Calculated Risk Taking in Youth Welfare Practice in the Multicultural Environment of the City of Vienna

Heinz Wilfing
Susanne Wurm

University of Applied Sciences of Social Work in Urban Areas
Vienna

September 2009

TABLE OF CONTENT

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper is designed to explore first, the practical application of risk assessment criteria of youth welfare workers and related social care professions working on a team with children and youth at risk of neglect, abuse and abandonment in the multicultural environment of the city of Vienna. A second aspect of the study focuses on an analysis of the personal perception of risk of the youth welfare workers employed by the city of Vienna and private charities, especially in how far they feel at risk themselves, which risks the young people are exposed to and how the professionals perceive the risk for society when "open social work" methods are applied.

A legitimate purpose of social work is to minimize risks and control violence and anti-social behaviour by individuals and social groups. A utilization concept of social work may however

include a certain kind of risk behaviour as a methodological approach under the conditions of monitoring, scientific evaluation and control.

The study is based on an in-depth investigation of the risk assessment catalogues and practice standards applied by the Vienna Youth Welfare Office, city organisations and private charities and on an analysis of thirteen qualitative interviews with professionals involved in various areas of youth work in Vienna, which enables the authors of the study to compare their approaches to the practical application of calculated risk-taking, risk assessment criteria and good practice codes.

This study might be of interest to social workers and an interested public in Europe because Vienna today is dealing with risk in youth welfare work in a multicultural urban environment in a different way, compared to other big multicultural cities in Europe. Since the last turn of the century around 1900, when Vienna was one of the most multicultural cities in Europe with a share of immigrants of above 60 per cent, there has been a paradigmatic sea change from a paternalistic and restrictive approach of forced assimilation via a custodial and protective child welfare approach to today's liberal, open and more relaxed approach of calculated risk-taking in child welfare and integration. In the past youth welfare focused on prophylactic measures and quick regulatory intervention, whereas today the model of calculated risk taking involves more freedom of decision making of the individuals within their specific cultural environments. This method is accompanied by preventive measures, but is less patriarchal in the sense that the city's officials know best what is good for its citizens.

Youth workers have developed solution-oriented strategies to address ethical dilemmas of one ethical conflict clashing with another. Vienna boasts several initiatives to help children to live along the lines of their individual cultural traditions and at the same time to enable them to participate in the life of the city. They illustrate the pragmatic concept of "interculturality" embraced in Vienna, such as an arrangement of the city of Vienna, by which with municipal support the Islamic Religious Community in Austria IGGiÖ provides "Islamic swimming suits" (Burkinis) for girls of orthodox Muslim families, so that these girls can participate in the obligatory swimming lessons in Viennese schools.

Youth welfare workers see the need for special risk management programmes to reduce bullying and victimization in secondary schools in Vienna with a high percentage of pupils with a migratory background. Moreover, migrant parents are encouraged to participate in such programmes to improve pro-social behaviour. These special programmes include calculated "risky" adventure sports activities and experiential adventure education, which offer conditions of specific cultural "push and pull" effects for young migrants within their social space. In this framework a crucial problem is refusal of social care by migrant families, who want to exclude liberal influences and are afraid of losing honour by accepting social workers´ interventions. So "low adherence" or "bad compliance" of such families is a challenge and a form of risk for social workers.

Tolerance and a high degree of freedom in dealing with ways of life that deviate from the indigenous Central European lifestyle, family structure and set of values involves a certain amount of risk-taking in youth welfare. This study therefore investigates the thin line that youth welfare workers in Vienna are walking between allowing the maximum amount of freedom in raising children and at the same time safe-guarding socio-cultural values. An example of the conscious and well-planned attempts of the city of Vienna to guarantee a truly mixed multicultural environment and to prevent the development of ethnic ghettos is the integrative social housing policy of the city, which is designed to reduce the risk of social and

ethnic unrest. Risk and uncertainty are managed by the introduction of new concepts for professional open youth work practice, which are based on first, cultural fairness, second, on juveniles` capacity to sublimate destructive traits by controlled risky behaviour - a culture-free social behaviour does not exist - and third, on the attempt of reducing obstacles rooted in different cultural experiences. This research evaluates the effectiveness of such a concept applied in practice and its relevance for youth work.

In allowing a higher degree of autonomy than for instance in the United Kingdom, the Viennese youth workers have to cope with a higher degree of risk. This policy of conscious risk-taking in exchange for a more peaceful and harmonious living together and much less radicalisation, violence and anti-social behaviour among youth than in cities of Great Britain or France has its disadvantages, too. At least in one community, namely the Turkish one, a slowed-down process of adaptation to the European lifestyle among Turkish children is noticeable. Their significant lack of knowledge of the German language and their unsatisfactory performance at school have just been confirmed by the 2008 Pisa Study, where Turkish children abroad perform the worst in Austria, followed by Denmark and Germany. Children of different migratory background integrate in the Viennese society in different ways, which has implications for the risk assessment of youth welfare workers and an impact on their position as social workers in the respective communities, whether they are seen as a risk or as an asset. For example, a recent survey in Vienna has shown that school children of Serbian or Bosnian descent usually do have indigenous Austrian friends, whereas school children with a Turkish ethnic background do not have any Austrian friends, which hinders their integration.

