THE SOCIAL PRODUCTION OF CHARISMA

Phyllis J. Day

The University of Michigan

May 1974

Lynn, age 16, resident at Roseland:

"Dear God:

Give me the strength to live my life to the fullest.

I am confused, scorned, and exhausted.

I need your help for my sanity, maybe even for the sanity

of others.

I cry, scream, ache to be able to know myself.

I disgust myself so often that I wonder at my being.

There is a purpose somewhere. An original love.

Please help me find sanctuary within myself, and trust in

others.

First steps are quoted as being the roughest, yet, to me,

every step is a new and first one.

Please help me find my special staircase. It's the time

for my beginning. Again."

PREFACE

I would like to express my deep appreciation to
the Director of Roseland Services for her willingness
to have me do this study, all her help while I was
involved in it, and for her continuing friendship.
My thanks also to the staff and residents of Roseland
for their interest in the project and their frankness
in discussing their lives there, and their personal
feelings, with me. The data for this working paper are
taken from the Field Work Sequence 522-523, Research on
Social Organization.

Finally, I am extremely grateful to Professor Lawrence
Redlinger for his direction, instruction, and encouragement
throughout the course of the project, and most especially
for his understanding and support at a most difficult
time in my life.

People and incidents described in this paper are real,
but names and locations have been changed to protect their
identities.

OUTLINE

OUTLINE   (continued)

INTRODUCTION

Charisma and the complex of ideas surrounding it -- charismatic authority, domination, the charismatic situation, etc. -- were recognized as phenomena inherent in human society long before the beginnings of sociology. Looking at the early prophets and leaders of men, Weber, beginning to isolate sociological concepts for study, developed an ideal type to describe the charismatic personality, and defined charisma as:

> "... a certain quality of an individual personality by virtue of which he is set apart from ordinary men and treated as endowed with supernatural, super-human, or at least specifically exceptional qualities. These are ... not accessible to the ordinary person, but are regarded as exemplary, and on the basis of them the individual concerned is treated as a leader."[1]

Beyond that, the ideals propagated by the charismatic are religious or mystical in nature, lying in "what is thought to be his connection with ... some very central factor of man's existence and the cosmos in which he lives."[2]

From the time of Weber, work on the charismatic individual has been largely theoretical. Primarily, it has dealt with characters "larger than life," as were the prophets and founders of great movements. Weber, however, included in his work the idea that charisma is of a dialectic nature in the processes of institution-building, and

---

1. Bendix, Reinhard, MAX WEBER, AN INTELLECTUAL PORTRAIT, (New York: Doubleday and Co., 1962), p. 88 footnote 14.

2. Eisenstadt, S.N., SELECTED PAPERS OF MAX WEBER ON CHARISMA AND INSTITUTION BUILDING, (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), p. xxii.

both Shils and Eisenstadt concerned themselves with that facet of charisma. Shils' focus led to the theory that charisma "inheres in" the organization; that "... an attenuated, mediated, institutionalized charismatic propensity is present in the routine functioning of society."[3] And that:

> "In the rational-legal system, the charisma is not concentratedly imputed to the person occupying the central role or to the role itself, but is dispersed in a diminished but unequal intensity throughout the hierarchy of roles and rules."[4]
> ... "What the 'subject' responds to is not just the specific declaration or order of the incumbent of the role ... but the incumbent enveloped in the vague and powerful nimbus of the authority of the entire institution."[5]

Eisenstadt, on the other hand, takes the middle road between the charismatic as the great leader (Weber's ideal type) and the almost non-personal institutional meaning which Shils gives. He sees charisma in an individual as a vital part of the process of social change, saying:

> "... Charisma /is/ ... of crucial importance for understanding the processes of institution building ... and that the explication of the relation between charisma and institution building is perhaps the most important challenge which Weber's work poses for modern sociology."[6]

Despite all the theories, nothing much has been accomplished in the way of empirical study of the charismatic in "normal life," (i.e., other than for the world changers). Thus the charismatic leader producing institutional or social change within the context

3. Shils, Edward, "Charisma, Order, and Status," ASR 30, (April, 1965), p. 200.

4. IBID.,p. 204.

5. IBID.,p. 206.

6. Eisenstadt, op.cit.,p. ix.

of daily, non-spectacular life has not been observed. If Eisenstadts' theories are true, such charisma should be visible whenever a reasonably large change in any area of institutional life is made, whether the area is large or small. There are a few studies which deal with the entrepreneurial character, and in the sense that charisma may be the entrepreneur made mystical these add to our knowledge (e.g., David McClelland's THE ACHIEVING SOCIETY[7]). But these dissect the personality outside the social context, and so still do not fill the gap.

It is the position of this paper that charisma arises, and comes into focus as a necessary aspect of institution building only when certain conditions are met. These conditions arise at times of disequilibrium or change in three separate areas -- societal, organizational, and personal -- and it is the convergence of the three sets of changes through which charisma arises to build (or, perhaps in the process of building, to destroy) institutions. In this paper the separate sets of change are called "propensities to charisma," for without the simultaneous occurrences of any of the conditions of change charisma would not arise.

Charisma itself, as used in the above statement, is more than the actions of a charismatic leader or the occurrences of the charismatic situation. It is defined as the illuminating spark of innovation which occurs only at the convergence of the three propensities to charisma, when a leader emerges from an institution in a society in flux, beholds that institution in the new light of

---

7. McClelland, David C., THE ACHIEVING SOCIETY, (Princeton: D. Van Nostrand, Inc. 1961).

his personal ideal, and molds it by means of certain attracting
personal characteristics, power, and the strength of his convictions,
to become a new entity. The charismatic leader and the charismatic
situation depend on one another, and on the society in the sense that
the charismatic person needs a "socially organized" context in which
his emergent extraordinary traits can be recognized, utilized, and
institutionalized into the new form.

This paper is an empirical study of charisma at work. Its locus
is a small organization, an institutional home for predelinquent
girls. Because of the small size of the Home, certain qualities,
situations, and activities stand clearly in relief against a setting
which is normally bureaucratic. Indeed, the "take-off point" of
the paper is that generally an organization, once conceived in
charisma, becomes bureaucratized incrementally and progressively.
In this instance, the process of bureaucratization was reversed, and
radically so, to "charismatization." This provides us with an unusual
opportunity for insight into what has been called the dialectic of
charisma in institution-building, which concept will be elaborated
upon later.

Our contact with the agency throughout the time of change
(approximately two years), provided the opportunity to view almost
the whole process, beginning with the organization's struggle for
survival in the face of dwindling funds and ending with the insti-
tution of a radically new program. Perhaps the situation would
have called out charisma in any person; this we do not know. But
the qualities exhibited by the Director in this time of stress were
extraordinary, and the actions she took because of certain personal

preconditions and predispositions in combination with the survival
needs of the organization, were clearly charismatic. Under her
influence an outstanding and innovative change in direction for the
agency was accomplished.

Statement of Purpose

Eisenstadt decries the fact that very little has been done
to document propensities to institutional change and the part that
charisma plays in that change. It is to this task the paper is
oriented. A serendipitous choice or chance of organizational study,
and the inclination to participant observation from which to develop
grounded theory, provided an opportunity to see charisma in action.
The purpose of this paper is to detail propensities toward a social
change interwoven in the person of a charismatic leader, the or-
ganizational structure, and changing societal norms. We hope this
attempt will help to "fill in the gaps" in understanding the relation
of charisma to institution building.

OVERVIEW: STRUCTURE PAST AND PRESENT

A.   History

Prudence Rains, in her article "Moral Reinstatement," says of maternity homes that:

> "As they have been traditionally conceived and operated, maternity homes have directly taken a girl-in-trouble view of their clients -- the view that these are essentially respectable girls who made a mistake."[8]

It was on the basis of this tradition that Roseland Home was founded in 1916. Located in a middle-sized, ultra-conservative midwestern community, the Home was one of a chain of such institutions developed to provide seclusion for the daughters of middle- and upper-class parents while awaiting the births of their illegitimate children. At first it was financed solely by private grants and fees. Later it became the recipient of funds from the local United Fund.

Treatment in the Home consisted of mental health counseling to help the girls deal with the emotional trauma of such pregnancy and with the pain of releasing their babies for the nearly inevitable adoption. Though the girls were still stigmatized by medical personnel whose services they required, it was felt by staff in the Home that their situation was punishment enough, and life within the institution was made as pleasant as possible. A program of educational tutoring was established in cooperation with the local city and county school districts by which the girls could keep up with their classes.

---

8.   Rains, Prudence, "Moral Reinstatement: The Characteristics of Maternity Homes," AMERICAN BEHAVIORAL SCIENTIST, Vol. 14, (Nov.-Dec., 1970), p. 220.

Generally, girls in the Home were not local. They came from cities throughout the area, and local girls needing maternity home care were "traded" to other localities. This was within the tradition of secrecy and seclusion by which the girls were sheltered from the negative sanctions imposed by society outside the Home. It is worth noting that clients of the Home were generally homogeneous: white, middle-class economically, "repentant", etc. Capacity of the Home was up to 25 girls, with 22 the optimum. Staff consisted of a Director, a part-time secretary/bookkeeper, one full time and one half-time housemother (who switched duty times), a part-time cook, and a social worker. The Director was also a social worker and carried a case-load of girls for counseling. A doctor and a nurse made regular visits and a local hospital cared for the girls during labor and delivery. At first set up on a tutorial basis, the education program had developed by 1960 into regular classroom classes, staffed by teachers paid for by cooperating city and county school districts but reporting to the Director. Subjects taught were math, history, English, and homemaking.

The present Director, Caroline, came to the Home in 1958. At that time and until about four years ago (1970) Roseland and its program remained essentially as described above. It was a typical maternity home and a typical social work agency/bureaucracy, almost invisible to the community as a whole (by design). It was well thought of among its sister agencies, and allotments were made regularly and with very little question by the United Fund.

Chart 1
About Here

CHARACTERISTICS OF ROSELAND SERVICES OVER TIME

TIME	TYPE OF AGENCY	STRUCTURE	PURPOSE	TYPE OF HIERARCHY	STAFF	CLIENTELE
Time I:	Maternity Home	Bureaucratic	Shelter girls and adopt out babies	Lines of authority for all personnel except sec. through social work to Director	Director; 1 social worker; 1 1/2 house-parents; part-time cook; part-time sec.; visiting tutors and later teachers in classrooms	Pregnant girl in residence, age 12-20
Time II: Interim Per.	Maternity Home and School for local pregnant girls residing at home	Bureaucratic with some staff and program innovations	Shelter residents; give mental health counseling to res. and non-res. girls; medical help for both sets of girls; educational serv. for both sets	Same as above, except new shepherd has direct access to Director	Same as above, except new shepherd takes place of 1 house-parent and 1/2 social worker	Pregnant girl in residence; pregnant girl from local areas wishing to continue i school while living at hom in community age 12-20
Time III: New Program	Residence or group home for delinquent and pre-delinquent girls Pregnant not a necessary condition for admittance	Charismatic	Provide a home-like setting for girls assigned by courts and state as troubled girls or girls with no other place to go	Flattened hierarchy with Director presiding over democratic peer group of shepherds Other staff is peripheral	Director; 6 shepherds who serve as house-parents and social workers; 1 sec., part-time cook, part-time housekeeper	Court-assigne girls ages 13-18 judged pre linquent or without prope parental care Some state-assigned (neglected) girls. Not necessarily pregnant

B. Interim

From 1970 through 1972, Roseland underwent a radical change
in outlook, program, and service. The first public intimations of
change came in the fall, 1971, when a new educational program was
established. This program was set up to fulfill the needs of girls
within the community who, while still living at home, had dropped
out of school because of unwed pregnancy. Previous to the law
which permitted pregnant girls to remain in school, the school dis-
tricts involved had had tutoring programs for pregnant girls. With
the law these girls were no longer considered eligible for the
"home-bound" programs and so were dropped. However, they continued
to leave school when their pregnancies became obvious, and the
community found that it had no program at all for them. Many re-
mained drop-outs after their babies were born.

To fulfill their needs for education, mental health counseling,
pregnancy counseling and medical surveillance, adoption counseling,
and school re-entry problems, Roseland established the Day School
Program for Pregnant Girls. This was done in cooperation with the
city school district, which provided the teachers, and the County
Intermediate District, which supported one half-time social worker
and applied for and got federal funds to pay for the lunches which
were served at the Home.

The most important features of this new clientele were that
the girls were local, generally of a lower socio-economic class
than residents of the Home, and were in high proportion black.
Implications for the Home, which still maintained its residency

program with 15 to 18 girls, were the sheer addition of <u>numbers</u> of
girls (up to 40 day girls enrolled in the 1971-72 school year) with
the resultant crowding in already small classrooms and dining area;
friction between resident/non-resident, local/non-local girls; new
racial tensions; and newly heterogeneous normative expectations based
on socio-economic differences -- "morality" of the illegitimate
pregnancy, language, behavior, and the tendency for day girls to keep
their babies.

In addition, the education program became a recruiting mechanism
for new resident girls. This compounded the problem of heterogeneity
beyond the day hours and added a new financial problem. Whereas the
day program, including lunch, was financed through the public
schools, resident girls recruited from poor families had no resources
with which to pay boarding fees equal to what other residents paid.
The costs were simply "absorbed" by Roseland when no state or court
financing for foster care could be obtained. For an organization
already in trouble because of reduced occupancy, this created an
even more severe "pinch."

