Editorial for the special issue on "personal relationships and social interventions"

In the specialist discourse within social work and social pedagogy, there is broad-ranging discussion on the form taken by professional relationships characterised by knowledge-based rationality, professional competence and reflexivity (Dewe & Otto, 2018). Social work and social pedagogy (jointly known as "Soziale Arbeit" in Germanophone discourse) are increasingly becoming known as a relational profession (Gahleitner, 2017) because of professional relationships' significance both to practice and as a research topic. However, the *personal* side of *professional* relationships, and of *personal* relationships in the context of social work and social pedagogy, have only been addressed peripherally. However, personal relationships make a key difference to the way we experience and conduct our everyday lives. Personal relationships are – or at least can be – one element of the professional relationships found in social work and social pedagogy. It is against this background that the current issue of the Annual Review of Social Work and Social Pedagogy in Austria – OeJS – investigates the connection between personal relationships and social interventions.

1. "Personal" and "professional" relationships

Recently, the topic of personal life has been explored by socio-scientific approaches that view the individual as a fundamentally "relational person" (Seichter, 2014, p. 227) and see the "degree to which one is connected with and open to other people (and things)" (Rosa, 2019, p. 53) as central to the relationship people have with the world. After all, personal relationships are characteristic of our existence as socialised individuals from before we are born throughout our lives until we die – and even beyond that. Here, "personal life" does not mean something thought to be distinctively special, authentic or internal to an individual; rather, it can be used as a heuristic concept summing up a certain structured quality and way of being connected to others, comprising elements such as free will and taking an interest in one another. Personal relationships are what makes it possible for us to develop physically, emotionally and in socio-material terms. As a central

way in which people establish relationships, they determine our own individual existence. They govern how, as "relational beings" (Gergen, 2009), we understand ourselves and the world and how we can develop a sense of our own self (Gergen, 1995, p. 77).

1.1 The personal dimension of public life

Contributions on the "Sociology of Personal Life" (Smart, 2007) have shown clearly that personal life does not just play a role in or affect private spheres such as the family, partnership, parenthood or peer groups. Instead, in late modern societies, personal life and personal relationships extend far into the sphere that we call public and see as separate to the private sphere (May & Norquvist, 2019, p. 3). Accordingly, the personal dimensions of people's lives, and their personal relationships, are always also in the mix as people navigate contexts considered part of the public sphere, such as democracy, citizenship and the welfare state. That is especially true of social interventions that are based on prevailing social problems and intended to have a positive influence on individual agency, and/or those that take place in personal areas such as a family home. In the German socio-political discourse, interventions of this kind are described as "pädagogisch"; falling under education theory (Kaufmann, 2012, pp. 1295–1297). They are designed to help people develop, maintain or re-establish skills, or aimed at "social education" (Sting, 2016). From the 1970s in particular, social work and social pedagogy involving this type of intervention benefited from the fact that – driven by programmes rooted in education theory – they were expected to put into practice various measures and activities that formed part of a rise in service production.

1.2 Public production of services and professional relationships

As a result, social work in developed welfare states largely provides personal services (Oechler, 2009, p. 47), even if the effects of the Covid-19 pandemic have led to the parallel establishment of new services that are community-based or focus on social spaces, such as Housing First. Although the shift towards personal services, or human services, is marked by ambivalence (Gängler, 2013), social work has expanded strongly as the provider of professionalised, largely state-funded care and support, and its relevance to society as a whole has flourished (Ewijk, 2009, p. 61). The trend towards

increased state governance and the public-sector production of services has gone hand in hand with an increase in academic knowledge production. Today, professionality, professionalisation, the profession and the professional aspect of relationships with service users or clients are central to research, theorising, training and practice.

One thing that stands out is that within the discipline, personal life and personal relationships tend to take up little space in reflection on social interventions. The personal dimension often seems only to be taken into account as something that actually belongs to service users or clients' "private" worlds – sometimes becoming the subject of a social intervention in that role. As a result, the deliberate inclusion of personal aspects tends to be left to informal social work. In professionals' self-understanding, it occurs in the lead-up to "real" professional work, or simply rounds off the setting, as research on counselling has shown (Grothe, 2008; Loch & Schulze, 2009). "Informalisation" of this kind takes place despite the professional form of these social contexts because communication between the professionals and service users is of an everyday, apparently personal nature (Loch, 2016; Petko, 2006).

