give the confidence to innovate in completing work.

Concerning integrity, leaders have strong integrity in channelling donations. Leaders do not have special perks as a leader. Leaders set an example both in work and attitude to everyone. Leaders never blame others when there is an error in implementing activities. Leaders never ask to be respected and do not discriminate between fellow employees. The leader communicates the role of all team members for the organization as crucial for achieving goals by channelling donations to the community so they can develop. These attitudes illustrate how integrity positively impacts the flow of power relations between leaders and members.

Regarding motivation, the leader provides orientation at the start of employees joining the foundation, so there is never any compulsion at work. Leaders often share various informants about the organization's dynamics of change, so expect all employees to learn new things continuously. Leaders invite employees to communicate and coordinate with each other in activities. Leaders are people who are totally in meeting the needs of employees. As a non-profit organization, leaders appreciate praise and opportunities to learn new things.

As for human resource development, leaders not only play a dominant role at the top of the organizational structure hierarchy but also provide opportunities for employees to convey ideas in developing the organization. Leaders support the potential of employees. Leaders remind employees not to rush themselves and continue to motivate employees so that employees continue to improve their performance. Leaders provide opportunities for employees to communicate and coordinate with outsiders while at the same time improving their abilities in the form of language, ways of working and communication.

In openness to communication, a leader is a person who is full of openness and ready to accept criticism. The leader conducts discussions on the arrangement and division of labour. Leaders share ideas with the team in planning activities or finding solutions to problems. Politically, leaders are ready to work with various parties, whether they support or do not support activities to achieve organizational goals. Leaders value the differences that exist in discussions with the team.

Informants stated various statements in five categories of statements on questions submitted by researchers. These five categories align with Greenleaf's theory (2002) regarding the ten characteristics of servant leadership: "listening, empathy, healing, awareness, persuasion, philosophy, conceptualization, foresight, stewardship, commitment to the growth of people, and building community". Informants stated statements through discussion, communication, listening, persuading various parties, having a solid commitment to the organization and empowering the team.

In carrying out their operational activities, leaders always provide direction by opening discussions to their staff so that solid interpersonal relationships are built, and open management will be realized while monitoring each potential to be considered, even though the leader does not give specific targets and resolves internal problems through coaching, sanctions are only given for fatal mistakes. With this, both in terms of politics through policies and decisions made by leaders as well as in terms of directing practices, it is hoped that employees can work comfortably without fear, innovation can develop, and the vision and mission of schools and foundations can be realized.

In compiling the vision and mission of schools and foundations, leaders involve all levels of staff. However, things have been going poorly lately due to changing shareholders or administrators quickly, so adjustments to activities and work programs are needed. However, the delegation of work to employees is endeavoured to continue as it should by considering the needs and competence of the field.

Organizations carrying out operational school and other social activities seek funding from outside parties such as the Global Giving Foundation (from the United States), corporate/industry CSR, and community or individual donations, and the remainder will be met by other business ventures developed by the foundation.

Employees and teachers involved are encouraged to develop themselves, so they feel they need more time to feel satisfied with their achievements. The activities involve third parties (campus, community, industry, etc.) so that the skills possessed are always improved according to the needs of the work environment.

Servant leadership has a positive effect on managerial performance. A leader can choose how to lead with servant leadership to improve managerial performance because this has proven significant (Rifa'i et al., 2022). The perception of political will also has a positive effect on organizational performance. Thus, a person's perception of political will must also be considered to improve

organizational performance. As servant leadership has a positive effect on perceptions of political will, it can be understood that one's perception of political will makes how to lead with the servant leadership model recommended. Political will can mediate the influence of servant leadership on managerial performance, which means that if there is a weak influence between servant leadership and managerial performance, it can be seen first how organizational members perceive political will.

Leaders building a healthy work culture strive to set an example in speaking, behaving, being committed, directing, fostering and worshipping. They expect to be able to become role models for their staff to maintain the trust given and empathize with the sustainability of the activities of the foundations, schools and businesses that are being developed. Leaders often appreciate the achievements of their employees or teachers in their respective fields and competencies. This is inseparable from the expertise and experience of leaders in building a healthy work culture.