Moreover, adjustments in the program itself faced great difficulty
in terms of funding and personnel. One of the premises on which the
day program was based (and financed) was that the Home, now called
Roseland <u>Services</u>, would provide mental health care and some physical
health services. The Home had effectively increased its clientele
by a factor of 3. Yet funding was only made available for an addition-
al half-time social worker. The doctor who volunteered his time
for the resident girls refused to deal with the day girls, requir-
ing that the social worker run interference with local "non-
committed" doctors. In this town there is a shortage of doctors

and many either will not take new patients or will not take Medicaid
patients, and many new girls were in that position. Moreover, the
day girls required a myriad services connected with their poverty
in addition to their pregnancies. Really adequate service was,
therefore, just not possible.

In the classrooms, middle-class teachers who had taken this
work on a part-time basis, as much for the sake of "volunteering"
to help girls in trouble as for the money, found that their classes
were no longer well-behaved or with at least average ability. They
were often disrupted by foul language, fighting among the girls,
and even verbal and threatened physical abuse toward teachers.
Many of the day girls were not well-motivated to learn (though the
fact that they were coming to school at all showed some motivation)
and required long-term personal tutoring. Previous to this time,
studies had been conducted on the premise of individual instruction,
but with the idea of proceeding as rapidly as possible so as to
enable the girl to remain with her classes even though taking off
time for delivery and recuperation. The position of the teachers
now became more remedial for problem workers than anything, and
they did not like this.

Work in the dining room and kitchen, for lunch and snacks,
became a major focus of difficulty for all concerned. Cleaning up
had been a housekeeping chore given the residents, and they still
found that if they wanted a clean house to live in much of the
work would have to be done by them. Though an attempt was made
to have the day girls share in the work, it was not too successful.
And now more people had access to the girls' rooms; stealing and

destruction of property also became a problem. There was a growing unrest which occasionally broke into the open in screaming and some physical fights.

There was also a great deal more work for the secretary/book-keeper to do. Before the day program, work had generally been to obtain school records from the girls' schools, keep records, and return them to the school district for credit when the girl left Roseland. Also, finances were recorded and reported. With the new program the work was almost immediately tripled. Moreover, it became necessary for the secretary to solicit the money that before had been paid in advance by parents. She had now to deal with some-what recalcitrant bureaucracies. And because of the lower-class, non-motivated status of the new set of girls, the school bureaucracies just didn't seem to care about getting information, records, etc., to Roseland. These were the girls that were marginal to the school system anyway, and perhaps they had been "written off." At any rate, it became the unpleasant task of the secretary to try to do the job she had done before, but in far greater numbers and with less pleasant respondents.

The decision to end the day program at the end of the 1972-73 school year was made unilaterally by the public schools (city), in favor of an alternate school for all drop-out students. The decision was not really contested by Roseland, probably on the realization that the program was not viable. The Director made no public protest, said "What good would it do?" and laid the blame on the official in the city schools that had made the decision. (The County School District was not even informed by the city schools,

and did not know in fall 73 that the school program was no longer
available to pregnant girls at Roseland). Given her persuasive
abilities in other situations, it would seem that the Director might
have made more of a protest if the day program had really been a
major goal. The lack of protest given the investment Roseland had
made in the program is certainly indicative that the survival interests
of the Director had turned in another direction.

C. The New Program

   1. Clients

Part of the reason for this lack of entrepreneurship on her
part was probably the interest in and attention to a new area of
programming in the Home. Until the beginnings of the day program,
all girls at Roseland were there because of pregnancy. However,
some of the local girls recruited as residents were seen by the
courts to have no proper homes to return to once their babies were
born. Because of this, and because of the Director's commitment to
girls with problems (now compounded by poverty), girls were assigned
to the Home for foster care after their babies had been delivered.
The courts assigned them as "predelinquents" and paid the regular
boarding care fees (up to $15.00 per day). Soon non-pregnant pre-
delinquent girls from all over the state were being assigned to
Roseland, and for all practical purposes the Home ceased to be a
maternity home and became instead an institution for predelinquent
girls, some of whom happened to be pregnant.

The nature of the program is also radically different from what
it was as a maternity home. The girls are not seen as "girls who
are respectable but have made a mistake" but as deeply troubled girls.

Many of them have been known to the courts almost all their lives, and many would be assigned to Girl's Training School if there were no Roseland. Roseland is no more a genteel place of seclusion for the repentant middle class girl involved in an illegitimate pregnancy but a custodial/foster care institution for girls labeled, in one way or another, as "bad" or "going bad."

2. Staff and Treatment

This, of course, led to major changes in treatment orientation. A major change is the concept of the "shepherd." Shepherds have two jobs: in the first place they are somewhat analogous to the house-parent in that they live with the girls (there is a male shepherd on the staff also, but he lives away from the Home); and even moreso they are replacements for the professional social worker, as they carry counseling caseloads (up to 4 girls) and are "responsible" for the girls in the same way that a social worker would be. In the words of one,

> "We're halfway between mother and sister, I think
> nothing official, ever, except when we have to
> make a decision...."

(The kinds of decisions referred to involve such as going home for visits, rule-breaking, etc.)

Shepherds are young -- all under 26 -- for most this is their first regular job after college, they are non-professional in the sense that they have no graduate training and only one has been trained in undergraduate college as a social worker (another in psychology). There are 5 women shepherds and one male shepherd on the staff. All but one woman lives in the Home, and duty hours are 48 on, 48 off, with one girl on "swing" for odd hours. The man

shepherd, rather than having a caseload, deals with all the girls in the way that a big brother or model father might. Rate of turnover for the shepherds is nine to twelve months, usually coinciding with the school year. Along with being sisters and counselors, they serve as models for the girls.

It should be noted that these six shepherds replace one full-time social worker and one full-time houseparent. Aside from the desire of the Director to have young, "non-jaded" workers with a contemporary attitude toward the girls, the fact remains that choosing young, inexperienced workers who can live in the Home makes good budgetary sense. The Director is the only professional social worker on the staff.

Other staff positions, i.e., cook, secretary, nurse, and doctor remain the same. However, all personnel except the doctor have been changed since 1972.

3. Program

The program itself has changed from traditional mental health counseling to a modified "behavior modification" situation. There is no punishment in the Home except for dollar fines for use of drugs or alcohol. This is paid from the two dollar per week allowance each girl receives. The treatment plan is a system of levels devised by a former shepherd with some experience in behavior modification. Each of four levels has cumulative privileges as the girl behaves (doesn't make "goofs") for a specified period of time per level. The girl enters the Home on Level 1, which is called "Slip back and New Girl Level." She is allowed out only with an old resident for two hours on her second, third

and fourth days, and for three hours on the fifth, sixth and
seventh days. She may go out only until 8 PM, and may have no
visitors and no overnights away from the Home. She is allowed
2 goofs. If she exceeds 2, she remains on Level 1 for another
week.

On Level 2, where she stays for 3 weeks, she is allowed one
time out late (till 10 if under age 16, 11 if over) per week on
Friday or Saturday. She may go home overnight one night if it
is approved by the shepherd. Her boyfriend is allowed to see
her three times at Roseland and 2 times elsewhere, providing she
has no goofs that day. She is allowed to be out four hours per
day, observing curfews until 8:30 for girls under 16, 9:30 over
16. All girls must be present for dinner, and the girl is
allowed 9 goofs at this level.

She remains at Level 3 for 5 weeks. Here she is allowed two
late nights, Friday and Saturday, with curfews of 10:30 under 16,
11:30 over 16. She can stay overnight with parents twice in that
period; her boyfriend can visit her three times a week on grounds
and three times a week off grounds. She can be away from the Home
for 4 hours a day, must be present for dinner, and is allowed 15
goofs at this level.

On the optimum level 4, seeing her boyfriend and having late
nights or overnight stays are permitted at the discretion of her
shepherd. She may be out any time until 9:30 for under 16 or
10:30 for over 16 on week days. Goofs are determined by the girl
and her shepherd together, and 20 goofs are allowed in a 10 week
period.

These very lenient rules are based on the ideals of the
Director, who says

> "What we have, I think, or what we want to
> develop, is a viable program built on mine
> own image, based on my concepts, convictions,
> experience, as a attempt to reach kids that
> haven't yet been reached...To provide a
> setting in which the girls can be given some
> kind of care and security, and helped to
> handle some problems here so that they can
> face them when they go back to the community."

Basic to the program is the choice made that this would be not
a custodial care institution primarily but a home. Thus though the
doors are locked at night, after everyone is in, they can be opened
by anyone from the inside. The locks have more to do with keeping
people out than with locking the girls in:

> "Maybe they really need more control. Some
> people do. But I don't believe in locking
> kids up. I have some really strong convictions
> about locking kids up...And how can they learn
> how to act if they're locked up, if they don't
> have a chance to learn?...I want it open...I
> want it to be like a home, a home-like place as
> much as possible."- Director

According to the Director, their behavior modification program is

> "...not strictly a technique for changing the
> kids' behavior except as a matter of controlling
> what things go on around here...We use the ideas
> of reinforcing good behavior and extinguishing
> bad behavior, but only in terms of looking at
> relationships. It's not true gung-ho behavior
> mod and to hell with everything else...Reward
> and punishment, but I think you have to go
> farther."

A major effort is toward helping the girls to build a rewarding
relationship with her shepherd and with the Director.

4. Admission and Removal

Girls are admitted to the Home at the Director's discretion.
If they cannot live within the limits of the level system, the
shepherds and the Director confer together and make the decision
to have the girl removed from Roseland. This decision is made on
just how well the girl seems to be getting along; her number of
goofs, runaways, fights, arguing with the Shepherds, and so on.
Depending on the girl herself, many things are permitted and are
not grounds for removal: repeated runaways, having sex relations
with boys even to the extent of pregnancy, and so on -- there are
no hard and fast rules, it appears to be a matter of what the
staff is willing to continue to cope with. Discussing a particularly
"unsocialized" girl, this interplay took place at a staff meeting:

B. "That was the bet, if she could make you say 'you're sick
of me' before Monday she'd win $5.00."

Director "Can she make us sick of her? Can she do it?"

B. "I really like her. I want to try."

S. "Me too."

Director: "But the demand is high. To live with a shitty
obnoxious pre-adolescent who's had lots of practice in
turning people off, Can we do it, living with 20 other
demanding, shitty, obnoxious..."

People laughed.

F. "As long as she doesn't put live ashes in my hand.
As long as I can keep it running through my head --
Shocking grownups is fun, shocking grownups in fun."

Director: "We are not infinite beings. Can we do it?

Are we saying we want to do it?"

Everyone says yes or nods. The Director continues

"It's awfully important we be realistic. Never say you

want to because you think, well, I should want to. Do

we have a fighting chance of reaching this kid?"

F. "As long as our bodies hold up?"

A visitor: "What are the limits?"

Director: "Paul, you ask what are the limits. With

the calibre of people we have here, it's probably like

the outer limits of human capabilities." There are

yays and clappings.

Paul: "But is it by majority vote that we can't deal

with it that makes you decide whether or not to keep a

girl?"

Director: "If you're asking if its my decision or the

staff's, I like to think it's a staff decision."

B. "And sometimes we consider if its detrimental to

the others." Director "We try to be realistic. There

are some kids we aren't going to reach. And with some

the minimum is the most you can do."

As to the program, aside from the individual talks the girls

have with their own shepherds, there are house meetings once a

week where the girls and the shepherds air their problems and where

topics that the shepherds consider important are brought out for

discussion, such as use of drugs, ripping off other people's

things, use of the phone, etc. Also, there are group meetings,

where a kind of group therapy is being attempted. These have only been in operation for two months, however, so it is not clear whether they help or will be continued. The doors of the shepherds and the Director are always open except when counseling or official business is going on, and the staff is completely accessible when the girls need to see them. There is nothing in the way of planned and regular activities; rather events are planned for by girls and staff as they come up.

D. Dismantling the Bureaucracy

An important facet of the change which has taken place in Roseland during the past two years is that of the bureaucracy itself. Previous to the beginnings of the day program, though carried through it to some extent, the Home was a typical bureaucracy. Among the characteristics of a bureaucracy are that it is a continuous organization of official functions bound by rules; has a specific sphere of functions with an incumbent with the necessary authority to carry out these functions; that norms and sanctions are used subject to definite rules; that organization follows the principles of hierarchy; and that there is a record system which maintains a systematic interpretation of norms and enforcement of rules, which cannot be maintained through oral communications.[9]

Until the change, the rules and official functions were maintained in accordance with the needs of the organization for reporting; the functions were limited to the needs of pregnant girls; what violations occurred had known and universally applied

---

9.   Etzioni, Amitai, Modern Organizations,(Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964), p. 53.

sanctions; a definite hierarchy was visible, though on a small

scale, with houseparents reporting to social worker, social

worker to Director, and the line of authority obvious. Moreover,

the traditional records of the social agency were kept --

generally narrative in form and subjective, but also giving

specifics of the girls' ages, parents, and so on. With the

coming of the predelinquent program, vast changes in the bureau-

cracy occurred. A hierarchy is still observable in that the

shepherds report to the Director, but it is flattened in that

there is a system of conferences and consultations used to make

decisions in the democratic manner (apparently) rather that all

authority resting with the Director. It is not clear whether

the Director actually makes the decisions and then "influences"

the shepherds to see things in her light or whether the shepherds

really have a great part in the decision-making. It is clear,

however, that the shepherds believe they share in decision-

making. A shepherd says:

> "She's supportive but not wishy-washy, she's
> firm and not afraid to face you down when she
> thinks you're wrong. But she doesn't decide
> on things alone, either, when she wants to
> do something she has a staff meeting and if
> we don't agree she lets it go. That's the
> way it should be because we have to live
> with it and she knows it."

Beyond an admittance form, no real or consistent records are

now kept for the girls. The old social work narratives are no

longer written; though each girl arrives with a packet of records

from the court very little if anything is added during her stay.