On the other hand, professionals' personal side tends to be seen and set apart as something that is (and should remain) part of *their* private life. The mixing and overlapping of professional and personal relationships tends to be formulated as a problem, even though aspects of personal relationships such as trust, emotionality and commitment influence professional practice. Meanwhile, in the discourse on professionality, personal relationships with service users and clients are mainly instrumentalised and taken advantage of from a utilitarian perspective.

1.3 Alternative ways of addressing relationships in social work, social pedagogy, and self-help

Put in stark terms, personal relationships – viewed historically and in their full range of meaning – are rarely borne in mind or reflected upon as central to a social work or social pedagogy that sees itself as a public-sector producer of services. By contrast, critical ("radical") social work traditions view social work as a relationship-based practice taking place in the context of liberating both social workers *and* service users. Something similar can be said of the early days of feminist social work, whose arguments drew upon a feeling of unity (Ebermann & Zehetner, 2010, p. 10), i. e. "we women", that was also used to call for reciprocal research (Mies, 1987). These theoretical and practical approaches link in closely with participatory action research,

which goes so far as to see authentic, intersubjective, non-utilitarian relationships as a means of demonstrating resistance and gaining knowledge. Working in partnership with communities is understood as a relational means of cooperating to achieve progressive social change and solve problems (Sousa, 2022, p. 410). In the early stages of these movements, personal relationships between activists and clients respectively users led, among other things, to political practices and politicised relationships that created empowerment but also overwhelmed those involved, as there was little reflection on the effects of their differing social and educational backgrounds and experiences of life (Scherl & Fritz, 2010).

In the 1970s and 1980s, just as early decolonial perspectives from the Global South began to enter the Western discourse, service user movements also began to make their voices heard. This development was closely related to the struggles taken up by various historically oppressed groups, and the formation of new social movements. Similarly to the views expressed in radical social work, the service user movements adopted a stance in opposition to professional top-down regulations and hegemonic, disciplinary forms of knowledge. Among other things, there was and still is criticism of stipulations imposed from above, prescribing how to determine clients' needs and how to make relationships and social interventions with them "professional" (Cowden & Singh, 2007).

In summary, it can be said that the knowledge production falling under these two traditions of radical social work and service user movements (e. g. see Beresford, 2011; Beresford & Croft, 2019) involves a way of addressing the personal dimensions of social work and social pedagogy that differs considerably from the discourse on relationships with social service providers. That discourse still follows the model of practices primarily being developed on the basis of expert academic knowledge.

1.4 The personal relationship: central to popular social problem-solving

In the research on recent "popular" forms of social work (Lavalette & Ioakimidis, 2011), personal relationships are treated differently to the way they are approached in the dominant discourse on professionalisation. This kind of flexible, reliable, non-stigmatising, unconditional social work, that is open to all, carries out activities users like and actively support, hand in hand with unpaid "professionals" and solidaristic communities. As described by Lavalette (2019, p. 538), popular social work differs from "official" social work (which is often conservative, controlling and pathologis-

ing) in that it acts critically and radically and actively takes part in social protest movements calling for justice. In studies on informally organised practices and institutions providing help, care, education and support for marginalised groups, personal relationships are addressed as *the* central, ultimate means of dealing with problems. Among other things, the focus is on new relationships being established with strangers, i. e. with people to whom there was no previous "natural" (privately established) connection.

One example of this is social mentoring programmes, a field that is rapidly growing in Europe (Raithelhuber, 2023) and involves millions of volunteers. Private individuals and activists build personal relationships with people such as children, young people or refugees. Research shows that relationships of this kind can be one of the central mechanisms driving the development of social capital (Raithelhuber, 2019). They can help provide various kinds of social support that service users do not get from professional social workers (or not in sufficient quantity), if they even turn to them for such support at all (Alarcón, Bobowik, & Prieto Flores, 2021; Alarcón & Prieto Flores, 2021). The establishment and negotiation of personal relationships often proves to be one of the main ways to help people in precarious life circumstances gain access to social rights. Personal relationships can create social security where that is otherwise impossible. They are often the key to welfare state services such as social and public services. They involve dedicated individuals using parts of their own personal lives and small worlds – their families, households and workmates – and the cultures associated with them (Gubrium, 1993, p. 55) to deal with social problems.