Neglect, other forms of child abuse and physically dangerous behaviour can be viewed as a special "honour-related risk". What a Muslim father may consider his right or even duty in terms of making his wife and children behave correctly from his point of view, will be often seen as violence within the family and a cause of battered wife syndrome. "Revenge" or "defence of honour" are accepted as a cultural duty by some immigrant families, where a certain form of orthodox religious practice has a strong impact on every day life. For social workers it is often difficult to assess to what extent a "risk-including" social work approach is applicable in order to overcome the oppression of girls and women.

Various reports point out psycho-social differences with regard to addiction as a special risk among young migrants and indigenous youth. As a result these findings have consequences for the social work approach. Young people's substance abuse varies according to cultural background, socio-economic status and level of education. A system of social and occupational measures offers the chance to apply the calculated risk-taking approach in recreation and leisure time activities.

This specific approach to risk-taking, namely calculated risk-taking, in youth work in Vienna firstly has its roots in the special mentality of the Viennese, who tend to avoid open confrontation and prefer taking a certain amount of risk to establishing a rigid regulatory framework. Secondly, it is based on the long tradition of innovative pedagogical, psychological and psychoanalytical theorists and practitioners who have found in Vienna a fertile ground for developing their theories. Finally, this special approach is the result of a negative historical experience of forced assimilation, split personalities, xenophobia and political and racial radicalisation in the first half of the 20th century. This historical legacy explains the reluctance of city authorities and the Youth Welfare Office to put pressure on immigrants to integrate and to impose strict rules to promote integration of immigrant children in Vienna.

Fin-de-siècle Vienna around 1900 was characterised by the ambivalence of a multi-lingual international aspect on the one hand and an increasing nationalism on the other hand. This atmosphere formed the basis for the vibrant cultural climate and philosophic and scientific innovations, but also for cultural and political clashes and a strong pressure to assimilate. The resulting nationalistic pressure and the lack of integration policies led to a disorientation of immigrants and split personalities. This uprooting caused an increase in violence, militancy and nationalistic radicalisation on the one hand and an excessive adaptation of immigrants who tried to overcompensate and adopt the majority nation excessively on the other hand. It is the intention of today's youth welfare policy to contain the risk of disorientation and overcompensation and respond to the multicultural environment of Vienna in the 21st century with calculated risk-taking and the maximum possible cultural and personal autonomy and freedom of the individual within his/her ethnic setting.

Vienna and the whole of Austria, for instance, offer uniform Islamic religious instruction in German, supported by the state. Already in 1912 Islam had become an official religion in the Austro-Hungarian Empire with the same status and the same rights as the dominant Catholic Church and with elected representatives. In 1979 the Islamic community – Muslims constitute approximately 10 per cent of the population of Vienna today - organised itself on the basis of the law of 1912 and in 1998 a Teacher Training College for Islamic Religious Instruction was founded in Vienna, which is a model institution in Europe. In 2006 this college was turned into a pedagogical university.

Another example of social work intervention to reduce risk would be the urban office of "Immediate Measures", which sends social workers and related social care specialists to a site of conflict and negotiates rules and regulations with parties concerned, as for instance rules for public barbecue sites, so that Turkish and indigenous Viennese do not fall out about diverse barbecue habits. This "Acute Intervention Unit" is one of the many efficient social work tools of the city to solve conflicts among citizens. These are just two examples where Vienna, a city where one quarter of the population has a migratory background, has taken the lead in Europe in dealing with risk in youth work in a multicultural environment in a special way.

Vienna further boasts an avant-garde role in the provision of mental health programs. Prior to 1985 dissatisfaction with the traditional custodial mental health service was based on some inadequacies. First, increasing numbers of persons were being treated in long-term custodial psychiatric hospitals. Established in the 19th century as the psychiatric centre of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, Vienna´s psychiatric hospital "Am Steinhof", was the largest single psychiatric unit of Europe. Due to a reduced need for lengthy hospitalization nowadays, it was scaled down in space and capacity and is now called "Otto Wagner" hospital after its famous "art nouveau" architect. Second, social workers commented critically on a certain social class inequity in the delivery of mental health service. Persons of lower socio-economic status and especially young people were being underserved. Only those received full and sufficient treatment that sought care from private therapists and could afford it. The reform led to the setting up of small psychiatric units in general hospitals. Furthermore a big outpatient service (Psychosozialer Dienst) was established, associated with concepts of prevention, consultation, social networks and crisis intervention. The psycho-biological and the psycho-dynamic approach are still important, but the concept of clinical social work now is more concerned with the interface between the person and the social system. This "person in environment" concept of social work may bee seen as quite a challenge for calculated risk-taking. Psychoses, personality disorders, alcoholism and drug addiction or some forms of sexual

deviation are of course often causative factors of high-risk behaviour. So the clinical social worker's caseload includes persons from a high-risk population with multiple mental and social problems, among them an increasing number of very young people, which requires highly qualified risk assessment and risk management.