There are behavior records kept in the form of a "goof sheet,"

on which the girl's goofs and levels are recorded, but this is
thrown out when filled and a new one started. And there is a small
card file kept, in which for some of the girls the behavior to be
modified (as, screaming, being obstinate) are noted, and progress
made toward the goal. However, entries are sporadic and cards are
not kept for all the girls.

Records dealing with external matters, such as court payments,
reports to the United Fund, etc., are maintained by the secretary/
bookkeeper. They would seem to be solely her responsibility, as are
the entries made in the girls' permanent files -- usually now just
the name, date of arrival, address of parents, and occasionally such
things as whether or not she is pregnant. She says "It is a heavy
job as far as getting things done. But Caroline just tells me what
to do and it's up to me to do it."

The particularistic[10] ways in which rules are treated have already
been mentioned. With the level system this discretionary enforcement
is built right into the system. Sanctions seem to be very subjective;
for example, the only reason for fining a girl is supposed to be
if she uses drugs or alcohol. Yet one girl was fined for letting
the air out of a shepherd's tires. The most obvious subjectivity
in dealing with the rules is in the situation with runaways. Here the

---

10. Particularistic: referring to Parsons' dichotomy of particular-
    istic versus universalistic, in which particularistic means that
    each arising situation is dealt with according to its own merits
    as to incident, people involved, etc. Universalistic, on the
    other hand, means that each arising situation is dealt with on
    the basis of established rules and precedents, without consideration
    of the individual or unique merits of any specific case.

status which the girl has with the shepherds or with Caroline is often the determining factor. The rules state that when a girl is gone more than two hours after curfew the court is to be notified immediately. If the court is not open, the police are to be notified. Yet in one case a girl was gone for two days and the officials were never notified; the Director said "I don't worry about R., she can take care of herself, she has a good head on her shoulders."

In another case, a girl who had lived for 2 years at Roseland ran away "to teach the shepherds a lesson." This was discussed at staff meeting with much laughter.

> "W. asked how long she'd been away, and Caroline said only that night. I asked if she'd 'run,' the Rose- land work for run away or maybe escaped, and C. said 'last week she wrote us a note that says that we had to shape up or else, that she'd come back when things were right and not a day sooner.... She wanted us to shape up and she wanted the girls to start behaving right, and when E. wants some- thing you better do it. Anyway, she came back the next day.' They laughed about that, kind of in exasperation."

Nothing was done about this girl. Contrast that with C., who stayed away over night, was picked up and taken by the police to the Juvenile Home and was refused re-entry to Roseland. There was no obvious difference except that C. didn't fit in, didn't relate well to the shepherds, etc.

Another interesting feature of the Home, which may pertain to the breakdown of the purpose or function of it as a deterrent to delinquency, or may be part of another phenomenon not having to do with the bureaucracy at all, is that four of the girls who were non- pregnant when they entered the Home are now pregnant. The great deal of freedom allowed the girls, plus the idea, almost, that pregnant

is the way to be, are factors here. There appears to be no censure
at all for this behavior. Caroline says "There's so little control.
I don't have control. There's a bunch of them out now, some smoking
dope, some screwing up a storm. What can I do?" She really seems
to feel that pregnancy is the better of two evils, the worse being
more control.

A final characteristic of a bureaucracy is that positions within
it are not dependent on the incumbent in that position; i.e., that
jobs within the bureaucracy are transferable. This is certainly
not true of the Director's position at Roseland. In fact, the whole
structure is built around her special attributes -- she is the only
strong pillar of the organization. Everyone is aware of this. The
secretary says "Oh, Caroline, she's wonderful. She's what holds this
together. Every organization has to have one person that does that,
and Caroline is the one who does it for this place." Almost every
shepherd said the same kind of thing, with the added comment that
"no one can do what she does." I asked what would happen if Caroline
left, and they answered "No one can replace Caroline." Caroline her-
self is aware of this weakness. She says "If we really have a viable
program, it should be transferable. I'm not sure that it is. Not
that I'm so great or anything, but this is so much... the way I want
it to be that I'm not sure anyone else could step into it and carry
on this kind of a program. They'd have to adopt it to their own
methods, and would the program that we have now adjust to that change?
... Is this a saleable job? I don't think that it is, the way that
it stands now.... It bothers me -- it's not transferable."

E. Change of Institutional Type

Before the change, Roseland had many of the characteristics of a total institution. It was never intended to be a prison-like institution, to which the deviant was "committed" and could not leave for a specified length of time. Commitment was, in fact, voluntary, but by will of the parents probably more than that of the girls themselves. Certainly the effect on girls who became residents was much like that of commitment to a total institution -- they could go nowhere without express permission from the staff and without being accompanied by staff or other residents; hours for rising, eating, working, and sleeping were set by the staff and penalties imposed for non-compliance; the residents were "locked in" and let out, even for visits with their families, according to specified rules and precedents.

A chart indicating the totality of institution follows:

Degree of Totality of Institution

	Committed by	Rigidity of Restrictions on Freedom	Surveillance	Stereotyping and Isolation of Staff and Clients	"Planning" of Life of Clients
Time I	Parents or voluntary	Very few exceptions to rigid visiting hours rules	Close; locked doors after hours	No crossing of staff/client lines; stereotypes of and by both staff and clients	Total planning of client institutional life
Time II	Parents, for residents; voluntary for day school	Somewhat relaxed restrictions for residents, no restrictions for day girls	Attempted close surveillance for residents, reduced because of lack of surveillance for day girls; locked doors but fewer restrictions	Same as above except as regards shepherd	Total planning for residents attempted; some for day girls as in clean up after lunch, but this was not too successful
Time III	Court-judged delinquent or pre-delinquent; state-appointed neglected or dependent girls	Very relaxed rules, depending on "level system" and discretion of shepherds, with girls helping to make decisions	Very little; girls expected home for dinner and hours depending on levels. Locked doors to keep people out rather than - girls in	Shepherds considered models for girls, part of their desired peer group. Very relaxed home-like life; some stereotypes by girls of staff, little observable other direction	Very little planning. Only dinner attendance required and this often neglected. Most jobs for housekeeping voluntary and paid except for kitchen cleanup

Thus before the change, Roseland had been more or less a total institution, in that all facets of life -- sleep, play, and work -- were carried out there and the bureaucracy took the responsibility for planning life for the girls en masse. Goffman says: "The handling of many human needs by the bureaucratic organization of whole blocked of people ... can be taken as a key fact of total institutions."[11] He describes the characteristics of such institutions as:

1) surveillance; a seeing to it that everyone does what he has been clearly told is required of him. This goes along with the need for a small supervisory staff in comparison with the number of "inmates."

2) a basic split between inmates and staff, where each grouping tends to conceive of members of the other in terms of narrow hostile stereotypes.

3) the restriction of social mobility.

4) the institution "plans" the entire inmate day.

There is an obvious difference with this in comparison with the structure of the agency after the dismantling of the bureaucracy. Girls are allowed to come and go almost as they please, within the light restrictions of the level system. Activities for the day are not planned, except for an occasional special function in which the girls share planning, such as the crafts fair held at Roseland recently. While the girls are still expected to be on hand for the evening meal, and to sleep there, school has been removed from the home environment (corresponding to Goffman's 'work time'), and play is at the discretion of the girls with agreement from shepherds.

---

11. Goffman, Erving, "The Characteristics of Total Institutions," in Etzioni, A., ed., COMPLEX ORGANIZATIONS, (New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc., 1965), pp. 312-314 -- p. 314.

As to the four characteristics of total institutions Goffman lists:

1) rules are not uniform and are particularistic. Whereas shepherds have responsibility for the girls' behavior, neither they nor the girls are held tightly to this, so there is little surveillance in the sense Goffman uses. Moreover, supervisory staff has been greatly increased, from 2 to 6.

2) Staff and inmates do not seem to be isolated one from the other. Staff is always available to the girls; they live together. Girls see the staff as friends, sisters, more than as guards or social workers.

3) Though there is no real movement from one position to another, there is much interrelationship and integration of staff and clients. There is an "in-feeling" the Roseland girls have which includes the staff and the Director. "It's Roseland against the world." ... "It's a distorted family configuration. They do develop a feeling we're all on one side here."

4) As mentioned before, the girls have much freedom outside the Home. When they are there, it is much like any family at home, despite the number of people. They sit around, talk, watch television, or do other things which are unorganized and unplanned by the staff.

PROPENSITIES TO CHARISMA

Every organization, in its quest for survival in a changing
environment, requires adaptations. Yet the change described above
is revolutionary rather than adaptive. Rather than an extension of
structure and program in a manner simply compatible with maintenance
needs, there is in Roseland a complete change in clientele choice,
methods of treatment, and general outlook; in combination with a
complete changeover in staff and type of staff, a dismantling of
the bureaucracy itself, and a commitment to a homelike atmosphere
completely uncharacteristic of what had been almost a total
institution.

When thinking of the change in the bureaucracy, consider that
this particular one survived almost unchanged for more than 50 years.
In speaking of the permanent nature of the bureaucracy, Eisenstadt
says

> "Once it is fully established, bureaucracy is among
> the social structures which are hardest to destroy
> ... And when the bureaucratization of administra-
> tion has been completely carried through, a form of
> power is established that is practically unshatterable."[12]

Yet in Roseland a bureaucracy of 50 years' standing was shattered
with, as it were, almost an invisible blow, within the space of a
few months. Even now much of the community is unaware of the change
in program. When asked how the community views the program now, the
Director says "They don't know much about it, not the change. We've
deliberately kept it low profile because it's controversial." In
another conversation we talked about her use of money in the agency
to hire more shepherds than were authorized. I asked if anyone
objected, and she replied "No, and that's when United Fund could

---

12. Eisenstadt, S. N., SELECTED WRITINGS, OP. CIT., p. 75.

have, should have. But they don't know." I said "They don't
really know what's going on here, do they? Does anyone?" Her reply
was "No, they don't know." Thus not only the community but a major
source of funds is really unaware of what has happened to the
organization.

What was the source of the power to institute such a change,
and how was it accomplished so as to cause almost no reverberations?
In speaking of structural change, Parsons says that it occurs when
exogenous and endogenous stresses occur simultaneously, the external
changes occurring in other social systems and the internal strains
having to do with values which can't be supplied within the present
structure. He says

> 'This is the situation to which Max Weber's
> category of charismatic innovation applies...
> It must concern alterations in the definition
> of /meaning/ of the character of the society
> itself."[13]

Eisenstadt elaborates on this theme of institution building.
He says that in fact there must be three conditions for social
change. The first is a change within the culture or concepts of
society; the second has to do with the social system or organization
itself; and the third is a person with charismatic qualities.

> "Perhaps the most important aspect of this
> analysis is that tensions or conflicts are
> rooted not only in the clashes of different
> interests in a society but in the differential
> distribution of the charismatic in the symbolic
> and organizational aspects of every institutional
> system, and that it is the combination of this
> differential distribution...that may indeed con-
> stitute a major focus both of continuity and of
> potential changes in any social system."[14]

---

13. Parsons, Talcott, STRUCTURE OF SOCIAL ACTIONS, (York, Pa.;
    McGraw-Hill, 1937), p. 71.

14. Eisenstadt, SELECTED WRITINGS, OP. CIT., p. xliii.

If we follow these lines of reasoning, certainly in the context of such a clear and revolutionary change as occurred at Roseland we should be able to find evidences of these three conditions for change, and the propensities toward them. Then, in an albeit circular manner, we can infer from our observations that in Roseland there was indeed a charismatic leader in action.

A. Societal Propensities to Change

The most important factor in this area has been the changing morality regarding sex and illegitimacy in our society. No longer are such heavy sanctions imposed on a girl involved in an unwed pregnancy that she must leave her home, be hidden, and dispose of the baby at its birth. Indeed, increasingly the course seen as proper in such cases is for the girl to remain in her home and keep the baby, with the willing support of her parents. Thus the traditional maternity home finds itself out of step with the times, and its lowered occupancy means dwindling funds.

Another factor in the environment having consequences for the agency is the spiral of inflation in the general economy. This interrelates with organizational factors of finance again, aggravating both the maintenance of the organization in the area of "sunk costs," and the day-to-day increased boarding expenses of the girls.

Finally, there is, within the wider context of the changing morality issue (primarily accepted by the younger generation), a resistance to this change. The resistance has its locus in middle-class, middle-aged morality. In the community hosting Roseland the question of terminating the agency has simply not arisen; the

community, the agency's board, and the local funding institution
and the system of social agencies give "social blessings" to the
organization as a bulwark against changing morality and non-penitent
sex. Roseland's continued existence assures the community, because
it insures a "home" (institution) not only for those in need of such
seclusion but as a place for girls to "repent their sin." That
Roseland is not that kind of an institution now is not known, so
blessings for its survival continue.

B. Organizational Propensities to Change

    1. Obsolete Goals

    For any organization faced with the attenuation of its goals
survival becomes an issue. Indeed, where a goal becomes inoperative
in the context of agency survival, as in the case of Roseland,
another may be chosen for the sake of maintaining the organization.
Such goal succession has occurred many times, the most documented
of which is probably David Sill's treatment of the National Founda-
tion.[15] This is the case with Roseland, where obsolescing goals
created a financial bind. At Roseland in the past, the client
capacity of 22 has often been exceeded, but in recent years even
with the closings of its sister homes, and thus the funneling of more clien
to Roseland, full occupancy has been unusual. A goal succession
was necessary, but it is the quality of the change which concerns us.