Within the field of social work, however, popular involvement and the personal relationships that entails are not taken into consideration and studied by researchers as an equal means of dealing with social problems. The same is true in principle of user-run self-help and self-organisation initiatives, or of schemes run by communities with a religious, spiritual or ideological background. All of these rely (sometimes heavily) on personal relationships and/or community-building to provide social support, encouraging collective and individual healing and empowering people to overcome oppression (Dolgon, 2022). Services and transfer payments that are based mainly on personal ties can, of course, be seen as problematic with regard to social justice, equality and accessibility. However, user-oriented research shows that they are often seen in an extremely positive light, especially from the perspective of disadvantaged people. They are perceived as reliable, longer-lasting, effective, immediately available, accessible from people's lifeworlds and playing a crucial role in transitions in life, in view of the structural exclusion and disregard that people experience.

Conversely, it can be seen that in situations where professionals develop, or have to develop, intense personal relationships with service users when providing social services – as in residential homes – parts of the personal networks thus formed are ultimately damaged when institutionalised support processes come to an end, and this tends to have lastingly negative effects (Raithelhuber, Trott & Piemontese, 2019; Sievers, Thomas & Zeller, 2015, pp. 122–123; Sting & Groinig, 2020).

2. Personal relationships as a heuristic concept against the background of social change

Until now, socio-scientific research into personal relationships has tended to be just one (often secondary) part of studies on relationships among peers, groups, families, couples or social networks. Researchers have often only focused on certain aspects of personal relationships, for example in investigations into "close" or "intimate" relationships, but the far broader heuristic concept of the personal relationship can add to those previous perspectives (Lenz & Nestmann, 2009, p. 10). After all, the term "personal relationships" refers to ties of a certain type, quality and function that are critical to people's experiences and life course. The term thus goes beyond the associations that relationships have in formal network analysis (Mewes, 2010, p. 20). It is more flexible and general than other concepts such as relationships with partners and friends. It can also be used to understand the changes in family and community relationships that occur in the context of social change (Smart, 2007, pp. 7–31), and the associated, sometimes new duties and informal forms of solidarity found in our contemporary social world (Allan, 2001). This makes it possible to describe relationship types, aspects or settings that are not in line with traditional distinctions between, for example, "private" and "professional" relationships.

2.1 Characteristics of personal relationships

In the research, there is an attempt to avoid an atomistic, individualist view of personal relationships; to see them not as static and "stable", but as something processual and fluid (Allan, 2006, p. 657). Like any other type of relationship, personal relationships are integrated into and governed by powerful structures (Allan, 2008, p. 14).

According to Lenz and Nestmann (2009), the characteristics of personal relationships differ from professional relationships that take the form of a

role. They are unique and involve personal knowledge about the other person, emotional connectedness and intimacy. Similarly, Oevermann (1996) distinguishes between "diffuse" social relationships that are all-embracing and take on all responsibilities – and "specific" social relationships that take the form of a role. The latter include relationships with teachers or police officers, for instance, that involve a limited range of responsibilities and category-based knowledge. Personal relationships, by contrast, are based on an idealised, long-term assumption by those involved that they will continue to stay in touch in future. The reciprocal connection can include felt closeness, care for one another, compassion and deep intimacy.

2.2 Potential, processes and changes in personal relationships

Personal relationships thus create *other* ways in which people can position themselves towards one another, e. g. with regard to education, parenting, looking after one another, care, coping, help and support. This is because when people want to reconnect with someone flagged as *personal*, it takes far less effort compared to encounters with strangers. Personal relationships, too, are established in various social contexts and organisational settings, but the interactions are less formalised. Unlike more function-based relationships, they can involve a wide range of conversational content. Personal relationships also have to be maintained and refreshed in interative situations. They thus point to certain modes of structured relationing that can be constituted in markedly differing spheres of life: in friendships and the family, at work or at school, through involvement in civil society or the neighbourhood.

Personal relationships change not only over people's individual life courses, but also as a result of social, cultural, technological and political change, one current example being the increasing digitalisation of private communication. In the context of recent anthropological reflections, personal relationships are now also seen as being established with non-humans, e. g. machines or animals (Wulf, 2020; Schwarte, 2020). From a historical perspective, experiences, social practices and groupings connected to personal relationships can spread beyond private life and go on to affect the public and political spheres. Conversely, they are influenced by processes of institutionalisation and de-institutionalisation. In the context of the social organisations and political measures that are part of social interventions, they are also made the subject of "societal governance" (Kooiman, 2002) in various ways.