2. YOUTH WELFARE & THE YOUNG IN VIENNA 1900-1934

2.1. Social Structure of the Multicultural City around 1900

Multiple identities as a result of immigration were a matter of fact in fin-de-siècle Vienna, which was enforced by increased mobility, urbanisation, industrialisation and modernisation. Why were these symptoms more obvious in Vienna than in other big European cities that also experienced ethnical and cultural "strangeness"? First of all, the share of "strangers" in Vienna around 1900 was 60 per cent as compared to Paris with 6.3 per cent. In spite of the fact that most of these "immigrants" had migrated from various parts of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the pressure of assimilation forced the newcomers to constantly move between different cultural patterns and values which reinforced their already extensive disorientation. On top of that, the social strata in Vienna were much differentiated as well and were characterised by very different cultural rules, lifestyles and ways of expressing themselves.[1]

But this proximity of different cultures also led to a form of multiculturalism that was linked to specific social strata. The multiculturality that was often embodied in one person was a stimulus for the specific creativity of fin-de-siècle Vienna. One person could choose from various cultural traditions, so that cultural elements from very different traditions were melted and linked in totally new ways. The production of music, literature and art of this time is an indication of that process of melting and linking multiple identities in new ways. Another aspect contributed to the vibrancy of the cultural climate: the marginalisation of peoples, especially the Jews, because marginalised people have a highly creative potential. Individuals, who in themselves carry multiple identities, move in several cultures at the same time and are not geared towards one culture only, so they move effortlessly between cultures and can link elements and produce something totally innovative and new from this synthesis. But in the densely populated city of Vienna this cultural and ethnical plurality was also felt as a threat, because the "strangeness " could be seen and felt daily, which created the fear that soon one could be moved from a socially dominant position to an inferior position in this society. Therefore, in order to better define the "strangeness", artificial "strangenesses" were constructed and exaggerated to be able to rid oneself from them as soon as one had properly defined them. Despite so many cultural contrasts a common way of communication developed among certain communities and social classes. Although belonging to one culture, one participated in other cultures as well. This often resulted in bi- or multi-linguality. Many people spoke more than one "mother tongue" and thought in more than one language. So reducing the national identity to only one language was an artificial construction. Especially in cities like Vienna many inhabitants were multilingual.[2] Many of these mechanisms of 1900 can be observed once more in 21st century Vienna.

In the course of the 19th century the population of Vienna grew six times, including an extension of the territory of the city. As the Habsburg monarchy was a multi-national state,

---

[1] Müller-Funk, Wolfgang, Kakanien revisited, A. Francke Vlg. 2002, p.14-32
[2] Csáky, Moritz, „Was man Nation und Rasse heißt, sind Ergebnisse und keine Ursachen". Zur Konstruktion kollektiver Identitäten in Zentraleuropa, in: Kakanien revisted, p. 33-49

millions of people of different nationality moved around. This resulted in cultural differences compared to other European cities and led to special problems of integration of masses of people in the fast growing capital city. In Vienna migration was not only regional migration from the country, but long-distance migration from other parts of the empire. Already in 1857 the Viennese population consisted to 50 per cent of persons not born in the city. These included Germans, Czechs, Moravians, Slovaks, Jews, Hungarians, Poles, Ruthenes, Slovenes, Croats, Serbs, Italians, Romanians, Greeks, Armenians, etc. Most of the Jews in Vienna saw themselves as Germans, others as Poles or Turks. Around 1900 only 38 per cent of the population were citizens of Vienna, 62 per cent had „alien status". Only the Viennese citizenship secured an undisturbed stay in the city. Aliens were threatened with eviction in case of poverty or small offences against the law.

A large part of the immigrants were Jews, who were defined as a religious group in statistics of those days. In 1867 Jews were awarded full and equal civil rights in the Habsburg monarchy and after that date tens of thousands of Jews left the northern and eastern parts of the empire in the direction of Vienna and Budapest. In 1910 Budapest was the biggest Jewish town in Europe with 23.1 per cent of the population and Vienna was the second biggest with 8.6 per cent. The multilingual character of Vienna stood out against the predominantly monolingual urban cultures of Berlin, Paris or London. Language statistics of these times cannot be used as a basis for analysis in Vienna because in the census of 1900 the Viennese Mayor Karl Lueger stated that whoever did not declare German as the language he/she used all the time would not be considered for any job in the city's public sector. Landlords threatened to evict Czech speaking tenants and foster children were taken away from foster parents who spoke Czech with them. It was politically vital for Lueger to keep the numbers of German speakers high. The statistics of the 1850s and 1860s still spoke of the colourful picture of the different peoples of the empire as a mirror of the nations of the empire, whereas half a century later the statistics were manipulated to create a majority of German-speakers in Vienna. This is a reflection of the nationality conflict that worsened in the course of the second half of the century.