    2. Dwindling Resources and New Clientele

    The abortive attempt to gain money through establishing a

---

15. Sills, David, The Volunteers, (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957).

viable school program for local pregnant girls was a mixed blessing;
in itself it did not serve the financial end hoped for but created
more difficulty in that area; however, it did open up a new area of
state and court funding via client recruitment, which led to
acceptance of non-pregnant girls from court and state. To reiterate
the organizational problems caused by the day school program:

1) the development of a clientele heterogeneous in financial,
   economic, and "moral" spheres

2) the resident/non-resident problem, with its ensuing
   clashes over work

3) the local/non-local problem, usually a racial one

4) problems of staffing

Though the school program ended after two years, recruitment
of clients from it meant that its problems had become established
in the organization. And with the opening up of a new source of
clients the Home became an institution for the care of girls who had
been publicly labelled delinquent or predelinquent. The organiza-
tional structure now had to deal with problems completely different
from those for which it was established.

C. Personal Propensities to Charisma

In speaking of the context in which charisma occurs, Parsons
says "The main context is that of a break in the traditional order"
in which two of the most prominent aspects are

1) an antitraditional or revolutionary character

2) a specific person or leader.[16]

Certainly a break in the traditional order had occurred at Roseland,

---

16. Parsons, OP. CIT., p. 663.

and it was revolutionary in nature. And the person who conceived, accomplished, and carried it through to success was Caroline, the Director.

Charisma appears to be an emergent quality rather than an ever-present aura surrounding an individual. Weber speaks of the contrast between the everyday routine of legal and traditional domination and the emergency character of charismatic leadership, saying that the latter comes to the fore only in situations where the others cannot meet crisis needs. "Charismatic leadership...is the product of crisis and enthusiasm."[17] And, though not explicitly stated, charisma can surely arise in the same person as has been a traditional or legal leader before the crisis occurred. "...charismatic leadership occurs most frequently in emergencies.../it/ approximates its 'pure type' only at the time of its origin, in contrast with the other two more enduring structures. The charismatic leader is always a radical who challenges established practice by going to 'the root of the matter.' He dominates men by virtue of qualities inaccessible to others and incompatible with the rules of thought and action that govern everyday life."[18]

Certainly it is true that in Caroline's case only in a particular situation and time was she seen as charismatic. We know that for 13 years previous to the program change she was Director. While this speaks for loyalty and respect for her as an executive and professional it does not indicate a particular charismatic

---

17. Bendix, OP. CIT., p. 301.

18. IBID., p. 300.

tenure of office. Moreover, in situations outside the Home she did not take the position of a leader. She was considered a good executive by personnel in other social agencies but was not particularly sought out. (This may have been in part, of course, because of the low profile of observability maintained at Roseland.) And in the collapse of the school day program she was not even consulted, though Roseland provided all services for that program while it was in operation.

Though partly dependent on the arising situation, two equally important factors are lodged in personal preconditions. The first is that the individual have latent propensities to charisma, and the second that his personal situation be such that he is free to answer the call to charisma. For beyond the qualities of leadership or entrepreneurship essential to a good executive or administrator, charisma demands commitment -- the belief of the leader in his mission and the commitment to it that makes it a way of life rather than a job circumscribed by time.

The Director's latent propensities to charisma were, of course, not visible until the situation arose to make them manifest. Their appearance at that time seems proof enough of their latent existence and we will deal with this later. As to the freedom for charisma, however, certain changes in her personal life did indeed free her so that when factors converged which opened the way for charismatic action, she could take the steps toward revolutionary leadership that were required of a charismatic.

What changes, then, occurred in her personal life to set up the preconditions for charisma? A major factor was the death of

her husband. She had no other family at home, and thus in effect
she was freed of all responsibilities or commitments outside Rose-
land. The Home became for her a 24-hour a day commitment. Many
times she spends the night at the house, if for example a shepherd
is sick or the girls are edgy. One evening she had decided to
stay, to

> "...just circulate around the house. They're really
> edgy, bitchy tonight. I came out and could feel it
> as soon as I came in. So I'll stay. I guess they're
> afraid of me. I don't know why, but they are. When
> I'm here they cool it."

She is on call all the time. Fights and quarrels are not uncommon
in the Home, and usually happen at night. When it is too much for
shepherds, they call Caroline, and she comes right out. In one
instance they had called at 4 a.m., and she came to cool it down.
She says

> "One person can't do it as a job. It's really a life.
> I work all the time, I'm always on call and I spend a
> lot of time here. But other people couldn't. If Ted
> was still alive I couldn't either. I've really con-
> sidered just moving in out here. That would take
> some of the pressure off the shepherds, and I'm
> dedicated enough."

Another factor was that, shortly after her husband's death,
she was operated on for a congenital hip deformity. While this
condition had not seemed to be much of a handicap before, the opera-
tion seemed to give an emotional life, a feeling of freedom. She
often comments on how good it feels to just sit and cross her legs,
be comfortable. Within a few months after the operation, friends
and peer social workers in the community noticed a change in her
personality, that she seemed more outgoing, more aggressive. In
fact, rumors were circulated by one of the powers in the mental

health community in the town that the anaesthetic used in the
operation had affected her mental health. To this charge she demanded,
and got, a hearing at United Community Services. She faced down her
accuser, demanding proof of his charges or a cessation of the rumors
he was fostering. He did indeed withdraw them, and it ended his
rumor-mongering. This kind of public confrontation, which was a
victory for her, seems an indication of her growing confidence.

Some factors or preconditions for charisma were simply person-
ality traits which added to the charisma later developed. One is
that she is English, with a pronounced English accent. She feels
that this accent has always been a positive factor in dealing with
people. Moreover, she is personally attractive, a neat small person,
somewhat chunky, with greying hair and bright blue eyes. She is
warm and friendly and has a keen sense of humor. And, being in
her middle fifties, her age also lends authority to her personality.

Two more preconditions to her emerging charisma are important.
The first is her position as Executive Director of the agency; the
second is her status as a professional person. There is, according
to Shils, a kind of aura of charisma that attaches to an officeholder.

> "It seems...that an attenuated, mediated, institu-
> tionalized charismatic propensity is present in
> the routine functioning of society. There is...
> a widespread disposition to attribute charismatic
> propensities to ordinary secular roles..."[19] and
> "...The charisma is felt to inher in the major
> order-effecting system of roles."[20]

---

19.   Shils, OP. CIT. p. 200.

20.   IBID., p. 204.

And such a position increases distance --

> "...charisma entails a certain remoteness, distinctiveness, or transcendency...the greater these differences are, the less likely to occur are such detractors...as competition and envy...the more remote the more easily disguised may be the feet of clay...the more ambiguous the nature the more readily may valued concerns be projected upon it."[21]

And speaking to the charisma attached by virtue of professionalism,

Etzioni, quoted in Turk, says

> "In such organizations [public service] the special knowledge or skill of those playing professional roles is linked to highly valued [by the relevant public] matters..."[22]

Turk goes on to say

> "That most professionals have charismatic attraction within the broader society....and that most professionals as a class are accorded charisma...is that the work of the professional is directed toward some highly valued concerns of his clients or of the entire society, such as those of social justice, divine will, salvation, liberty, life, health, and personal security; the professional is seen to advance, symbolize, or have control over such central concerns."[23]

Finally, the importance of the existence of a personal ideal on which to base charismatic actions cannot be underestimated. Caroline's career, and her choice of profession and position, have been predicated upon her belief that people in trouble, whether girls involved in unwanted pregnancies or in deeper troubles, need care and love more than they need to be institutionalized. It has been her goal to provide, as much as possible, a home-like and

---

21. Turk, Herman, "Task and Emotion, Value and Charisma, Theoretical Union at Several Levels," in Turk and Simpson, eds., INSTITUTIONS AND SOCIAL EXCHANGE, (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971) p. 129

22. IBID., p. 124

23. IBID., p. 123-124

nurturing environment for the girls in her care. The relaxation of regulations in favor of building relationships is essential to her believs. And these ideals are indeed centrally attached to facets of man's existence; they deal not only with care for the unfortunate but with nurturing and the establishment of family life, both of which are essential to the development of the human society.

CHART III   PROPENSITIES TO CHARISMA AT ROSELAND

I.   Societal
   1.   Change in morality regarding illegitimacy and sex, leading to
   2.   Change in needs for maternity homes
   3.   Spiral of Inflation in the Economy
      a.   maintenance of sunk cost factors
      b.   increased living (and Boarding) expenses

II. Organizational
   1.   Obsolete goals and the problem of goal succession within a
      near context to that of a maternity home
   2.   Dwindling resources
      a.   lack of clientele and sufficient income due to societal
       changes
      b.   necessity of "absorbing" costs of local girls solicited
       as clients from the day program, where girls were
       generally from low income families
   3.   New "Type" of Clientele
      a.   heterogeneous in financial, economic, and "moral" spheres
      b.   resident/non-resident
      c.   local/non-local girls, usually a racial problem
      d.   problems of staffing

III. Personal
   1.   Latent propensities
      a.   personality traits
      b.   position as Executive Director of Agency
      c.   position as professional
      d.   the personal ideal or dream
   2.   Changes in personal life: time for commitment
      a.   death of husband
      b.   operation
      c.   no other family commitments
      d.   personal needs

Thus, in the same time span as severe problems shook the Home,

the Director herself was undergoing traumatic but, in a sense,

liberating experiences. Her husband's death and her lack of family

gave her time for total commitment; Roseland filled her personal needs:

> "Perhaps I've built the program _for_ my dedication, perhaps
> it wouldn't have turned out this way but that I needed it
> for my own purposes."

And her operation provided new freedom both emotionally and physically. Personal traits and positional ones added preconditions, and her personal ideal laid the groundwork upon which the new program was built.

DEVELOPING THE POTENTIAL

A.   The Qualities of Charisma

There is, according to Eisenstadt, a kind of persistent
wish for, or miasma of felt need for, a social order, both in
society and in what seems to be the egotistical wishes of the
charismatic -- "a quest for and conception of the symbolic
order, of the "good society," and of the quest for participation
in such an order."[24]   Or, as Shils says, "Men need an order
within which they can locate themselves, an order providing
coherence, continuity, and justice.[25]   It is this need that in-
spires change, and lays the groundwork for the two basic aspects
of the charismatic situation: the development of the charis-
matic personality itself and the drawing together of a group of
people who believe in and are faithful to the leader and his
mission.

What are the characteristics of a charismatic leader?
Weber, Eisenstadt, and Shils have laid out the broad picture.
They see him as at least extraordinary, having a mystical quality
which is a part of ideals central to man's existence, a leader
in crises, a revolutionary, and instrumental in innovation in
social institutions. To this we have added the necessary
quality of commitment: belief of the leader in himself and his
mission. The other side of such leadership is the power to attract
and hold followers in the accomplishment of his mission.

---

24. Eisenstadt, op. cit.
25. Shils, op. cit., p. 203.

But let us for a moment lay aside these transcendental qualities and deal with some of the more mundane qualities of leadership. There is a conceptual link between charisma and entrepreneurship: charisma _is_ entrepreneurship with magic added. In describing a moral entrepreneur, for example, Becker says "The existing rules do not satisfy him because there is some evil which profoundly disturbs him."[26] This inspires him to become a rule creator and to establish, at the same time, the appropriate machinery with which to enforce his new rules. Eisenstadt, speaking again of the charismatic, says that he has "...the capacity to create and crystallize...broader symbolic orientations and norms, to articulate various goals, to establish organizational frameworks, and to mobilize the resources necessary for all these purposes."[27]

McClelland also adds to the profile of the entrepreneur. He itemizes the characteristics of entrepreneurship as

 I. Entrepreneurial Role Behavior

   a. moderate risk-taking as a factor of skill --
      decisiveness

   b. energetic and/or novel activity

   c. individual responsibility-taking

   d. knowledge of results of decisions and anticipation
      of future needs

   e. organizational skills

 II. An interest in entrepreneurial occupations as a
     function of prestige and riskiness(28)

---

26. Becker, Howard s., _Outsiders_, (New York: Free Press, 1963),
    p. 147.
27. Eisenstadt, _Selected Writings_, _op. cit._, p. xxxix.
28. McClelland, _op. cit._

One final quality of entrepreneurial role behavior would seem to be the ability and willingness to manipulate, to influence, and to utilize selective materials in the pursuit of a goal.

There appear to be three major phases in the development of an individual's charisma leading to the establishment of a new social order. The first is the leader's recognition himself of his mission and his unique importance to it -- his "conversion," if you will, in belief in himself. The second is the development of a following who also believe in his mission -- his disciples and converts -- and who are able to work with him to fulfill that mission. And finally, there is the development of the ideal, or mission, until it becomes a reality. Let us consider each of these phases in turn.

B. Belief in Self and Mission

The qualities of a good executive or a successful person in any field are those cited by McClelland in his profile of the entrepreneur. Certainly self-confidence and belief in one's own capabilities are essential to any career. But at what point do these qualities attain a mystical penumbra, and become charismatic? We believe there is a qualitative difference between being confident in one's role and being aware that no one else could put into operation a particular ideal. It is at this point, the realization of a personal mission, that self-confidence becomes charismatic.

During the time of the program's development, Caroline's self-realization of mission was not at first evident, though she worked long hours, took no vacations, etc. It seemed to

be done in the spirit of getting necessary work accomplished --
obtaining new sources of funding. On the several occasions we
talked, she spoke of her weariness, of the long hours she
worked, in being executive, social worker, trainer for the new
staff, and so on. I asked why she didn't slow down, take time
off, put in more reasonable hours, and she replied, "There's no
one else to do this. I have to pull it all together myself,
because no one else has the whole concept of what needs to be
done. There is no time; it all has to be done at once."

The program at Roseland is uniquely Caroline's. Other
maternity homes have changed their goals; there are other
institutional or small-group homes for predelinquent girls.
Yet this combination of change of goals and type of program is
not evident elsewhere; if it does exist it has arisen separately,
the outgrowth of another's ideals. There is little literature
available which mentions it. Certainly there was no pattern by
which Caroline worked. Though bits and pieces exist elsewhere,
as in the theories of behavior modification, the idea of "open
institutions," live-in houseparents, and so forth, the comina-
tion at Roseland is unique.