3. "Personal relationships and social interventions" in this issue

The articles in this year's review can be divided into three subject areas. The first section examines what personal relationships that are not established exclusively between humans, but also humans and animals or "things" mean to social work and social pedagogy. In the second section, six empirical studies investigate the tensions that arise when personal relationships are, or are not, taken into account when organising social interventions in various fields of social work practice. The third section examines a field of intervention that is not (yet) seen as part of "professional" social work and social pedagogy in German-speaking countries, studying relationships in the broader context of mentoring and befriending programmes relying on volunteers.

3.1 Personal relationships involving digital things and animals

The first two articles both explore personal relationships with non-human others respectively "things", but from very different perspectives. The article by *Marc Weinhardt* studies how relationships are created to digital objects such as apps incorporating voice assistants, and how they can be integrated into counselling contexts. Weinhardt describes how "doing digitality" can be actively shaped, an issue that raises questions about how counselling relationships and contexts can be redesigned, rather than merely involving remote counselling via video calls or asynchronous e-mails and chats. He examines how counselling relationships involving algorithm-based devices can be understood in the theory on social work and social pedagogy.

Frank Nestmann and Sandra Wesenberg also argue that social work theory respectively social pedagogy needs to tackle relationships with non-human entities. Their article is about personal relationships between humans and animals, focusing on human–dog interactions. Among other things, the two authors show that schemes cannot get through to service users such as homeless dog owners if the animals that are their central companions – and thus the human–animal relationship – are ignored by social services or excluded from case work.

3.2 "Personal relationships" as a balancing act for professionalised social work practice

Ruth Enggruber and Birthe Sander examine the importance of personal relationships in case management working with addicts experiencing long-term unemployment. While case management is strongly characterised by standardised processes at the systemic level, aspects of personal relationships such as permanence, emotionality, trust and familiarity with individual people are seen to play an important role in interactions with service users at the level of cases. The service users' wishes regarding relationships call into question the line drawn between case management (simply arranging social services) and case work (carrying them out).

Michael May and Vera Dangel ask how therapeutic alliances and professional relationships in the field of psychiatry (e. g. community psychiatry) can be designed so that service users, in particular, see them as conducive to their recovery. Observed and recorded examples of everyday interaction between professionals and service users who have experienced psychiatric treatment are used to analyse the tensions arising from a relationship the addressees see as personal, the experts' understanding of professionality and the norms found in the context of the service provision, which often remain implicit. Against this background, the authors sketch out a concept of professionality that sees co-operation on an equal footing as fundamental to what is considered a professional therapeutic alliance, and places equal value on moments of personal contact that encompass the whole person.

Sara Blumenthal focuses on the shape taken by interactions between professionals and young people in out-of-home care, and between the young people themselves, in the context of the child and youth welfare services' duty to offer socio-pedagogical support. Using ethnographic analysis, the author reveals the extent to which professionals use shaming in relationships, without reflection, as a childraising tool, and what role research can play in this. Blumenthal also examines how shaming can cause degrading experiences, and how shaming situations can be dealt with within relationships if responsibility is accepted and reintegrative shaming is employed (i. e. shaming, but not degrading someone). This article makes an empirically backed contribution to the theorisation of affect, paying particular attention to the regulation of shame in relationships developing in the context of children's social care services.

The article by *Carolin Ehlke and Severine Thomas* is also about personal relationships in out-of-home care, the main focus being on care leaving. The two authors address the importance of personal relationships to young

adults. At the same time, they show that care leavers' social networks shrink when children's social care services come to an end (though there are qualitative differences between specific kinds of services). In consequence, they call for child and youth welfare services to include the establishment of personal relationships as part of their support planning. This would require social work to engage with the topic of personal relationships in theory and practice.

In less formalised social work settings, such as community youth work and acceptance-oriented work with drug users, special efforts are needed to establish professional relationships. *Rebekka Streck and Ursula Unterkofler* use ethnographic studies to show how components of personal relationships can create accessibility and reliability in these contexts. The situational production of personal elements produces participatory working relationships which, while they incur a risk of instrumentalisation, can also be employed by service users to avoid unreasonable treatment during interactions and compensate for imbalances of power.