Since the 1880s politics and everyday life were dominated by nationalism and nationalistic conflicts in Vienna. Yet the multinational dynastic Habsburg Empire continued to exist and to protect all peoples and religions. All the bigger minority groups in the city had developed an infra-structural network. In Vienna there were dozens of Jewish and Czech associations, Jewish newspapers, a Hungarian and a Croatian newspaper and several Czech newspapers. Furthermore there were a number of national mutual loan societies, a Czech private school system, a Polish school, Jewish Thora schools and many charities to support even small communities of migrants from remote rural regions and villages. These societies, associations, clubs and charities compensated the dispersed living conditions because the minorities in the crammed two-million capital city could not crowd together in special areas. Contrary to US immigration cities like New York there were no secluded quarters of the different nationalities in Vienna. Yet for instance Czechs and Slovaks often moved in with their compatriots, when they arrived in Vienna. Via such informal channels they learned about a bed to rent, a job etc. This kind of informal national infrastructure was of immense importance for the immigrants who had to cope with language problems and the totally new way of life in a big city. All this of course reinforced the community spirit of the immigrants. So many of the immigrants carried their rural traditions to Vienna and continued them there, like wedding celebrations, Sunday entertainment, social contact, neighbourhood support and solidarity. Therefore in some districts minorities did crowd together, such as the brick workers on the Wienerberg or Czech communities in the workers' districts of Hernals and Ottakring. Especially the religious orthodox Jews kept in close contact and continued their traditions and languages – Jiddish,

Polish and Hungarian – in parts of Leopoldstadt and Brigittenau. This changed the character of these two districts, where you could distinguish several aspects of the eastern Jewish "Stedtl", such as special kosher shops, closed on Saturdays, and women with wigs. The segregation of the Jewish orthodox minority was the most prominent of all minorities.

2.2 Identity Crises and Assimilation

Assimilation had become the core principle of Viennese policy. After the collapse of the Habsburg Empire and during the time of establishing national states after 1918, this trend was continued. This resulted in the loss of national identity and the melting with the majority culture. Three steps of assimilation can be identified: cultural, social and finally structural assimilation. In fin-de-siècle Vienna there was a strong pressure to assimilate, but there was no integration policy because the dominant political parties were nationalistic. The Viennese Social Democrat of Czech descent Franz Tomasek pointed out that the children of the poor Czech menial workers were neglected because they were left alone while their parents worked in factories, they spoke a bastard language, neither proper Czech nor proper German, they could not follow the teachers at school because their knowledge of German was too less developed and they were ashamed of their parents and their background. All this contributed to a high percentage of Czech names on the court lists of accused and sentenced young people. On the other hand there were many Czechs in the Christian Socialist Party who acted even more nationalistic and were more "German" than their German counterparts. A report of 1910 speaks of the theory of disorientation of immigrants in the first phase of immigration. Reception in the receiving country and possibilities for development decide how long this phase lasts. This uprooting may cause an increase in violence and militancy, especially among the young. Another phenomenon was "excessive adaptation", meaning that immigrants try to overcompensate and adopt the majority nation excessively and become nationalistic in their newly adopted national identity. The trend that the second and third generation of immigrants in Vienna assimilated excessively and acted more patriotically than the indigenous population can be traced back to the first half of the 19th century. For instance assimilated Czechs were especially anti-Semitic. In the First Austrian Republic after 1918 many "Germanised" their Czech names.[3]

2.3. Working Class Family Structure & Living Conditions of Children

In the context of this paper the living conditions of children of low-income families, very often with a migratory background, in Vienna around 1900 are of special interest. Statistical data of the time just before the outbreak of the First World War still show a considerable amount of children below the age of 14 at work in Vienna[4]. This seems proof of a very slow retreat of child labour in Vienna. The phasing out of child labour was more due to a change in work technology than social protest. Another important impetus for the end of child labour in Vienna was the introduction of the "Reichsvolksschulgesetz" of 1869. This law extended compulsory schooling from six to eight years. Although it has to be noted that the law stipulated several exceptions because especially working class families depended on the income of the children and a loss of this income would have jeopardised their existence. Many working class parents considered obligatory school attendance a nuisance and refused

---

[3] John, Michael, Mosaik oder Schmelztiegel? Bemerkungen zu Migration, Multikulturalität und Assimilation im Zeitalter Kaiser Franz Josephs, BHS2/91, p. 40-50
[4] Ehmer, Josef, Familienstruktur und Arbeitsorganisation im frühindustriellen Wien, p.200

to have the state prescribe what they were supposed to do with their children. Most considered three years of schooling as sufficient. In the late 19th century compliance with obligatory school attendance was the exception rather than the rule in Vienna. Before the turn of the century the authorities executed more rigid supervision, so that by 1900 the start of work for Viennese working class children had been postponed to 12 - 14 years of age.

