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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."
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.
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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, superhuman, 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

---


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

---

4. IBID., p. 204.
5. IBID., p. 206.
of daily, non-spectacular life has not been observed. If Eisenstadt's 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). 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

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 institution 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 organizational 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.

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.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIME</th>
<th>TYPE OF AGENCY</th>
<th>STRUCTURE</th>
<th>PURPOSE</th>
<th>TYPE OF HIERARCHY</th>
<th>STAFF</th>
<th>CLIENTELE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time I:</td>
<td>Maternity Home</td>
<td>Bureaucratic</td>
<td>Shelter girls and adopt out babies</td>
<td>Lines of author-</td>
<td>Director; 1 social worker; 1 1/2</td>
<td>Pregnant girl in residence, age 12-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ity for all person-</td>
<td>house-parents; part-time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>el except per-</td>
<td>cook; part-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sonnel except</td>
<td>time sec.; visiting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>through social work</td>
<td>tutors and later teachers in classrooms</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>to Director</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time II:</td>
<td>Maternity Home and School for local pregnant girls residing at home</td>
<td>Bureaucratic with some staff and program innovations</td>
<td>Shelter residents; give mental health counseling to res. and non-res. girls; medical help for both sets of girls; educational serv. for both sets</td>
<td>Same as above, except new shepherd has direct access to Director</td>
<td>Same as above, except new shepherd takes place of 1 house-parent and 1/2 social worker</td>
<td>Pregnant girl in residence; pregnant girl from local areas wishing to continue in school while living at home in community age 12-20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim Per.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residence or Charismatic group home for delinquent and pre-delinquent girls Pregnant not a necessary condition for admittance</td>
<td>Charismatic</td>
<td>Provide a home-like setting for girls assigned by courts and state as troubled girls or girls with no other place to go</td>
<td>Flattened hierarchy with Director presiding over democratic peer group of shepherds Other staff is peripheral</td>
<td>Director; 6 shepherds who serve as house-parents and social workers; 1 sec., part-time cook, part-time house-keeper</td>
<td>Court-assigne girls ages 13-18 judged pre-linquent or without parental care Some state-assigned (neglected) girls. Not necessarily pregnant</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 districts 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 remained 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 numbers 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 Services, 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 additional half-time social worker. The doctor who volunteered his time for the resident girls refused to deal with the day girls, requiring 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/bookkeeper 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 somewhat 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 more so 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.  


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
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 bureaucracy 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 than 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 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 particularistic 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 Roseland 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 something 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 herself 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:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time I</th>
<th>Parents or voluntary</th>
<th>Very few exceptions to rigid visiting hours rules</th>
<th>Close; locked doors after hours</th>
<th>No crossing of staff/client lines; stereotypes of and by both staff and clients</th>
<th>Total planning of client institutional life</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Time II</td>
<td>Parents, for residents; voluntary for day school</td>
<td>Somewhat relaxed restrictions for residents, no restrictions for day girls</td>
<td>Attempted close surveillance for residents, reduced because of lack of surveillance for day girls; locked doors but fewer restrictions</td>
<td>Same as above except as regards shepherd</td>
<td>Total planning for residents attempted; some for day girls as in clean up after lunch, but this was not too successful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time III</td>
<td>Court-judged delinquent or pre-delinquent; state-appointed neglected or dependent girls</td>
<td>Very relaxed rules, depending on &quot;level system&quot; and discretion of shepherds, with girls helping to make decisions.</td>
<td>Very little; girls expected home for dinner and hours depending on levels. Locked doors to keep people out rather than girls in</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>Very little planning. Only dinner attendance required and this often neglected. Most jobs for housekeeping voluntary and paid except for kitchen cleanup</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 blocks of people ... can be taken as a key fact of total institutions." 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.

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 administration 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

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 constitute a major focus both of continuity and of potential changes in any social system."14

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 Foundation.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 clientele 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

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 organizational 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 Roseland. 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 considered 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 operation 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 personality 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, institutionalized 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

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

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 beliefs. 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 inspires change, and lays the groundwork for the two basic aspects of the charismatic situation: the development of the charismatic 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.

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." 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." 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)

27. Eisenstadt, Selected Writings, op. cit., p. xxxix.
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 combination 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 off 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 swearing 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 believe 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 produced 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 recommendation 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:

"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 program)."

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 indeterminate 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 generally 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 following. 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, anyone 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 particularly the shepherds. While the cook, secretary, and half-time housekeeper 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 qualifications, who constitute a charismatic aristocracy.... The disciples are bound together by the charismatic leader and his mission." 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...."

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
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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 asking 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, because 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
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the sense that they were no longer talking, heads were bowed, it was obvious they agreed with her and would try harder. Thus instruction 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 about runaways, are other examples. When a shepherd is upset because of the way her relationships 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 institutional 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 extraordinarily 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 permissible. 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." 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." 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
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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 weekends, 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 re-
lationship 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.
As to the future, there are indications that routinization of the charismatic innovations are taking place. Weber speaks of the dialectic of chairisma 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 architectural 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?"
"When I first met you, it was hard for me to understand 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, mentioned 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 perhaps 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." 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."

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.

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

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 disreputable 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

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 outstanding 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 institutionalization -- "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 itself 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 unpleasant 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 identify 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 "changing 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 several 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 official 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 approaching 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..." 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.

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 outside 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 rehabilitation 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 duplicating 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 diversity in his data, the analyst is forced to develop ideas on a level of generality which is higher than the qualitative material being analyzed."\textsuperscript{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

\textsuperscript{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.
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