The article by *Michael Domes, Christian Ghanem, Frieda Heinzelmann* and *Frank Sowa* explores the challenges that arise when providing professional social pedagogical support for young homeless people. Many of these people's biographies are characterised by extreme breakdowns of trust, e. g. through relationships suddenly ending, or experiences of violence in relationships with family and friends. The informal support systems they need to live (to survive) on the street often seem precarious. Against this background, the authors report findings from qualitative research demonstrating how important it is for professional support systems to place trust at the centre of their (relationship) work. One of the research group's central theses is that establishing trust in this field requires the creation of a (professional) relationship that lets in elements of personal relationships, such as forms of semi-friendship, while remaining stable and reliable.

3.3   Creating personal relationships in the context of social mentoring

Mentoring for social inclusion programmes are among the fastest-growing forms of pedagogical intervention in Europe and elsewhere. Most depend upon people's personal engagement. Launched and supported by a civil society initiative or NGO, they involve volunteers meeting up with people viewed as disadvantaged and developing a relationship with them over an extended period of time. The founding of the "Bundesverband soziales Mentoring", the German social mentoring alliance, in October 2022, at the

same time as the first lobbying event for mentoring in the European Parliament, underlines the fact that social work needs to carry out research to accompany these developments (Raithelhuber, 2023).

In her overview of the state of the research, *Tereza Brumovská* picks up on the fact that the way mentors respond to their mentees, and the attitudes they adopt towards them, have a significant impact on the quality of their relationship. Ultimately, this also decides whether service users experience the mentoring as a beneficial, useful social intervention. Starting from this research basis, in her qualitative longitudinal study Tereza Brumovská examines how volunteer mentors in the Czech branch of "Big Brother, Big Sister" (BBBS CZ) deal with the challenges they experience in their personal relationships with young people, identifying different coping styles and drawing conclusions that apply to practice.

The article by *Anke Freuwört, Manuela Westphal, Monika Alisch and Jens Vogler* draws upon the empirically well-proven proposition that everyday forms of social support play a highly significant role in immigrants' participation in and integration into the host society. It is often unclear, however, exactly what kind of support they potentially provide. With this in mind, the authors investigate the potential for friendship and solidarity found in personal relationships between immigrants and non-immigrants who meet in everyday life or through professionally initiated sponsorship projects. They succeed in demonstrating that such relationships offer great potential for support that includes forms of "solidary involvement" directed *at* immigrants, but that solidary relationships in the form of friendship only develop when individual interests and needs are *mutually* acknowledged.

4. Internal matters: the 5-year milestone has been reached

This issue sees the *Annual Review of Social Work and Social Pedagogy in Austria (OeJS)* celebrate its fifth anniversary! The feedback from academia shows the editorial team – Birgit Bütow, Ulrike Loch, Eberhard Raithelhuber, Hannelore Reicher and Stephan Sting – that the journal has now become well established, especially in German-speaking countries. We believe that this is partly down to our unique profile: the OeJS is published in German and English, and both in print and open access, taking the "gold route", which means that all articles are freely accessible from the date of publication; our authors do not even have to pay any publication charges (APCs). As a result, we have so far been able to publish without being tied

to the publication strategies of any individual universities or publishing houses. The quality of the articles is ensured by means of an international double-blind peer review and by professional appraisals by the editors.

We would like to take this opportunity to thank everyone who has played a role in this success! The open access publication fund at the University of Salzburg's library funds our model by paying an annual base sum. Additional grants by individual universities enable us to cover the cost of translations and proofreading, meaning that content such as our editorials and all German-language abstracts can also be published in English. We also thank Frank Engelhardt and the Beltz Juventa imprint for joining us in this open-access pilot project, and the scientific advisory board and the many academic peers who have reviewed the contributions and offered further recommendations. Their involvement has played a significant part in our success. Our heartfelt thanks also to the editorial assistants at the Salzburg office; currently Christina Stubler and before her Jens Rüdiger and Christina Maierhofer-Reisch. Many thanks, in addition, to Manuela Brandstetter, who was a real asset to the work of our editorial group as a "permanent guest" from issues one to five.

Last but not least, we would like to thank you, the reader, for your interest in and feedback on the journal. We hope you enjoy reading and discussing the topics and published articles described here!