CONCLUSION

Management of non-profit organizations or non-profit organizations requires leadership with integrity both politically through policies and decisions made and practically through directions and behaviour towards members. The leader communicates the direction and goals of the organization in each work unit. Leaders prioritize the interests of the organization rather than personal interests. The leader communicates each complete direction to the team within the organization and then discusses the steps in detail. All efforts to find solutions to problems are discussed with the team.

Servant leadership becomes part of implementing democratic political values, which have also been realized as a political will in running the organization. Leaders in non-profit organizations are passionate about developing teams and meeting members' needs in a disinterested organization, not for the personal needs of a leader.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adams, J.S. (1963). Towards an Understanding of Inequity. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67(5), 422–436. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0040968>
- Anthony, R.N., & Young, D.W. (2003). *Management Control in Non-profit Organizations*. New York: McGraw Hill/Irwin.
- Arogundade, O.T., & Arogundade, A.B. (2015). *Psychological Empowerment in the Workplace*:

- Implications for Employees' Career Satisfaction. *North American Journal of Psychology*, 17, 27–36.
- Awaru, T., Fitria, N., Ainun, N., Khairunisha, M. (2019). Komunikasi Organisasi. Jurnal Universitas Muslim Indonesia, 1(1), 1-10.
- Brinkerhoff, D.W. (2000). Assessing political will for anti-corruption efforts: an analytic framework. *Public Administration and Development*, 20(3), 239–252. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-162X\(200008\)20:3<239::AID-PAD138>3.0.CO;2-3](https://doi.org/10.1002/1099-162X(200008)20:3<239::AID-PAD138>3.0.CO;2-3)
- Burch, M.J., Swails, P. & Mills, R. (2015). Perceptions of Administrators' Servant Leadership Qualities at a Christian University: A Descriptive Study. *Education*, 135, 399–404.
- Burrai, E., Font, X., & Cochrane, J. (2015). Destination Stakeholders' Perceptions of Volunteer Tourism: An Equity Theory Approach. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 17(5), 451–459. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jtr.2012>
- Cahyono, Y., Jihadi, M., Arifin, Z., Purnamasari, W., Musnaini, Wijoyo, H., Fitriaty, Putra, R. S., Putri, R. A., Muliansyah, D., Suryani, P., & Purwanto, A. (2020). Do Servant Leadership Influence Market Performance? Evidence from Indonesian Pharmacy Industries. *Systematic Reviews in Pharmacy*, 11(9), 439–451. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.31838/srp.2020.9.62>
- Chaidir. (2017). *Pengaruh Budaya Organisasi, Kepemimpinan Transformasional dan Kompetensi Terhadap Komitmen Anggota DPRD Serta Implikasinya Pada Kinerja Anggota DPRD Kabupaten/Kota di Provinsi Riau Periode 2014-2019* [Universitas Pasundan]. <http://repository.unpas.ac.id/id/eprint/32209>
- Charbonneau, D., Barling, J., & Kelloway, E. K. (2006). Transformational Leadership and Sports Performance: The Mediating Role of Intrinsic Motivation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 31(7), 1521–1534. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2001.tb02686.x>
- Choudhary, A. I., Akhtar, S. A., & Zaheer, A. (2013). Impact of Transformational and Servant Leadership on Organizational Performance: A Comparative Analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 116(2), 433–440. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1470-8>
- Crippen, C. (2012). Enhancing Authentic Leadership-Followership: Strengthening School Relationships. *Management in Education*, 26(4), 192–198. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0892020612439084>
- Deichmann, D., & Stam, D. (2015). Leveraging Transformational and Transactional Leadership to Cultivate the Generation of Organization-Focused Ideas. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(2), 204–219. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.10.004>
- Epitropaki, O., & Martin, R. (2013). Transformational-Transactional Leadership and Upward Influence: The Role of Relative Leader-Member Exchanges (RLMX) and Perceived Organizational Support (POS). *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24(2), 299–315. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2012.11.007>
- Gani, N.A., Utama, R.E., Jaharuddin, & Priharta, A. (2020). *Perilaku Organisasi*. Jakarta: Penerbit Mirqat.
- George, J.M., & Jones, G.R. (2005). *Understanding and Managing Organizational Behavior*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Ghasabeh, M. S., Soosay, C., & Reaiche, C. (2015). The Emerging Role of Transformational Leadership. *The Journal of Developing Areas*, 49(6), 459–467. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jda.2015.0090>
- Greasley, P. E., & Bocârnea, M. C. (2014). The Relationship between Personality Type and the Servant Leadership Characteristic of Empowerment. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 124, 11–19. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.02.454>
- Greenleaf, R.K. (2002). *Servant Leadership: A Journey into the Nature of Legitimate Power and Greatness*. Paulist Press.
- Gunawan, I. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif: Teori dan Praktik*. Jakarta: Bumi Aksara.
- Hamstra, M. R. W., Van Yperen, N. W., Wisse, B., & Sassenberg, K. (2014). Transformational and Transactional Leadership and Followers' Achievement Goals. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 29(3), 413–425. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10869-013-9322-9>
- Harris, J. N., Maher, L. P., & Ferris, G. R. (2016). The Roles of Political Skill and Political Will in Job Performance Prediction: A Moderated Nonlinear Perspective. *Handbook of Organizational Politics:*