Now that the plan is in operation, she speaks very openly
of her capabilities and her mission. Of her relationship to
the community and the Board she says "I'm a manipulator, politician,
occasional diplomat, and salesman to the Board and the community
at large." Concerning the new program, "The personality cult
helped bring it about..."im the only one who can do it my way,
and that's what they [the Board] want." Of getting money for
extra shepherds she says she "...razzle-dazzled the Board. They

kind of know, but it wasn't authorized. I just said that the money was there, so why not use it. Then I found the money." Speaking of the fact that the whole structure is built on her personality and capabilities, she says, "...We've got a structure, it's a viable structure...But it's got such a narrow base...." (herself).

Speaking of her relationship with the staff, she says

"I am fearless leader, saint, silver fox (they think I'm pretty foxy)...teacher, counselor, mother."

The work is terribly wearing on the shepherds, and she says

"It"s me that's keeping them here now. I coddle them and help them -- Ma --." "They stay because of me, partly, if I didn't give them a lot of support -- I get to be mother to the shepherds too."

Her attitude toward the one shepherd who is marginal, not fitting quite well with the others, is particularly informative of her relation with the rest.

"She's the one I've never been able to draw out -- she doesn't want me to....Of all the girls she's the only one who has her own apartment. And she doesn't ask for my advice -- that is, she asks me for it up to a point and no farther. It's almost like she dares me to go into her business...I've asked her, told her that I didn't want to pry into her affairs, but she keeps going right to that point, then if I step over she's mad. I've told her, when she brings me personal problems, that I don't want to get into that."

I said, "And yet that's exactly what you do with the others."

"I know it, but it's different with C. She's got something about authority figures -- I don't think she's got herself together there yet...."

The girl's style of dress also bothered Caroline.

"I think it's got something to do with her reaction to authority, but I just wish that she wouldn't wear those tight sweaters, and that she'd do something with that hair."

I said "And if it were one of the other girls, you could

tell them and it would be all right."

"Right. I can talk with them, they know how I mean it. But not with C. She wouldn't take it right."

I said "It looks to me like...you have to be boss with C -- If you were boss, you could tell her because she was your staff that her dress was inappropriate. But you can't be boss with her because you're not boss with the others, you're friend -- boss too, but mostly friend. And you can't be friends with C, and you can't go back to being boss with her because of the others, you're friends to them."

"But I have authority with them too."

"Yes, but it's a different kind. It's based on respect, mutual liking, that kind of thing. And you don't have it with C."

"Well, I like this kind of authority much better."

To the girls she is mother figure as well as authority. They call her Ma, hug and kiss her, ask her for advice on problems, clothes, etc. She says "To the kids, I'm Ma Caroline. I'm the stability, the center, Ma will come through in big trouble." When there is trouble at Roseland, girls fighting, etc., she comes out. "I came out and could feel it as soon as I came in [the girls being edgy] so I'll stay. I guess they're afraid of me. I don't know why but they are. I told Y that she just hadn't better threaten a shepherd again or else and she calmed right down. I don't know or else what, but it seems to work."

The following interchange with a girl is indicative of the warm relationship she has established with them. Caroline and she had been talking about a problem at school, and the girl had been swearing every other word.

"Lynn seems to be getting more and more restless by the minute, and every other word is swearing.

> Suddenly Caroline lets go with a fine string of cuss
> words. Lynn looks appalled. "Ma!"
>
> Caroline - "Ma? How come you all can swear, and when
> I do all you can say is Ma!"
>
> Lynn smiles a little sheepishly. "It's just like
> with my mother. All of a sudden she'll start swear-
> ing and we go 'Mother!'"

An interesting feature of Caroline's charisma, however, is that
she expresses many self-doubts, particularly when talking about the
viability of the program into which she has put so much effort. This
self-doubt in the midst of affirmation of her mission is a phenomenon
not mentioned in the literature, and I wonder if it is a universal
feature of the charismatic or if it is peculiar to this one. One
evening she called me in to listen to her problems. She said:

> "I'm just beginning to question, is it a really viable
> program, is it worth what we put those kids [shepherds]
> through? ... Maybe the whole thing is fallacious. What's
> the answer? I have strong convictions, I have a lot of
> will, if anyone can make it work I can, but am I wrong?
> What should we be doing for these kids?"
>
> ...
> "There's so little control. I don't have control of
> them. There's a bunch of them out now, some smoking
> dope, some screwing up a storm. What can I do? Maybe
> they really need more control. Some people do. But
> I don't belive in locking kids up. I have some really
> strong convictions about locking kids up. And there's
> so little gain to be seen. There's some -- some girls
> really show improvement.... And for a lot of them
> will the change stick?
>
> ...
> "And the price the shepherds pay ... how can they do it:
> Why do they stay? Now me, I can take it. I've seen
> enough in my life, had enough happen to me, so that
> I'm tough. These kids can't defeat me. But what will
> it do to the shepherds?..."
>
> I said, "I guess you just have to make a choice, whether
> you want it open or controlled."
>
> "I want it open, but is that what the kids need? Some
> need structure, we've sent some to places where there

is more structure, but do they need it here too?
Do we really have any control here at all? I
want it to be like a home, a home-like place as
much as possible, but maybe it's supposed to be
an institution, maybe that's what the kids need."
        ...
"But what I really want to know, is this whole thing
workable? There's nothing written on this type of
thing. There's a young man in Philadelphia who's
done research on it, not for me but for his own
purposes. And he found nothing about this kind
of set-up.... There's no research, no write-
ups, we just have to guess at what's right. Is
this whole thing invalid? What is the answer?"

It would seem that, once the charismatic situation has pro-
duced a social change in the institution, the major concern is
how to routinize it into the organizational structure. Perhaps
this problem, rather than self-doubt, is the real issue about which
Caroline is disturbed. We will speak of routinization later.

C.   The Development of a Following

One cannot be a leader without a following, or social organization,
and the interesting thing in the situation of Roseland is the means
by which the Director accumulated her following. Perhaps in the
universe of charismatic leaders followings are "called" to the leader
in the sense of conversion, but in this instance the followers,
the groups that made up the cohorts of the agency, were nearly all
hand-selected by the Director.

   1.   The Board

The selection of the Board took place over all the years of
her tenure. As one member resigned, another was chosen by her re-
commendation and approval of others on the Board. In this way a
Board sympathetic to her ideals and goals, and supportive of her as

their executive, was developed. James Senor has studied the power positions of executives and Boards in social agencies, and infers that, far from the partnership relationship in which most students of agencies believe exist, maneuvering and manipulation bring either one or the other into the power position. Propositions that permit the executive to maximize his position depend on the agency structure and the characteristics of the Board itself.

1) The more "total" the institution the more powerful the executive;

2) Selective information and little contact of the Board with the ongoing activity of the agency increase the executive's power;

3) Support of the executive by the staff increases his power;

4) The more technical the operation the more power the executive has.

As to the characteristics of the Board, the more latent conflict among the Board members the more power has the executive, and the more the interests of Board members are toward the community rather than toward the agency the more power has the Executive.[29]

In the case of Roseland, agency structure acted to increase her power, and the choices she made to fill the Board, even though they remained unified among themselves and vitally interested in the agency, acted to give support to that power. At the beginning of the change in program, she and I had discussed her use of selective information in gaining their support. By this and by her personal power of persuasion they were apparently brought to full awareness and support of her program. I asked:

29. Senor, James M., "Another Look at the Executive Board Relationship," in Zald, Mayer, ed., SOCIAL WELFARE INSTITUTIONS, (New York: Wiley and Sons, 1965), p. 420.

"Do you think the Board is completely aware of how the agency is changed around?"

She answered, "The Board is very aware -- the only way you can do it is to have an extremely aware Board."

I said, "It seemed to me, from things I have heard and seen, that maybe the Board still sees the home as a maternity home. Am I mistaken?"

Caroline - "Yes, completely mistaken. This is, however, an executive dominated agency. That's a weakness."

Me - "A weakness?"

Caroline - "Not that it's executive dominated, the personality cult thing -- the Board is sold on me and that could be dangerous (for the viability of the pro-gram)."

That she can get them to do what she wants is evident from the total

Board support she got when calling for the confrontation with her

accuser (previously referred to), their support in the fields of

fund-raising and the soon-to-be-constructed addition to the Home,

and her references to "razzle-dazzling" them to get the new shepherds

she wanted.

2. The Clients

Selection of the clients admitted to Roseland is done solely on

Caroline's decision. Courts and county departments of social welfare

petition the Home to take the girl; Caroline decides on the basis

of the presented record and meeting the girl. Her general rules

are that they be aged 14 to 17 (though some 13 year olds are admitted)

and that they be in contact with reality; i.e., not needing the more

concentrated services of a mental health clinic. There are exceptions

to this too; there is in residence one girl who occasionally

hallucinates, another who seems retarded, and one who has been deeply

involved in drugs. Thus admission of a selected group is totally
in the hands of the Director.

Removal from Roseland of the girls is a little more complicated.
They are committed by the courts for what might be called indeter-
minate sentences. In the normal course of events there are two
ways for release. The first is that when they reach age 18 they are
no longer under the supervision of court or state. The second is
that "progress reports" are made to probation officers and if the
progress is sufficient a girl may be released at any time. I asked
Caroline if the girls ever made or helped make the decision to
leave Roseland. She replied that they did, that before the hearing
they would all talk over the advances the girl had made, and that
sometimes the girls would help to write the report. Then they
would make the presentation to the judge, and usually he went
along with it, though they couldn't be sure he would.

If a girl wished to stay beyond the time of her release, this
also would be allowed, though so far only one has wanted to. Caroline
said:

> "I would never just turn one out. They could stay.
> Most would leave, try it out, then come back later.
> But you know, there's no viable home for these kids,
> not really. They just about have to develop some
> kind of independent living when they leave here."

The other way girls leave the home is before the time of court
release, on the basis that Roseland can't "contain" them. This
kind of release has two forms: one by consultation among all the
members of the staff; the second by unilateral decision by Caroline.
Generally the girl who can't be "contained" is one who runs away

repeatedly, is very aggressive both verbally and physically against

the other girls and the shepherds, or is blatantly promiscuous. (The

process of such removal is reported in earlier pages.) Though general-

ly such removal may be made by staff decision, in some instances

Caroline acts immediately, as in the case of C. She says:

> "I'm usually pretty deliberate in what I do, I prefer
> to wait and see before acting, but not with her. I
> acted right away, jumped right in. ... She's not
> really retarded, just kind of borderline, and she's
> been associating with pimps and prostitutes -- she
> had one boyfriend, now there's another and he
> pimps for her. What's worse is that he's trying
> to sign up some of our girls.... Anyway, I stopped
> that immediately. Grounded her, and the DSS
> worker will be here at 9:30 tomorrow morning. I
> couldn't be deliberate there -- had to act immediately,
> stop it before it happened. All we need is two or
> three girls prostituting here. That would do it
> in the community. I can take the drugs, and the
> occasional screwing, but not that. The agency
> couldn't make it with that kind of rep."

Thus her hand-selected clients make up one cohort of her follow-

ing. Though not all see her as mother-figure, and give to her the

awe and respect which Weber sees as necessary in the followers of the

charismatic leader, most do. In one house meeting, for example, the

girls were complaining that the shepherds never listened to them, that

nobody cared about them, and that all the shepherds were no good.

One of them spoke up, saying that one shepherd was good, and then,

practically by acclamation, they said "We love you, too, Ma, we all

love you."

One shepherd describes how the girls feel about Caroline:

> "Like the thing last night. (A fight.) If she'd been
> in town last night we'd have called her, and she'd have
> come right out and told this one to get to bed, and that
> one, and they'd have done it and the thing would have
> been over. She's got control. There's something about
> her -- they know she's boss. It's not like that with

us, it takes us longer to get control. It's more than
that she's just an authority, but that's part of it."

I said "Do you think the girls look upon her as a
mother or as an agency director, or what?"

"They look on her as a mother, not a director. Some
of them need that more than others do, and to some
she's not so much a mother. But she's not just an
agency director, either. She's got control, but she's
got something else too. She's always available, any-
one can go to her and she'll listen."

And one of the girls defends her against a new girl. There has been

a room search for a knife, and in the process some marijuana was

found. New girl:

"Sometimes she's really great, and sometimes she can
be a real bitch."

This brought D. up. "Maybe you don't know it, but
it takes someone like her to run a place like this.
If we didn't have Ma we'd have some real bitch
bitching at us all the time. No one could do what
Ma does." She spoke in a quite angry tone. M. on
the couch was also a little angry, and agreed with
D., defending Caroline.

Another example of the relationship between Caroline and the girls

follows:

Caroline came out and stood in the hall with me and
the others. T. asked what she was chewing, and when
she wouldn't tell tried to pry her mouth open.
T- "If you were my mother --" She hits her palm with
her fist, then put her arm around Caroline's shoulder
and Caroline put her arm around T.'s waist. "I guess
you are my ma -- I guess you're all our ma's, right?"

Caroline- "Right, I am."