Eberhard Raithelhuber, Petra Bauer, Ulrike Loch and Stephan Sting

Bibliography

Alarcón, X., Bobowik, M., & Prieto-Flores, Ò. (2021). Mentoring for Improving the Self-Esteem, Resilience, and Hope of Unaccompanied Migrant Youth in the Barcelona Metropolitan Area. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *18*(10), 5210.

Alarcón, X., & Prieto-Flores, Ò. (2021). Transnational family ties and networks of support for unaccompanied immigrant youths in Spain: The role of youth mentoring in Barcelona. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *128*, 106–140.

Allan, G. (2008). Flexibility, friendship, and family. *Personal Relationships*, *15*(1), 1–16.

Allan, G. (2006). Social Networks and Personal Communities. In A. L. Vangelisti & D. Perlman (Eds.), *Cambridge handbooks in psychology. The Cambridge handbook of personal relationships* (pp. 657–671). Cambridge University Press.

Allan, G. (2001). Personal relationships in late modernity. *Personal Relationships*, *8*(3), 325–339.

Beresford, P. (2011). Radical social work and service users: A crucial connection. In M. Lavalette (Ed.), *Radical social work today: Social work at the crossroads* (pp. 95–114). Policy Press.

Beresford, P., & Croft, S. (2019). Reprioritising Social Work Practice. Towards a Critical Reconnection of the Personal and the Social. In S. A. Webb (Ed.), *The Routledge handbook of critical social work* (pp. 511–522). Routledge.

Cowden, S., & Singh, G. (2007). The 'User': Friend, Foe or Fetish? A Critical Exploration of User Involvement in Health and Social Care. *Critical Social Policy*, *27*(1), 5–23.

Dewe, B., & Otto, H.-U. (2018). Professionalität. In H.-U. Otto, H. Thiersch, R. Treptow & H. Ziegler (eds.), *Handbuch Soziale Arbeit* (pp. 1203–1213). Reinhardt.

Dolgon, C. (2022). The 2021 SSSP Presidential Address: Revolutionary Sociology – Truth, Healing, Reparations, and Restructuring. *Social Problems*, *96*(4), 887–902.

Ebermann, T., & Zehetner, B. (2010). Einleitung. In Frauen beraten Frauen (eds.), *In Anerkennung der Differenz. Feministische Beratung und Psychotherapie* (pp. 9–17). Psychosozial.

Gahleitner, Silke (2017). *Soziale Arbeit als Beziehungsprofession. Bindung, Beziehung und Einbettung professionell ermöglichen*. Beltz Juventa.

Gängler, H. (2013). Nach dem sozialpädagogischen Jahrhundert. In M. Schilling, H. Gängler, I. Züchner & W. Thole (eds.), *Soziale Arbeit quo vadis?* (pp. 12–18). Beltz Juventa.

Gergen, K. J. (2009). *Relational being: Beyond self and community*. Oxford University Press.

Gergen, K. J. (1995). Postmodernism as a humanism. *Humanistic Psychologist*, *23*(1), 71–78.

Grothe, J. (2008). *Psychosoziale Beratung und kulturelle Differenz: Eine qualitative Studie zur Kommunikation zwischen einheimischen Beratern und Migranten aus der ehemaligen Sowjetunion*. Kovač.

Gubrium, J. F. (1993). For a Cautious Naturalism. In G. Miller & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Constructionist Controversies: Issues in Social Problems Theory* (pp. 55–68). Aldine de Gruyter.

Kaufmann, F.-X. (2012). Konzept und Formen sozialer Intervention. In G. Albrecht & A. Groenemeyer (Eds.), *Handbuch soziale Probleme. Vols. 1 and 2* (pp. 1285–1305). VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Kooiman, J. (2002). Societal Governance. In I. Katenhusen & W. Lamping (Eds.), *Demokratien in Europa: Der Einfluss der europäischen Integration auf Wandel, Leistungsfähigkeit und neue Konturen des demokratischen Verfassungsstaates* (pp. 229–250). Leske und Budrich.

Lavalette, M. (2019). Popular Social Work. In S. A. Webb (Ed.), *Routledge international handbooks. The Routledge handbook of critical social work* (pp. 536–548). Routledge.

Lavalette, M., & Ioakimidis, V. (Eds.). (2011). *Social Work in Extremis: Lessons for social work internationally*. Bristol University Press.

Lenz, K., & Nestmann, F. (2009). Persönliche Beziehungen. Eine Einleitung. In K. Lenz & F. Nestmann (Eds.), *Handbuch persönliche Beziehungen* (pp. 9–25). Juventa-Verlag.