A special characteristic of the Viennese working class family at the end of the 19th century was the absence of a complex family and household constellation, a concentration on the nuclear family and the lack of a network of relatives. In this way the Viennese working class family was radically different from family structures in other parts of industrialised Europe and North America., where complex family networks and a dense social structure, which supported the individual, could be found. Very often also not related members were included in the family structure, such as tenants. "It takes a whole village to raise one child" is an African saying that stresses the importance of an extended social network. The lack of such a complex social structure in Viennese working class families caused a special risk for children in Vienna. This singular development was caused by four factors. Firstly, the above mentioned wave of migration of single individuals, not whole families to Vienna; secondly, the Viennese structure of small- and medium-sized industry, which did not promote the employment of relatives in the same firm; thirdly, the lack of a tradition of a Viennese working class family and finally, the high percentage of persons living without their families in Vienna. It seems that the lack of family bonds among Viennese workers fostered the tendency to establish a complex social network of working class organisations to compensate the absence of family support. From the end of the 19th century until 1934 a highly sophisticated organisational structure of working class organisations was established that covered every aspect of working class life. This high concentration of social relationships inside the working class culture corresponded with a growing distance to other social strata in Vienna. [5]

The care of children at risk, mainly of poverty and neglect, was taken over, especially in Vienna, by a variety of youth welfare institutions and some private charities. By the end of the 1920s numerable communal child care services had been established in Vienna and several private, religious and political child care facilities operated there as well. A large number of working class children for instance took their meals regularly in one of these institutions free of charge or for a small fee. The Catholic Church played a prominent role in the feeding of poor working class families. Increasingly also the schools became a source of support for poor families as they offered free of charge school meals for deprived children. Poor children further acquired nourishment at school through begging, accepting small food presents and secretly collecting scraps from peers. So, for deprived children school was not just a place of relaxation from work, of learning and social interaction with other children, but also a place that contributed to their physical survival. In this way children not only learned to cope with the risk of hunger and deprivation, but developed a specific class consciousness. An interesting aspect is the role of teachers who adopted a caring role for children in a moral and economic way by organising free food, clothing and Christmas presents for needy children and sometimes even taking those children home for lunch or dinner. By attending school, children at risk of poverty encountered new sources of subsidy, not just formally via free school meals, but also informally. Anthony Hall ranked school teachers among the functionally specific patrons operating from within positions of authority. [6]

---

[5] Ehmer, Josef, Familienstruktur und Arbeitsorganisation im frühindustriellen Wien, p.224-225
[6] Papathanassiou, Maria, Zwischen Arbeit, Spiel und Schule. Die ökonomische Funktion der Kinder ärmerer Schichten in Österreich 1880-1939, p.179-180

In an 1883 amendment of the "Reichsvolksschulgesetz" of 1869, mentioned above, the various provisions for exemption from obligatory school attendance were even extended. This was due to pressure from various groups opposing the eight-year obligatory school attendance, such as the Catholic Church, which had to cede school supervision to state authorities and the farmers, small businesses and low-income groups who relied on the work force of children. Girls were much more at risk of missing out on school education, even without official exemption from attendance, as they were recruited for house work and the care for younger siblings more often than boys. According to a statistic of 1898/99 girls in Vienna missed school on 28.5 days per year on average and boys only 22.9 days.[7] Parents, and especially foster parents of children born out of wedlock, preferred paying a small fine or even spending a few days in prison to foregoing the work force of the child. At the second Austrian Child Protection Congress of 1913 it was claimed by some speakers that farmers sent their children to school, but not their foster children. Missing school and hard labour of course had serious effects on the children's performance at school. Some teachers showed understanding for these circumstances, others not. Some teachers as members of teacher associations and in publications for teachers raised awareness for the issue of official school exemptions and child labour and carried out small surveys on the living conditions of their pupils. Especially teachers, organised in teacher associations, and with support from the school reform policy of Otto Glöckl, who enjoyed a more favourable financial and social position in the 1920s in Vienna, became activists against school exemption and child labour. Already in 1896 a group of young Social Democratic teachers demanded in a conceptual paper the abolishment of child labour and at the second Austrian Child Protection Congress 1913 the Social Democratic school teachers Isidor Kraus and Theodor Neumann demanded an end to all general and individual exemptions from school attendance.

The mostly negative attitude of working class parents to school attendance and their disinterest towards their children's performance at school cannot just be explained by the bad economic situation of the families and the need for the child's income, but also the fear of a loss of authority of the fathers. This is another aspect that can be observed in today's Vienna again with respect to mostly Turkish immigrant families. Only politically active Social Democratic fathers and skilled workers promoted the school education of their children. An increase in interest in their children's achievements at school can be registered in Vienna in the context of the spread of the working class organisation and Glöckel's school reform in Vienna, which introduced parents' associations. A boost in prestige of school attendance among workers dates back to the end of the First World War and the reform movements of "Red Vienna". Parents then saw school as an institution with a disciplinary function and offering a basic education for daily life.