3. The Staff

The last cohort of Caroline's following is the staff, and particu-

larly the shepherds. While the cook, secretary, and half-time house-

keeper are unanimous in their respect for Caroline and her program,

it is the shepherds that make up the inside circle, as it were, of
Caroline's disciples. Bendix, quoting Weber, says "This organization
[a charismatic one] is composed of disciples, chosen for their qualifi-
cations, who constitute a charismatic aristocracy.... The disciples
are bound together by the charismatic leader and his mission."[30] As
stated before, all the shepherds are hand-picked. Only one was chosen
who was not recommended by at least one of the incumbent shepherds,
and she was selected on the basis of a recommendation of a mutual
acquaintance of Caroline's. (She has been the one most marginal,
also.) Of the shepherds Caroline says:

> "They are a team -- they are one body with six heads.
> We have no conflict among them -- there is no room
> for conflict.... The shepherds are unique, special
> people. They have to have a real feeling for people
> -- and intestinal fortitude. They're intelligent,
> receptive, willing to learn -- they complement each
> other. They've created their own peer group. They
> depend on each other. And they have another essential
> -- good humor."

I mentioned that Caroline was really fortunate to have found such a
cohesive group, and asked if she'd made any mistakes in her selections.

> "I did, two. One stayed longer than she should have,
> the other I dropped right away. There's just no
> room here for people who don't fit."

Another problem in her selection was C., the marginal shepherd. She
spoke very highly of her abilities, particularly in working on a one
to one basis with the girls. But of all the shepherds she was never
sure that C.:

> "... could fit in here at all. I've really had my
> doubts about her because she doesn't come out of
> herself, and we really need to be all together
> here...."

---

30. Bendix, OP.CIT., p. 302.

Both the shepherd and Caroline describe her as a "private person --
one who needs to be away, by herself." Caroline says:

> "C. has been the least satisfactory, ... she's the
> one I've never been able to draw out...."

Without exception the shepherds see Caroline as an exceptional
person, and the program as the best possible for troubled girls.
One says about the situation:

> "This is the best handled agency, administratively,
> that I know about. Caroline really knows her stuff,
> the staff never has to worry about things.... [of the
> Board] Caroline has them in her hand... She takes
> care of us, too. She's always right behind us, 24
> hours a day, 7 days a week. She's supportive but
> not wishy-washy, she's firm and not afraid to face
> you down when she thinks your wrong. But she doesn't
> decide on things alone, either, when she wants to do
> something she has a staff meeting and if we don't
> agree she lets it go. That's the way it should be
> because we have to live with it, and she knows it.
> She's always with us. And she always has time for
> the kids, too, even if it's only five minutes. Her
> door is never closed. She tunes in with the kids.
> She's involved in everything and involves us ...
> I'm learning as much here as in any grad school."

Another statement made by all was that "if it weren't for Caroline,
I wouldn't have stayed this long," or "wouldn't be here now," or
"I couldn't do it without Caroline."

It should be clearly pointed out that, even as Christ chose
His disciples, Caroline hired people for her staff who had special
occupational histories and weaknesses. All the shepherds are newly
out of an undergraduate school. This means that they have had no
extensive professional education, even though two do have degrees
in a social science; and they have had no professional training
or experience in other employment or agencies. Four of the six
were not even involved in the social agency field -- a couple were

in education, one was an accountant, and another was a student of English literature. They were, in effect, clean and new slates upon which to inscribe the charismatic idealism.

Moreover, the shepherds seem to have been hired at particularly vulnerable times in their lives. Among the first set of shepherds, before the participant observation study took place, were two young women who had recently been divorced. Another, in the later cohort, had had a shattering family experience in which a sister had committed suicide. The other shepherds were also at turning points in their lives; as recent graduates they were faced with the necessity of "being on their own" both in terms of money-making and physically leaving the homes of their parents. Whereas it seems that the shepherds maintain good relationships with their families, they are nonetheless away from that source of wisdom and direction, and so an adult such as Caroline is a valuable resource to have available to them.

The living- in arrangement that the shepherds have is also typical of the communal arrangement of the charismatic situation. Eisenstadt, explicating Weber, says "The corporate group which is subject to charismatic authority is based on an emotional-form of communal relationship. The administrative staff of a charismatic leader does not consist of 'officials;' at least its members are not technically trained."[31] The non-technical training of the shepherds has been dealt with before, but the communal nature of the Home should be emphasized. The shepherds not only have dormitories for use or days

---

31. Eisenstadt, SELECTED WRITINGS, OP. CIT., p. 50.

they must sleep at the Home, they are expected to live at the Home.
Board and room are considered part of their pay. When a shepherd is
off-duty and doesn't want to stay at the Home, or wants some time in
a more normal atmosphere, she is encouraged to spend the time at
Caroline's home, thus keeping even relaxation activities as a part
of the communal thing. And at present new construction is being
planned which will give the shepherds a much nicer living space -- at
present they have the third floor of the Home -- and will provide
rooms for the male shepherds also. It will also have separate kitchen
facilities from those of the girls (clients).

The conduct of affairs at the home in general is also indicative
of the charismatic situation at Roseland. Eisenstadt says, quoting
Weber, "There is no hierarchy; the leader merely intervenes in general
or in individual cases when he considers the members of his staff,
inadequate to a task with which they have been instructed...."[32]
The whole atmosphere of the staff meeting is one in which a persuasive
kind of instruction is used. In one instance, race relations was
under discussion. Caroline began the talk, giving her views and ask-
ing for their opinions, but over the whole time the discussion just
seemed molded to produce the conclusions she wanted. She says:

> "We've got to check our unconscious feelings that have
> been taken in, almost by osmosis, from our society.
> We reject the concept of racism consciously, but this
> is very different from rejecting it emotionally, be-
> cause we grew up with it. The sermon is now complete.
> What's your reactions?"

Reactions were given, and there was then another period when she put
forth her own feelings. Finally most of the group was subdued, in

---

32. IBID.

the sense that they were no longer talking, heads were bowed, it
was obvious they agreed with her and would try harder. Thus instruc-
tion was given in the form of discussion. It is a question whether
she persuaded the shepherds at that time or whether they simply
agreed with her, since she had chosen them in the first place. But
whatever the case, she had seen a problem, intervened, and brought
them to a kind of public-peer declaration of intent to follow her
wishes.

Other incidences abound in which she intervenes either in action
or in discussion when the occasion arises that the shepherds need
help. They recognize she is the one who can quell disturbances, as
is evidenced by their grateful knowledge that she is on call for
them 24 hours a day. Her action in removing girls from the Home, or
decisions whether or not to notify the police abour runaways, are
other examples. When a shepherd is upset because of the way her re-
lationships are evolving with a girl, Caroline is there to straighten
her out, cool her down and get her back on the right track.

> S- "I'm about ready to explode!"
>
> Caroline- "Want to talk?"
>
> S- "I just spent a half hour on the phone. A. wanted
> to go home, but Mrs. S. said she didn't want her, so
> there's trouble being stirred up again.
> ...
>
> Caroline- "You're getting hung up on what B. said
> again, and you shouldn't because B. has nothing to
> do with the Home. S., next time she calls, just
> turn her over to me. ...Don't get defensive, S."

The feelings of the staff toward Caroline are typical of the
respect and honor given the charismatic leader. Parsons says that:

> "...charisma implies a specific attitude of respect,
> and that this respect is like that owed a recognized
> duty. It is clearly the ritual attitude of Durkheim:
> Charismatic authority is a phase of moral authority."[33]

Thus within the confines of the organization itself has been developed a community bound round by the charisma of its leader. Within this context, and the wider contexts of organizational need and societal change, Caroline has begun and established a mutation in the social structure of an organization -- the process of institution-building, lit by the light of charisma, has been accomplished.

> "The development of such 'charismatic' personalities
> ... constitute perhaps the closest social analogy to
> 'mutation', and the degree of their ability to forge
> out a viable symbolic and institutional order may be
> an important factor in the process of survival, or
> selection of different ... cultural creations ...
> a crucial aspect of the charismatic personality ...
> is not only the possession of some extraordinarly
> exhilarating qualities, but also the ability, through
> these qualities, to reorder and reorganize both the
> symbolic cognitive order which is potentially inherent
> in such orientations and goals and the institutional
> order in which these orientations become embedded...."[34]

D. The Ideal Realized: Roseland as a Home

What, then, is this mutation by which Roseland has progressed toward survival? It has three major aspects: the dismantling of the bureaucracy; the enactment of a new type of program; and the deliberate attempt to make of Roseland, rather than the custodial-type institution normally established for delinquent or pre-delinquent girls, a home.

We have already touched on both the dismantling of the bureaucracy and the new program. There is no real way to separate these

---

33. Parsons, OP. CIT., p. 662.

34. Eisenstadt, SELECTED WRITINGS, OP. CIT., p. xi.

two from the concept of making Roseland a home. In Caroline's mind the previous stop-gap mental health program (out-dated even before the program change) and the bureaucratic procedures of the social agency itself were inimical to her concept of "Home." (Even the "allowing to resign" of an old and dear friend who did not fit the new concept was permimissible. Caroline tried to inform her as to the new context in which she should work, but she was unable to change.) "In contrast to any kind of bureaucratic organization of offices, the charismatic structure knows nothing of form or of an ordered procedure. Charisma knows only inner determination and inner restraint."[35] And, "Charismatic authority is thus specifically outside the realm of everyday routine and the profane sphere. In this respect it is sharply opposed both to rational, and particularly bureaucratic, authority ... Within the sphere of its claims, charismatic authority repudiates the past, and in this sense is a specifically revolutionary force."[36] Or, as Caroline puts it, "Bureaucracies don't help people. People help people."

The effort toward, or tendency to, a home-like atmosphere is undeniable. In the physical setting itself this is apparent. Though somewhat shabby at the first of my observations, new carpeting, wall treatment, and furniture have made of the Home a very pleasant home. There are no real regulations by which the girls must abide; they are free to spend time in the living room, watching television. snacking, talking, or doing what they wish, or they may go to their

---

35. Eisenstadt, OP.CIT., p. 20.

36. IBID., p. 51.

bedrooms for more privacy. What housekeeping chores they must do, aside from the ever-present kitchen clean-up chores, seem to be paid jobs. Visitors are welcome, and can go either to the small visitor's lounge, which is more a private situation, or sit in the living room with the rest of the "family." Unconcerned necking in either place is not frowned upon.

The social relationships, though somewhat constrained by the fact that Roseland _is_ an institution set up for a particular purpose, are quite relaxed. Staff and girls sit together in the living room, talk together, and show affection toward one another. The doors of the two offices are always open except if there is a private conference going on, and the girls may congregate in either Caroline's or the shepherds' offices, sprawling around the way any teenagers do in their own homes. About the only real rituals or regulations seem to be that on Wednesday nights the girls bring down their laundry, and the staff eats at one table while the girls share others. Sometimes the girls ask for permission to leave their tables when they have finished eating: this was a ritual only two years ago, but appears to be falling into disuse. Outside activities such as bowling or movies are arranged spontaneously, usually by the girls depending on how much money they have or exists in a "recreation fund."

This is, of course, still an institution for the care of girls who have been publicly labeled and stigmatized. Therefore, the "emotional discharge level" is higher than one would find in a home. Nobody seems to walk, they run or bound or rush. Talk is loud. Arguments are frequent, but rarely (considering the girls) break

into violence. One girl did in fact attack another in the period
of my observation, and she was immediately removed from the Home.
There was also a hair-pulling and scratching fight between two
residents, but this dissipated under peer pressure, and no official
action was taken. Most damage seems to be done to things (such as
when a girl's picture of her father was destroyed and baby clothes
torn), or to be self-inflicted. One suicide attempt was foiled and
the girl removed from the Home; another girl made knife slashes up
and down her arm, leaving scars but doing no permanent damage; and
a third, throwing herself around in kind of a frenzy, put her arm
through a window. There is a distinct racial tone to many of the
quarrels, of the 20 or so girls in residence about a third are black.
But still the doors remain open and the program of goofs and levels
persists, so the ideal of an open institution continues.

The girls, in general, thought Roseland was all right. Only
a few said that it felt like a home, that they liked being there.
But there was a feeling among them that it was better than most places
they would be in -- Roseland is known to be the alternative to being
placed in a Juvenile Home or the State Training School. There are
two girls assigned here permanently -- this is their home, and they
refer to it as such and to Caroline as Ma. Many girls who have
left remain in contact with the Home, calling, coming to spend week-
ends, and so on. As a shepherd says, "If you asked most of them,
they'd say the home is shitty and they couldn't wait to get out.
But most of them know it's better than any other place they could
be put, I think."

In conversation, the Home was described like this:

"... things were just kind of building up at home, so I asked my probation officer to find a place for me and she found this one. And I'm glad to be here."

Me- "Were you in any other home before? I mean, how does this place compare?"

L- "I was at Juvie before, and this is heaven compared to that."

Z- "Yeah, the Juvies -- any juvies -- are awful. Everything's locked up, and you always have to have someone with you, no matter where you go, to the bathroom, to bed, locked into rooms that are 4 inches by 7 inches --- that's what they feel like."

L- "Yeah, there are rules here, but this is pretty open."

Me- "What kind's of rules?"

L- "Oh, like not having boys in the rooms, no drugs, things like that."

Me- "Do you girls get to help make up the rules?"

L- "Well, they ask our opinions on things. We don't really set up rules, but they do ask what we think about things."

Me- "And I suppose you really do have to have rules for a place like this. If there wasn't this home, where would you be?"

L- "Other group homes, there are some other ones around."

M- "Girls' Training School, that's where a lot of the girls would be. There isn't any place but there, for a lot of us, except here or there."

Z- "This is a kind of a stepping off place for GTS. If you don't make it in a place like this, that's where they send you."

There seemed to be general agreement.

The secretary's comment seems to sum up the ideal of the home for the staff.

> "It's a really marvelous program. It gives the girls a leg up. For so many of the girls this program and this home show them what a home really is -- for a lot of them it gives them a bed to sleep in and shoes on their feet, something maybe they've never had before. This is a home, and the rules are the same as a parent might make.....All they know before they come here is to fight and scratch and claw. This teaches them that there are other ways to live, and shows them how to do it."