- (Second Edition) *Looking Back and to the Future*, 15–39. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4337/9781784713492.00007>
- Harris, K. J., Zivnuska, S., Kacmar, K. M., & Shaw, J. D. (2007). The Impact of Political Skill on Impression Management Effectiveness. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(1), 278–285. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.278>
- Hopton, C. (2014). Learning and Developing Followership. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 13, 129–137.
- Hunter, E.M., Neubert, M.J., Perry, S.J., Witt, L., Penney, L. M., & Weinberger, E. (2013). Servant Leaders Inspire Servant Followers: Antecedents and Outcomes for Employees and the Organization. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 24, 316–331.
- Kapoutsis, I., Papalexandris, A., Treadway, D. C., & Bentley, J. (2017). Measuring Political Will in Organizations: Theoretical Construct Development and Empirical Validation. *Journal of Management*, 43(7), 2252–2280. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314566460>
- Kpundeh, S. J. (2000). Controlling Corruption in Sierra Leone: an Assessment of Past Efforts and Suggestions for the Future. In *Corruption and Development in Africa* (pp. 198–217). Palgrave Macmillan UK. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780333982440_11
- Laub, J.A. (1999). *Assessing the Servant Organization: Development of the Servant Organizational Leadership Assessment (SOLA) Instrument*.
- Leroy, H., Anseel, F., Gardner, W.L., & Sels, L. (2015). Authentic Leadership, Authentic Followership, Basic Need Satisfaction, and Work Role Performance. *Journal of Management*, 41(6), 1677–1697. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312457822>
- Liden, R.C., Wayne, S.J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant Leadership: Development of a Multidimensional Measure and Multi-Level Assessment. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.006>
- McGregor, D. (1960). *The Human Side of Enterprise*. McGraw-Hill.
- Mintzberg, H. (1983). The Case for Corporate Social Responsibility. *Journal of Business Strategy*, 4(2), 3–15. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1108/eb039015>
- Mintzberg, H. (1985). The Organization As Political Arena. *Journal of Management Studies*, 22(2), 133–154. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.1985.tb00069.x>
- Mullaney, E. (2014). Generational Preferences Create Challenges for Modern Mobility Strategies. *Benefits Quarterly*, 30, 38–20.
- Parris, D.L., & Peachey, J.W. (2013a). A Systematic Literature Review of Servant Leadership Theory in Organizational Contexts. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 113(3), 377–393. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-012-1322-6>
- Parris, D.L., & Peachey, J.W. (2013b). Encouraging Servant Leadership: A Qualitative Study of How a Cause-Related Sporting Event Inspires Participants to Serve. *Leadership*, 9(4), 486–512. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1742715012470675>
- Post, L.A., Raile, A.N.W., & Raile, E.D. (2010). Defining Political Will. *Politics & Policy*, 38(4), 653–676. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1747-1346.2010.00253.x>
- Ratnasari, S.L., Sutjahjo, G., & Adam. (2020). The Effect of Job Satisfaction, Organizational Culture and Leadership on Employee Performance. *Annals of Tropical Medicine and Public Health*, 23(13). <https://doi.org/10.36295/ASRO.2020.231329>
- Read III, J.B. (2014). Followership at the FDIC: A Case Study. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 13, 136–145.
- Renko, M., Kroeck, K.G., & Bullough, A. (2012). Expectancy Theory and Nascent Entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 39(3), 667–684. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11187-011-9354-3>
- Rifa'i, A., Tan, S., Edward, & Adriani, Z. (2022). Effect of Servant Leadership and Political Will Perception Toward Managerial Performance. *Adpebi International Journal of Multidisciplinary Sciences*, 1(1), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.54099/AIJMS.V1I1.174>
- Russell, E.J. (2012). The Role of Servant Leadership in Faculty Development Programs: A Review Of The Literature. *Turkish Online Journal of Distance Education*, 13(1), 15–19.
- Russell, R.F., & Stone, A.G. (2002). A Review of Servant Leadership Attributes: Developing a Practical Model. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 23(3), 145–157. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437730210424>