The worsening economic crisis in the 1930s contributed to an increase in begging children in Vienna. Babies were carried around to stress the economic need of begging women for example. But also children themselves were sent into the streets of Vienna to beg, which was not a new phenomenon. On the contrary, begging children made up half of the beggars since the late 18th century because they were viewed by the authorities as the worthy poor in justified need of support and by that were "excused" and not harassed by the authorities. Yet, legislation for the protection of children since the end of the 19th century tried to eradicate the phenomenon of professional and systematic child begging and was by and large successful. Another aspect of risk-taking of children with respect to the violation of the law was petty crimes they committed, such as pick pocketing and small thefts. Especially during the First

---

[7] Papathanassiou, Maria, Zwischen Arbeit, Spiel und Schule. Die ökonomische Funktion der Kinder ärmerer Schichten in Österreich 1880-1939, p.238

World War and the interwar years theft by children constituted a vital form of income for Viennese working class families. Small thefts of food, coal, wood, etc. were considered morally acceptable and a form of redistribution of income to the Viennese poor. Why children were used to commit those petty crimes and why children were put at risk in this way can be explained by the fact that they could expect lighter punishment, such as beatings, when they were caught. Furthermore small theft was a taboo for adults, and finally, children could remain undetected more often as they were small and nimble. A very similar phenomenon can be observed today with respect to Romanian and Bulgarian children brought to Vienna to beg and pickpocket, mostly in underground stations. "Kinderdrehscheibe" is an organisation operating in Vienna today, which successfully tries to reintegrate those children in their home countries.

In low-income underclass families children were brought up under a strict regime of their parents: obedience, discipline, work and thrift dominated their upbringing. In general the children's work and their consumption habits were strictly checked. Even if parents showed some interest in the performance of their children at school, which was rare, this was seen more in the context of disciplining the children at school. As the percentage of unwed mothers was very high in Vienna, many children were given away to foster parents, often in the country, where they were used as cheap source of labour. Many foster children spent their childhood in different foster families. Economic motives were in the foreground when a foster child was taken into a family, not so much emotional or social ones. They constituted a source of income for the foster families, as cheap labour on the one hand and/or the money compensation paid for foster care by the mother or the municipality. Foster care was not always characterised by exploitation of the foster children, in a few cases foster children also experienced emotional warmth and care, especially if the foster parents were of the rural underclass themselves.[8]

In 1911 youngsters destroyed street lanterns, burst into schools and fought street battles with the police in the suburbs of Hernals and Ottakring. In front of the schools they burnt the books and registers they had thrown out of the classroom windows. There was destruction everywhere. The grammar school on Schuhmeierplatz was stormed, looted and burnt. Children and youths aged 12 to 14 occupied other schools in this area and threw stones at the police and the army. The riots started after a price rise of bread and the press spoke of the "boys' revolution". The police reports stress that the youngsters were supported by the local population. The youths were from the lowest rung of the social ladder, children of unskilled labourers, the unemployed and servants. They had no future; a poverty-stricken life awaited them, just like the ones of their parents. They were migrants to the city from Bohemia and Moravia with no prospects of social advancement and had to face widespread rejection and racism among the indigenous Viennese population. Their living conditions were abysmal. Beds were rented by the hour. The living areas of the rich and the poor were segregated in so far as the rich lived inside the "Ring", the middle class inside the "Gürtel" and the migrants, unemployed temporal workers, prostitutes, etc. in the suburbs. The centre and the periphery were separated by an invisible barrier, similar to the situation in Paris today.

The young rioters in Vienna spoke "Rotwelsch", a special slang of social outcasts with lots of Jiddish expressions, similar to "verlan" the youth slang of the French banlieues today. In both cases the rioters were very young, often still children and their aggression was directed against public institutions and symbols of everyday consumer culture. In both cases prospects of social advancement were lacking and strict segregation of living areas was prevalent. They

---

[8] Papathanassiou, Maria, Zwischen Arbeit, Spiel und Schule. Die ökonomische Funktion der Kinder ärmerer Schichten in Österreich 1880-1939, p.232-234

both felt discriminated against and their self esteem was destroyed. Their social group was neither represented publicly nor politically nor in the media. A male macho code of honour guided the rioters. Their parents were no role models because they were "losers", they had achieved nothing. There was no political or religious background to the revolts, just "nothing to lose".

2.4. Social Legislation of "Red Vienna" 1923-1933: Family and Child Welfare[9]

Three areas of social reform dominate the impressive and internationally renowned social policy of "Red Vienna": communal social welfare, social housing and the Viennese cultural and educational policy. Mayor Karl Seitz together with the city councillors Hugo Breitner for Finance, Julius Tandler for Social Welfare and Otto Glöckel for Education started a huge reform project from 1923 to 1933 that was admired elsewhere. Breitner introduced a new tax system for Vienna that taxed people progressively according to their expenditure. A high tax was levied on "consumption of luxury and pleasure", such as champagne, night clubs, dancing halls, horse-race betting or theatres. The proceeds from this new tax were used for building a new welfare and healthcare system and for constructing affordable and comfortable housing and schools.[10] Several big community housing estates built during this time still exist, nowadays inhabited by tenants with a migration background as well as by indigenous Viennese. Many people, however, opposed this "housing construction tax" and Hugo Breitner was subject to very aggressive political attacks, partly with an anti-Semitic tendency.