And a shepherd says:

> "We keep it as much like a family as we can. When something different comes up that we don't know how to handle we sit down and talk about how a family would handle it, and then try to do it that way."

And Caroline's ideal is, of course, exactly that:

> "What we have, I think, or what we want to develop, is a viable program built on mine own image, based on my concepts, convictions, experience, as an attempt to reach kids that haven't been reached. Bureaucracy doesn't reach kids, people do. I want to produce a viable way of reaching these kids."
>
> . . .
>
> "I think we're developing a hideous kind of family thing here. I'm the mother, the authority. The shepherds have the role of older siblings. When I'm away, the kids really drive them to their limits, testing them just as they do in a family when the parents are away. It's a distorted family configuration. I'm the stability, the center, Ma will come through in big trouble. They do develop a feeling we're all on one side here. They have probably a primary relationship with a shepherd, but if she's not there, Ma will take over. I'm the stability ....."

Another interesting development is the concept of the male shepherd. This too was an attempt to provide a less institutional-type atmosphere. Caroline says:

> "The kids needed a relation to a non-threatening, caring male. And we needed to get away from this artificial, all woman bind."

And finally, from another shepherd:

> "The whole point of the program is the freedom and
> the way the girls can be themselves without having
> anything put on them from the outside. That's the
> best part of it. I suppose that it would be easier
> to have a program if there were more rules, but the
> freedom, and the relationships the girls establish
> with their shepherds, is really important. ... They
> really do establish good relationships with the
> shepherds, even though it might not look like it
> sometimes."

As to the success of the ideal, it is still in the experimental stage, having been in actual operation for less than two years. It would appear that the girls are making progress in relating to people -- but of course their activities would be considered non-deviant most of the time anyway. There is no way to tell what would have happened to them in another setting, or how their experiences at Roseland will influence them in later life. They are not really delinquent girls in the first place: of 18, 14 were assigned to Roseland because of running away from home or being "out of control" of the parents. A few had shoplifted, one had been involved in a stolen car incident. Sixteen of the girls had come from broken homes, and 5 were pregnant.

According to the Annual Report, 1973, that Roseland put out, reasonably good results were obtained from the girls being placed there. Of the 82 girls served at Roseland during that year, 23 returned to their homes; 11 had gone to foster homes; 6 had moved to independent living; 2 had "gone underground," i.e., been released and lost to view; 1 was married; 1 went with a carnival; and 20 remained in residence. Unsuccessful careers continued for 2 who were transferred to GTS; 2 were transferred to mental hospitals,

and 13 were transferred to Juvenile Homes pending placements. The report says "of the 82 served. Roseland made a demonstrable impact on 43. What other impact we have made we do not know. Whether the impact attained is lasting only time will tell."

The real value of Roseland, regardless of "successful rehabilitation," would seem to be simply that it is there and available to a specific kind of girl -- generally non-delinquent, perhaps truant, perhaps pregnant -- but generally a girl who simply has no place to go. The courts would have to assign them somewhere, and this open home setting fills a need not otherwise met.

IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE OF ROSELAND

As to the future, there are indications that routinization of
the charismatic innovations are taking place. Weber speaks of the
dialectic of chairsma in institution building, and of a decline of
charisma not in the sense of degeneration but as being overlaid by
concomitant creation of new forms and norms. "It is the fate of
charisma, whenever it comes into the permanent institutions of a
community, to give way to powers of [new] tradition and of rational
socialization."[37] And indeed, if the organization is to survive now
that the old bureaucracy which maintained it is destroyed, a new
structure which is "generationally transferable" must be built.
Eisenstadt says:

> "The test of any great charismatic leader lies not
> only in his ability to create a single event or
> great movement, but also in his ability to leave a
> continuous impact on an institutional structure --
> to transform ... by infusing into it some of his
> charismatic vision, by investing the regular,
> orderly offices or aspects of social organization,
> with some of his charismatic qualities or aura."[38]

Among the most evident aspects of this concern is Caroline's
own feelings that the structure as it now stands is not viable. She
is aware that though a new structure for the program has been built
the old bureaucratic structure has been destroyed, and because she
wants to leave she is beginning plans to rebuild it. She feels that,
because rate of turnover for the shepherds is about nine months, that
they will all be gone by summer and "...when this group of shepherds
leaves I'll leave too. I can't put myself through that again." We
talked about the expectation that if she leaves ("I have to leave for

---

37. Bendix, OP.CIT., p. 326.

38. Eisenstadt, SELECTED WRITINGS, OP.CIT., p. xxi.

my own sake") the whole program will fall apart.

> Me- "Well, it looks to me like you're saying the
> program is good but the costs are too high."
>
> Caroline- "That's right. I'm convinced that this
> is the kind of thing that some girls need, but I
> just don't know if there's enough payoff, if it
> really does make enough difference in the girls'
> lives to make it worthwhile. I'd like to make it
> a viable program, but I just really question
> whether or not it's workable."
>
> Me- "Well, it's workable as long as you're here."
>
> Caroline- "But when I leave -- I really ought to
> hire someone here who knows what the program means.
> But I can't hire anyone. We can't afford it."

Having said that, and realizing that such a person was essential
if the program were to continue, she began planning to get the
money and offered me the job. When I refused, she began planning,
recognizing that the job should be split into two people, one for
administration and a program director to carry on her work. "I'm
talking in terms of nine months more here. That doesn't give me
much time to build back some of the structure...."

From that time on, the hiring of a Program Director became a
set ideal in the plan. There is a new person who has come to the
agency recently as a volunteer. She had directed a home for mentally
disturbed girls in California, has begun making suggestions, well
received by the staff, as to how things should be done, and she
sits in on staff meetings. Caroline is turning to her for advice,
and accepts her criticisms. At a recent meeting concerning archi-
tectural plans for the new addition, Caroline asked her if she didn't
make herself clear when she spoke.

> Caroline- "Do I have a hard time explaining myself to
> others so that they can understand me? I can't seem
> to get through to some people -- is it my fault?"

P- "When I first met you, it was hard for me to under-
stand anything you said." She continued in a low
earnest tone, and Caroline did not object.

Another indication of the routinization of the ideal is that

the physical structure itself will be changed by the new addition

to the building. Of major interest is the shepherds' quarters, men-

tioned before, which provide them isolation from the girls that they

do not now have. More locks and more doors is another innovation,

and this will surely be seen as limiting the freedom of the girls.

The kitchen will have no entry way into the girls' dining area, and

thus snacking at will will be changed. And they are now considering

outgoing phones in every room. At first this seems like an addition

to the girls' freedom of choice, but viewed in P.'s light (and she

might well be the new authority in the Home), "But that's what you

want, to keep the girls in their rooms. Let them spend as long

as they want talking. You'll know where they are and what they're

doing."

Thus a new structure will insure isolation for the shepherds

from the girls and a more secure system of control for the girls.

This will lead not only to less stress for the shepherds, and per-

haps a higher stability rate, but a professionalization of them,

an objectifying of the status of the girls. The hiring of a

"Program Director" will effectively separate the functions of the

Home into program and administration, and make it possible for the

holders of these positions to delimit their time at the Home. This

will turn the "commitment" expressed in terms of time into a more

routine, "job" situation rather than a "life work."

The problem of succession is of course central to the charismatic institution. Methods of choice "lead away from ... a uniquely personal mission. To select a successor in terms of criteria or rules objectifies what was originally personal."[39] Or as Eisenstadt says, "The first meeting point between the charismatic predisposition toward the destruction of orderly social organization and the exigencies of orderly social organization is demonstrated in the necessity of the charismatic leader ... to assure continuity; ... that is, to assure the succession of its leadership and the continuity of the organization."[40]

Thus it would seem that the charismatic phase of institution-building, holding within it the destruction of the old social organization, is over. Routinization has begun, and a successor, whether P or someone else, must soon be found, since Caroline is leaving. It is possible, even if she does not leave, that the charismatic stage will be ended, for even as she progressed from bureaucratic executive to charismatic she could again return to her former status.

---

39. Bendix, OP.CIT., p. 306.

40. Eisenstadt, SELECTED WRITINGS, OP.CIT., p. xxi.

CONCLUSION

There is always a question, when a phenomenon occurs, whether it was a natural happening or whether it was "pushed." Or, as a sage once said, was the valley flooded because God sent the rains or because someone opened the sluice in the dam? In the case of Roseland, that _something_ had to happen because of the rains of social change. But the _way_ in which it happened was consciously directed; the revolution did not occur by chance, nor simply because a charismatic figure was on hand. The opportunities for change were selected and molded to fit an ideal, and the driving force enabling the social change was charisma.

The interactions among the conditions for change can be separated only artificially. This is true also of the bureaucratic structure and the program itself -- change in one could not have occurred without change in the other. The destruction of the bureaucracy was an integral part of the building of the new program. "...an initial assumption of many sociological analyses of charisma has been that it is disruptive and contributes to the destruction of existing institutions and to social change. The recognition that charismatic activities or symbols also constitute a part of the solidary institutional framework does not negate this basic insight .... It enables us to see that the very quest for participation in a meaningful order may be related to processes of change and transformation, that it may indeed constitute ... the very focus of processes of social transformation."[41]

---

41. Eisenstadt, S.N., "Societal Goals, Systemic Needs, Social Interaction, and Individual Behavior; some Tentative Explanations," in Turk and Simpson, eds., INSTITUTIONS AND SOCIAL EXCHANGE, (New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971), p. 49.

Charisma is a tenuous concept no matter how familiar we may think we are with it. Theoretically it has been studied, and its presence in great men and large social changes has been documented. But charisma occurs everywhere, and if Eisenstadt is right, in greater or lesser degrees whenever there is social change on any scale. In Roseland charisma acted in the small society, extremely limited in scope, of a social agency. The charisma was organizationally bounded but overwhelming in its effect within those boundaries. By detailing its preconditions, development, and results on this small a scale not only has empirical information on the phenomenon itself been added, but the importance of charisma in social change and institution-building even at the smallest level of society has been pinpointed.

The preconditions of charisma were seen to be 1) societal change, 2) organizational need based on that change, and 3) a leader with both charismatic propensities and the time for charisma. The preconditions for charisma within the individual herself were 1) the qualities of entrepreneurship, 2) the ability to visualize, plan, articulate, organize, and mobilize the necessary resources to gain an ideal, and 3) an ideal itself, based on almost mystical concepts, and personal commitment to that ideal. Commitment, of course, has both the behavioral aspects of committing time, money, and knowledge to the ideal and the attitudinal aspects of "willing" to make the ideal reality, an orientation to commitment, and the salience of this role in relationship to all behaviors.

The components of development of the charismatic situation were 1) personal belief in the mission and in the unique capabilities of

self of the charismatic leader, 2) the gathering up of a following, and the communalization of that following, and 3) destruction of the old program and bureaucracy and the building of the new institution based on the ideals of the charismatic. The gathering up of a following at Roseland may or may not be unique in that almost all people within the scope of charismatic action were personally selected by the leader. Those who did not ""fit" were either removed or acknowledged by all as "outside" the circle of disciples.

Components of the institutional change (3 above) were 1) destruction -- of old methods, system and type of staffing, type of clientele, kinds and importance of record-keeping, etc.; and 2) rebuilding the institution, with new methods replacing those destroyed, and a new particularistic application of new regulations at the discretion of the leader and her disciples. Also, the communal nature of the institution, in which all but peripheral personnel such as the secretary participated, was an important part of the "ideal" of home and family. A pseudo-family structure was in fact developed. In-group feelings and loyalty were strong: among the girls, though they fought with each other; among the shepherds, who formed a sister-like peer group; and for the group as a whole.

Now that the ideal is operationalized and the program functioning, charisma is diminishing and the routinization of life at Roseland is beginning. Among the trends most easily seen are the Director's desire to leave or at least split the functions she carries into two parts; the expectation that all staff will leave within six months (except for peripheral personnel, who will carry on the routinization); the search for a successor; and the construction of the new

addition, which will begin the isolation or division of staff from clients and set up such "old-style" institutional barriers to the "new-style" home life as new locks, non-access to the kitchen and to shepherds at any time, and so forth.

This empirical study of charisma in action bears out the theoretical implications suggested by Weber and further conceptualized by Eisenstadt. Social change as it affects institution-building does indeed use charisma as a vital ingredient. And charisma is dialectical in nature, arising to challenge the old order and then, once a new order is established, becoming diminished and routinized. And though some kind of agency adaptation for the purposes of survival might have been accomplished in any case, the unique convergence of the three propensities to charisma -- societal, organizational, and personal -- provided a unique, quick, and exciting solution to the survival problem of Roseland. The small scale of this appearance of charisma only serves to emphasize its ubiquitousness in the society of man, and raises questions as to the comparative benefits of charisma to "simple adaptations" which might be studied in similar small situations. It would seem that charisma might produce quicker and more innovative adaptations while placing the structure of the organization greatly in jeopardy. On the other hand, simple adaptations would protect the organizational structure, but change might be slower and less efficient in the long run, since the incrementalization of a program or institution whose time is past merely delays its eventual collapse.

The parallel to mutation that Eisenstadt suggests is unmistakable and very appropriate, and can be seen clearly at Roseland -- the wild gene of charisma revitalizes a dying organism and through radical adaptations in a hostile environment, insures its survival.

METHODS

Participant observation seems to be the disowned and dis-
reputable grandparent of modern sociological research. Like an
old codger who, brilliant in his day, has outlived his time, he
creates difficulties for modern youth -- he appears unscientific,
full of biases, subjectively oriented, and insists on taking one
case at a time instead of sampling a universe of cases. Yet it seems
difficult to see how any of the more modern methods of research
could begin to build information on phenomena such as charisma --
there is a necessity for starting from the individual and working
toward the general. In this sense it is far from the time when
participant observation should be put away in an "old methods'"
home.