- Saleem, F., Zhang, Y.Z., Gopinath, C., & Adeel, A. (2020). Impact of Servant Leadership on Performance: The Mediating Role of Affective and Cognitive Trust. *SAGE Open*, 10(1). <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019900562>
- Schneider, S.K., & George, W.M. (2011). Servant Leadership versus Transformational Leadership in Voluntary Service Organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 32(1), 60–77. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01437731111099283>
- Schwepeker, C.H., & Schultz, R.J. (2015). Influence of the Ethical Servant Leader and Ethical Climate on Customer Value Enhancing Sales Performance. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 35(2), 93–107. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08853134.2015.1010537>
- Schermerhorn Jr., J.R. (2011). 2011. Organizational Behaviour. Hoboken : John Wiley.
- Sendjaya, S. (2015). Servant Leadership Research. In *Personal and Organizational Excellence through Servant Leadership* (pp. 15–38). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-16196-9_2
- Spears, L.C. (2010). Character and Servant Leadership: Ten Characteristics of Effective, Caring Leaders. *The Journal of Virtues & Leadership*, 1, 25–30.
- Tebeian, A. E. (2012). The Impact of Motivation through Leadership on Group Performance. *Review of International Comparative Management*, 13, 313–324.
- Tomigolung, H.N. (2015). The Effects of Servant Leadership on Employee Performance at Regional Government Office Southeast Minahasa. *Jurnal EMBA*, 3(1), 118–230. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.35794/emba.3.1.2015.6676>
- Treadway, D.C., Hochwarter, W.A., Kacmar, C.J., & Ferris, G.R. (2005). Political Will, Political Skill, and Political Behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(3), 229–245. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1002/job.310>
- Tseng, L.-M., & Kuo, C.-L. (2014). Customers' Attitudes toward Insurance Frauds: An Application of Adams' Equity Theory. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 41(11), 1038–1054. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJSE-08-2012-0142>
- van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant Leadership: A Review and Synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228–1261. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310380462>
- van Dierendonck, D., Stam, D., Boersma, P., de Windt, N., & Alkema, J. (2014). Same Difference? Exploring the Differential Mechanisms Linking Servant Leadership and Transformational Leadership to Follower Outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 25(3), 544–562. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2013.11.014>
- Van Winkle, B., Allen, S., De Vore, D., & Winston, B. (2014). The Relationship between the Servant Leadership Behaviors of Immediate Supervisors and Followers' Perceptions of Being Empowered in the Context of Small Business. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 13, 70–82.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and Motivation*. Wiley.
- Washington, R.R., Sutton, C.D., & Sauser, J.I. (2014). How Distinct Is Servant Leadership Theory? Empirical Comparisons with Competing Theories. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability & Ethics*, 11, 11–25.
- Wong, P. T. P., & Davey, D. (2007). *Best Practices in Servant Leadership*.
- Wren, D.A. (2005). *The History of Management Thought*. John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Zou, W.-C., Tian, Q., & Liu, J. (2015). Servant Leadership, Social Exchange Relationships, and Follower's Helping Behavior: Positive Reciprocity Belief Matters. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 51, 147–156. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2015.08.012>