Concerning social welfare, the ambitious aim of the Social Democrats was to prevent poverty in the first place and to introduce a welfare system that would supplement the federal state social insurance. Julius Tandler, university professor and dean and as city councillor responsible for welfare, put the emphasis of reform on the family. He introduced medical care at all schools, counselling and healthcare centres for mothers and babies, extended hospitals and built homes for invalids, neglected children and the old. His measures effectively reduced infant mortality. A large number of kindergartens, day care centres for school children, public baths and public swimming pools for children were constructed. Only figures can illustrate the huge achievement of "Red Vienna" in this area: Tandler doubled the number of children's homes run by the city, some of which of excellent architectural quality. His celebrated quip "Who builds palaces for children, tears down the walls of prisons" is still quoted as an inscription on a famous youth welfare building. He also encountered a lot of criticism because children were not only taken from their families in case of abuse but also because of homelessness, severe illness and long-term joblessness of the parents. Youth homes of that time were more or less like juvenile prisons. Together with some progressive educators, such as Aichhorn and Lazar, Tandler initiated a reform that aimed at providing a comprehensive programme of education and professional training. A primary intention was to abolish educational violence and to offer the young inmates the chance to work skilfully and creatively within an equal opportunity framework, enabling them to earn their livelihood honestly and independently later on. This was an early example of the application of a quite high but calculated risk-taking method. Some of the young people did of course misuse their new freedom and were not able to take advantage of the equal opportunities set-up. Lying, stealing, truancy and even cases of rape took place. These events triggered aggressive attacks

---

[9] Mir uns zieht die neue Zeit. Arbeiterkultur in Österreich 1918-1938, p. 68-79
[10] Achleitner, Friedrich, Siedlungshaus und Volkswohnpalast, In: Riedl, Joachim (ed.), Wien, Stadt der Juden, p. 97-116

against Tandler by the right-wing politicians of the opposition, who spoke out in favour of a punitive approach rather than of Tandler´s understanding approach. This social policy discussion is of current interest even today.[11]

Tandler further increased the number of kindergartens run by the city from 20 in 1913 to 113 in 1931. Additionally, day-care centres were established to care for children of working mothers after school in the afternoon. The city of Vienna organised free lunches for school children and recreational holidays for urban children and youth in the country. A specially installed dental clinic checked the school children's teeth and health and taught them hygiene. Since 1927 every mother received a "Baby Parcel" of baby clothes and linen, and the city's counselling centres for mothers regularly checked the children's health. Furthermore Tandler introduced counselling centres for couples advising them on family planning, for alcoholics - in the temperance movement he was rather dogmatic - and people with psychic problems. Vienna's expenditure on welfare increased to around 15 per cent of annual expenditures due to these welfare measures and several emergency support programmes.

Only since 1920 one can speak of a coordinated welfare and health policy of the city of Vienna – contrary to former imperial repressions of the "poor police" and philanthropical attempts of individuals. This new welfare and health policy of the city of Vienna was carried out against political trends in the rest of the country. The systemic approach of Julius Tandler established a network of institutions in connection with an economic strategy that went against squandering of productivity either via luxury or unproductive capital or unemployment or asocial behaviour. Investment in welfare for the individual was geared towards one goal: cost reduction, efficiency and social productivity for the city as a whole.

The Viennese welfare system rested on four pillars: First, the society is obliged, even without legal regulations, to provide help to the needy; second, individual help can only be provided in connection with family welfare; third, a constructive welfare system is a preventive measure; and fourth, welfare has to be provided from the cradle to the grave.[12]

It is difficult to imagine the situation of destitution the reformers had to tackle: e.g. only 50 per cent of the workers lived in a flat of their own, a quarter of married women had no flats of their own; they had to live with their parents or rent a bed. 50 per cent of the workers lived in a room that was bedroom, living room and kitchen in one together with two to three other people. Only 86 per cent had their own bed and only 18 per cent had water, gas and electricity in their flats. So the aim of social welfare and health policy was first of all to improve the living conditions of the workers so that they could survive and go to work. The family stood at the centre of the new policy, and above all the child. First steps were taken to decrease child mortality and tuberculosis. Tandler could boast a decline of the death rate by 25 per cent and of infant mortality by half from pre-war levels. Tuberculosis was only somewhat reduced and constituted the highest health risk among school children. A comprehensive system of aid to children was put in force. Municipal bathing facilities including swimming pools, with some 9 million visitors in 1927 were important attainments in public hygiene. Prophylactic medical examinations for children and adults in municipal clinics reached the number of 123,000 in 1932, and welfare workers carried out 91,000 home visits in the same year.[13]

---

[11] Sablik, Karl, Julius Tandler. Mediziner und Sozialreformer, Schendl. Wien 1983
[12] Pirhofer, Gottfried, Sozial-und Gesundheitspolitik im Roten Wien, In: Riedel, Joachim (ed.), Wien, Stadt der Juden, p. 117-128
[13] Gruber, Helmut, Red Vienna. Experiment in Working-Class Culture 1919-1934, OUP 1991, p.66

Under Tandler the welfare department pursued an overall policy of population politics. Its aim was the improvement of the quality and the quantity of the Viennese population. This involved the duty and power of the public authority to intervene in the life of the family. Under the auspices of the Public Welfare Office, a number of institutions were created to assist the family, which was considered the foundation of a healthy population. Where the family failed to provide optimal conditions for the children, the Public Welfare Office was to provide temporary or alternative care. The municipality was by that empowered to remove children from their parents, if it judged them deficient in their capability and responsibility to raise their children. Tandler maintained that the family was sacred for him, but only as long as it fulfilled its vital function of nurturing children properly. While claiming to raise the moral standards of the family, the Public Welfare Office acted in a supervisory capacity with the argument of preventive welfare. The methods employed combined persuasion with compulsion and voluntary cooperation with judicial force.