McCall and Simmons[42] say that participant observation can best
be described as a combination of methods rather than a single method
of sociological research "... it involves some amount of genuinely
social interaction in the field with the subjects of the study,
some direct observation of relevant events, some formal and a great
deal of informal interviewing, some systematic counting, some
collection of documents and artifacts, and open-endedness in the
direction the study takes." The difficulty in explication of this
method(s) is not that so _many_ techniques are used, but that they
are indeed blended, becoming greater than the sum of their separate
parts, by the way they are integrated in the mind of the researcher
and flow out in his interpretation. That part of the method is

---

42. McCall, George and Simmons, J.L., ISSUES IN PARTICIPANT OBSER-
    VATION, (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1969), p. 1.

what cannot be scientifically explained. The greatest problem seems to be the rampant availability of the data, and the fact that, in the field, a researcher can pull out data he wishes and pass over other data without really being aware of his subjective biases.

Perhaps understanding the purpose of participant observation is the key to evaluating research done in this manner. Rather than being a test of a theory (though it may be, given sufficient cases), participant observation seeks, through empirical study, to fulfill or modify existent theory, and perhaps in the process to generate new theory. From this viewpoint, following a particular lead in the body of scientific theory, being selective, etc., are not seen as such sins committed against the scientific method. And, after all, a major purpose of the method is to generate theory from the body of the data -- thus one does not go into the field with a preconceived set of ideas and search out only those facts which agree with his theory. Rather, a broad body of data is gathered in which more and more evidence regarding specific hypotheses appear until finally a decision is made to look more closely at the out-standing ones. After that point the research may be selective, but it is the body of data itself which first "selects out" the themes to pursue.

Choice of Site

One of the characteristics of field study is that a decision on the exact situation to be studied is not made until enough data has been collected so that theories begin to emerge. Nevertheless, predispositions as to topics are inherent in the choice of location

for the field study. Thus, when I chose to study Roseland Services,
it was with the general idea of looking at the process of institu-
tionalization -- "becoming clients" in such an agency -- from the
viewpoint of the girls thus institutionalized. I have a particular
bias on that topic: having worked with families as an advocate for
the poor, and having in my own childhood been among those stigmatized
as poor by society, I was more than aware of the liberties taken by
society in controlling those they label deviant. I had hoped by a
sympathetic exposition of the reasons for institutionalization of
these girls, and the real normalcy of most of their lives, to add
a little to the knowledge of stigmatization and deviation.

Moreover, because of a short term of working in the agency it-
self as a social worker -- less than six months half time -- and a
thus-developed firm friendship with the Director, I was aware that
the program developing was quite different in scope and purposes
both from what it had been in the past and from what was currently
offered by most organizations for the institutionalization of
"wayward girls." I expected my study to point out her program as
a showpiece in the way such children should be treated. Indeed, I
still consider that organization to be a model for treatment, but
the main focus of the study became charisma in social change. Thus
the exposition of the Home as a model for service is not so carefully
documented as it would deserve if that study had become the central
one.

Roles and Field Relationships

My role in Roseland during participant observation was to be a

student who was a friend of the Director. Thus I was legitimized not only because of the power of her position but because of the respect in which staff and girls held her. I had asked that my former status as social worker not be mentioned because of its un-pleasant connotations for the girls (and for the staff of shepherds in this particular setting). In the first few weeks of the study this front held up; then for some reason the Director began to identi-fy me to everyone as a social worker -- staff, girls, and really whoever walked in. Fortunately, by the time this happened, the "student front" was not so important, because I had moved my focus from work with the girls to the study of Caroline herself, and her charismatic leadership in an organization in flux.

Our friendship was a mixed blessing in this setting. It gave me complete access to the house, to records, and to the people there, since she rated so highly with them. However, there was some implication felt that I might be a "spy," at least with one shepherd and probably the secretary. This did not seem to be a problem with the girls, probably because of the openness of the institution; however, my status with them was not really put to the test because of the focus of the study. With Caroline herself the relationship was more difficult: I could not remain a disinterested observer to her problems because I was and am her friend. In my work at the agency before I had been a sounding board for her ideas and troubles, and I could not and did not want to shut off this relationship, even though I was aware of the possibility of "chang-ing the field." This gave me the opportunity to gain insights into her charisma that I might never have had otherwise. However, there

is no doubt that when she asked for advice on the continuation of the program I could not refuse her, and her actions after we talked may well have hastened the steps she began to take in the routinization of the new program.

I do not feel that I "infected the field" in other ways: the girls just didn't seem to care much whether I was there or not after they were used to seeing me, and though some shepherds tried to involve me in the Home I was able to extricate myself from those problems by sticking to my front as a non-involved observer.

Data Collection

I observed Roseland for several hours at least once a week for seven months. In addition, during that time I interviewed individually seven girls, four shepherds, the Director, and the secretary. Informally, I talked with all the shepherds, the cook, the housekeeper, and all the girls at one time or another. Though I was given the freedom of the house, I spent almost all my time in the offices or general living areas. I spent some time in the shepherds' dormitory; but did not visit any of the girls in their rooms. There were two reasons for this: I did not want to intrude in their homes at the beginning of the study before they knew me; and since focus had changed to organizational issues after that I did not have the time to spend with the girls that I might otherwise have had.

I attended staff meetings and one general house meeting, and was invited to observe one conference between Caroline and a shepherd and several others with serveral shepherds and Caroline. I also observed several interactive conferences between shepherds and

the girls they worked with. I observed the girls in interaction

in the living and dining areas, and in offices. I recorded not only

conversation but interaction as it occurred. At first my notetaking

was obvious, but after a session of joking and sanctioning by a girl,

Caroline, and a shepherd, I realized that it wasn't approved of, so

changed to making small reminder notes occasionally.

I was given complete access to the girls' files, both the offi-

cial dossiers in the main office and the behavior modification rules,

files, etc., that the shepherds maintained. I believe I was also

given access to other records, such as financial ones, but found the

secretary to be very protective of her territory and so did not pursue

the issue further. Only one exception was made, I asked for and

finally received, after several requests, budget figures for 1973.

During the time of my observation at Roseland, there were between

20 and 25 girls in residence. I obtained information about 18 of

them from the files. Four left because their babies were born;

4 were sent to other institutions; and 3 left because they reached

age 18 or were released by the courts. There were 3 girls who

ran away during that time; 2 came back of their own accord without

the police being notified and 1 was picked up and sent to the

Juvenile Home. She was not allowed to return to Roseland. The major

reason for commitment to Roseland was because of runaways, truancy,

or being "out of control" of parents or guardians. There were 4

pregnant girls when I first began the observation, 2 more were

admitted while I was there, and 3 non-pregnant residents became

pregnant while living at the Home.

Biases

The most obvious biases have already been mentioned, those
of my friendship with Caroline and my feelings of sympathy for
the girls. Also, when the data arising on charisma became so evident
I made the choice to select that kind of data rather than any other.
By doing this I limited my research, and thus important factors,
particularly about the girls reactions, feelings, etc., about Rose-
land, authorities, and the processes by which they were labeled,
are missing. I regard this as a real loss, but unavoidable given
time limitations. Another bias may be my own reticence in approach-
ing people -- perhaps my time could have better been spent gaining
interviews if I had not been so shy or so reluctant to intrude.

From the informants' viewpoint, I have already mentioned some
of the biases there -- that I was a spy, the attempt to involve me
in peer relationships with the shepherds, etc. I should also be
aware of the respondents' viewpoints, i.e., why did they talk to
me? For the girls, I was somebody to talk to who cared about what
they were doing and feeling. I made no secret of my feelings about
that, and they responded. Also, as an adult I had some authority
-- maybe they felt required to talk to me. Whatever their reasons,
it had little influence on the gist of this report, because aside
from their feelings about Caroline as a person and the institution
as a Home it was not included in the analysis. What they did say
was verified by other things -- their attitudes toward Caroline,
the way they kept up the Home (once the redecorating was done),
the freedom they felt in bringing in boyfriends, their attitudes

toward each other and the shepherds,and the shepherds' reports on
the way they felt.

This was also true of the shepherds. There was a unanimity in
the statements they made and in the way they acted toward Caroline
and the program. Certainly the fact that they lived there, brought
their problems to Caroline, etc., provides evidence that they were
not simply trying to "fool me," or have me carry good reports to
Caroline about them. The best information I got was probably that
from the "outside" shepherd, because she knew she was not as closely
attached to the Home, yet verified,even from that position, how the
shepherds as a whole felt toward Caroline and the program. She
was the most suspicious to me, too, and indicated in various ways
that she thought I might be "trying to get something on Caroline or
on herself." But from the other content of her conversation I
believe I got verifications for what I was seeking.

Hypotheses Arising from the Data

The constant comparative method of analysis not only gives the
kind of verifications of data listed above but, through the process
of collecting, coding, and analysis of data at the same time gives
rise to emerging hypotheses. Glaser says that "... if the analyst
starts with raw data, he will at first end up with a substantive
theory..."[43] having to do with the substantive area of the research.
After the preliminary coding of my data, theories arising out of
the data had primarily to do with the survival of Roseland itself.

---

43. Glaser, Barney G., "The Constant Comparative Method of Qualita-
     tive Analysis," in McCall-Simmons, OP.CIT., p. 227.

They were:

1) That if no attempt is made to restore maintenance features
   of the organization in terms of the on-going standards and
   rules <u>outside</u> the control of any single person, the agency
   may not survive.

2) If the organization does survive, because of the commitment
   of Board members and the community, the program the Director
   has established, involving intensive care and relationships,
   will probably not survive because:

   a. The success of the present program in terms of re-
       habilitation cannot be assessed in terms of money.

   b. The set of circumstances enabling this director, and
       her personal charisma, can probably not be found in
       any other one person.

   c. The intensive immersive program that now exists is
       not viable because of the costs involved in duplicat-
       ing in more persons what the Director does, allowing
       for time, money, and emotional toll, and for a
       less charisma-inspired staff.

From there, I went on to study in a more formal theoretical
area. Glaser says that "In making theoretical sense of much diver-
sity in his data, the analyst is forced to develop ideas on a level
of generality which is higher than the qualitative material being
analyzed."[44] In this instance the area of formal theory that I
went to was that of charisma, and particularly the idea of the
dialectic of charisma in institution-building. The formal theory

---

44. Glaser, OP.CIT., p. 227.

finally arrived at was that charisma is an essential part of social change, particularly of violent social change. This has certainly been true at Roseland; we see it also in great social movements, but the value of this small study is that the same thing occurs in a limited and relatively unimportant area of social life. Corollary to the stated theory are two others: that preconditions for social change must include societal and organization propensities to change and personal propensities, including time, for charisma; and that once the change has been instituted the dialectical nature of charisma calls for its diminishment and the routinization of program. Here again both of these are evident not only in the small arena of Roseland but in the accepted arenas of religious movements and of nation-building.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Becker, Howard, S., OUTSIDERS. New York: The Free Press, 1963.

2. Bendix, Reinhardt, "Max Weber's Sociology Today," INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE JOURNAL 17 (1965), pp. 9-20.

3. Eisenstadt, S.N., "Institutionalization and Change," AMERICAN SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 29 (1964), pp. 235-247.

4. Eisenstadt, S.N., SELECTED PAPERS OF MAX WEBER: ON CHARISMA AND INSTITUTION BUILDING. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

5. Eisenstadt, S.N., "Societal Goals, Systemic Needs, Social Interaction, and Individual Behavior: Some Tentative Explorations," in Turk and Simpson, INSTITUTIONS AND SOCIAL EXCHANGE. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971.

6. Etzioni, Amitai, MODERN ORGANIZATIONS, (Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964).

7. Glaser, Barney, "The Constant Comparative Analysis of Qualitative Analysis," in McCall-Simmons, ISSUES IN PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1969, pp. 216-227.

8. Jacobsen, A.L., "A Theoretical and Empirical Analysis of Social Change and Conflict based on Talcott Parson's Ideas," in Turk and Simpson, op cit., p. 344 ff.

9. McCall, George, and Simmons, J.L., ISSUES IN PARTICIPANT OBSERVATION. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1969.

10. McClelland, David C., THE ACHIEVING SOCIETY. Princeton: D. Van Nostrand Inc., 1961.

11. Mommsen, N., "Max Weber's Political Sociology," INTERNATIONAL SOCIAL SCIENCE JOURNAL, 17 (1965), pp. 23-48.

12. Parsons, Talcott, STRUCTURE OF SOCIAL ACTION. York, Pa.: McGraw-Hill, 1937.

13. Parsons, Shils, et al., THEORIES OF SOCIETY, V. 1 New York: Glencoe Press, 1961, pp. 30-80.

14. Rains, Prudence M., "Moral Reinstatement: The Characteristics of Maternity Homes," AMERICAN BEHAVIORAL SCIENTIST, V. 14 (November/December 1970), pp. 219-236.

15. Senor, James M., "Another Look at the Executive Board Relationship," in Zald, Mayer, SOCIAL WELFARE INSTITUTIONS. New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1965, pp. 418 ff.

16. Shils, Edward A., "Charisma, Order and Status," AMERICAN
     SOCIOLOGICAL REVIEW, 30 (April, 1965), pp. 199-213.

17. Sills, David, THE VOLUNTEERS, (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press,
     1957).

18. Turk, Herman, "Task and Emotion, Value and Charisma, Theoretical
     Union at Several Levels," in Turk and Simpson, INSTITUTIONS
     AND SOCIAL EXCHANGE. New York: Bobbs-Merrill, 1971.