Loch, Ulrike (2016). *Kinderschutz mit psychisch kranken Eltern*. Ethnografie im Jugendamt. Beltz Juventa.

Loch, Ulrike, & Schulze, Heidrun (2009). Von der interpretativen Theoriebildung zur narrativ reflexiven Beratung in der Sozialen Arbeit. Neue praxis *39*(5), 467–481.

May, V., & Nordqvist, P. (2019). Introducing a sociology of personal life. In V. May & P. Nordqvist (Eds.), *Sociology of personal life (2nd edition)* (pp. 5–15). Macmillan International Higher Education; Red Globe Press.

Mewes, J. (2010). *Ungleiche Netzwerke – Vernetzte Ungleichheit*. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Mies, M. (1987). Methodische Postulate zur Frauenforschung – dargestellt am Beispiel der Gewalt gegen Frauen. *Beiträge zur feministischen Theorie und Praxis*, *1*(1), 41–63.

Oechler, M. (2009). *Dienstleistungsqualität in der Sozialen Arbeit: Eine rhetorische Modernisierung*. VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Oevermann, U. (1996). Theoretische Skizze einer revidierten Theorie professionalisierten Handelns. In A. Combe & W. Helsper (eds.), *Pädagogische Professionalität* (pp. 70–183). Suhrkamp.

Petko, D. (2006). Nähe und Distanz in der Sozialpädagogischen Familienhilfe. In M. Dörr & B. Müller (Eds.), *Nähe und Distanz: Ein Spannungsfeld pädagogischer Professionalität* (pp. 159–174). Juventa Verlag.

Raithelhuber, E. (2023, in print). The rise of mentoring for social inclusion in Europe. Connecting personal relationships, programs, and policy in research. In S. Bollig & L. Groß (Eds.), *Doing and making family in, with and through education and social work*. transcript Verlag.

Raithelhuber, E. (2019). 'If We Want, They Help Us in Any Way': How 'Unaccompanied Refugee Minors' Experience Mentoring Relationships. *European Journal of Social Work*, *24*(2), 251–266.

Raithelhuber, E., Trott, L., & Piemontese, S. (2019). "Substantial social participation" for young people on the move? Welfare institutions and the personal life of marginalized youth in transition. In Kommission Sozialpädagogik (Ed.), *Teilhabe durch_in_trotz Sozialpädagogik* (pp. 146–158). Beltz Juventa.

Rosa, H. (2019). *Resonanz*. Suhrkamp.

Scherl, M., & Fritz, J. (2010). Einleitung. In Frauen beraten Frauen (eds.), *In Anerkennung der Differenz. Feministische Beratung und Psychotherapie* (pp. 21–39). Psychosozial.

Schwarte, L. (2020). Was für ein Tier ist der Mensch? *Paragrana* 29 (1), 114–122.

Seichter, S. (2014). Pädagogische Beziehungsformen. In C. Wulf & J. Zirfas (eds.), *Handbuch Pädagogische Anthropologie* (pp. 227–236). Springer VS.

Sievers, B., Thomas, S., & Zeller, M. (Eds.). (2015). *Jugendhilfe – und dann? Zur Gestaltung der Übergänge junger Erwachsener aus stationären Erziehungshilfen. Ein Arbeitsbuch*. IGFH-Eigenverlag.

Smart, C. (2007). *Personal life: New directions in sociological thinking*. Polity Press.

Sousa, J. W. (2022). Relationship as resistance: partnership and vivencia in participatory action research. In R. Stoecker & A. Falcón (Eds.), *Handbook on Participatory Action Research and Community Development* (pp. 396–416). Edward Elgar.

Sting, S. (2016). Bildung im sozialen Raum. Überlegungen zu einer sozialpädagogischen Konzeption von Bildung. *Zeitschrift für Sozialpädagogik*, 14 (2), 118–139.

Sting, S., & Groinig, M. (2020). Care Leaver und Familie. In J. Ecarius & A. Schierbaum (Eds.), *Handbuch Familie* (pp. 1–19). Springer Fachmedien Wiesbaden.

Van Ewijk, H. (2009). *European social policy and social work. Citizenship-based social work*. Routledge.

Wulf, C. (2020). Den Menschen neu denken im Anthropozän. *Paragrana* 29 (1), 13–35.