The municipal family supervision was organised virtually from conception to reaching adulthood, when the cycle started once more, when the former child became a parent. The most controversial institution was the marriage consultation clinic, established in 1922. Its function was to advise couples about to marry on their sexual health, genetic deficits, hereditary illnesses and the prospects of producing healthy children. The clinic even offered to issue certificates to prospective partners that they were free of disabilities, syphilis and tuberculosis. By that the administration hoped to improve the health and "quality" of the population. Few Viennese took up this offer because they saw it as an improper intrusion into their private lives, so the clinic had to close after 10 years. Tandler's intention of using the clinic for population selection purposes met with a lot of opposition, especially the possible legal abuse of the case records. The clinic refused to have anything to do with sex counselling and birth control advice, which would have made it really attractive for the young Viennese population. In this respect it was a rather conservative institution. By this time Wilhelm Reich had already established free of charge sex counselling agencies in Berlin, influenced by his concept of sexual release and orgasm as criteria of health functions. Yet, the marriage consultation clinic was the only institution of the Public Welfare Office that failed; all the other agencies concerned with the life cycle of the Viennese family were successful in achieving their aims.

A medical aspect purveyed the whole welfare policy of the city of Vienna, as Julius Tandler was a medical doctor and a professor of anatomy. The measures were centrally organised by the Public Welfare Office and ranged from family welfare, support in cash and kind, child support, educational counselling to the building of public kindergartens and day care centres, youth welfare institutions and children's homes. Some of the measures were rather harsh, seen from today's point of view, yet on the other end of the scale of child care there were public kindergartens which were all organised along the lines of Maria Montessori's pedagogical methods. A tightly-knit structure of welfare and control was developed. Health policy measures started with marriage counselling centres, continued with pregnancy counselling centres and training courses for mothers. With the birth of the child the young mothers' welfare set in. Midwives were obliged to register every birth at the city's welfare office. In the hospitals social workers of the city were employed to register any mother and/or child that might be in need of welfare. Then the welfare system continued its support with mother counselling centres. At the start of the cycle of public control of the family there were the municipal hospitals, in which 83 per cent of all births took place. Social workers in the maternity wards registered the newborn child, arranged for a subsequent home visit and recommended regular attendance at the mother's consultation clinics for further assistance in infant care. By 1927 there were already 34 such clinics established in Vienna. There doctors

advised mothers on breast feeding, child care, hygiene, and resident social workers followed up these instructions with home visits to see how the mother was coping. This was just one way in which the Public Welfare Office found entry into the homes of Viennese families in order to observe and judge the adequacy of child care. By this authoritative measure risk was supposed to be minimised. The right to regular inspections of families receiving any kind of municipal aid was statutory, and by that gave the office a great deal of power, not only in dealing with individual cases, but in setting standards of family health and behaviour. The distribution of the above mentioned "Baby Parcel" from the city of Vienna to all newborn children by social workers offered another route to the Public Welfare Office to look into homes, which were otherwise outside its reach because they did not receive municipal assistance.[14]

In 1921 the city council claimed guardianship over children born out of wedlock, foster children and those in institutional care. Following this group, which was subject to the most intense form of control, came the group of all those who received public assistance in any form. Such families were subject to regular visits by social workers who kept close watch on the standards of housekeeping, cleanliness, food preparation and family relations. Adolescents with problems of any kind were referred to youth consultation clinics. Families were also subject to home visits when the school doctor reported some health problems or because of court proceedings, such as eviction. In this case the family was considered in "troubled circumstances". Kindergartens and after-school youth centres worked hand in hand with the Public Welfare Office. Special attention was paid to the professional training of social workers. They were exclusively women, because Tandler believed that female empathy was necessary for the emotional demands of the job. This tradition might partly explain the prevalence of women in Vienna's Youth Welfare Office even today. However Tandler considered female social workers more as assistants of medical doctors than as specially qualified professionals, which caused conflicts between him and the social workers' professional association already in those days. Nowadays Tandler´s concept is still recognised as a remarkable progress in social welfare history, though from today`s point of view his biologistic approach and some of his eugenic tendencies have to be viewed critically. Of course, he could not have foreseen to what extent such ideas were abused only a few years later. He died in 1936, so he did not live to see the "Third Reich's" policies.

As soon as a social worker making a home visit concluded that the family did not meet the municipality's standard of a well-working family environment, a report was made to the children's diagnostic service, an observation centre under the direction of the child psychologist Charlotte Bühler. It was to decide on the fate of children from risky environments. A court order was issued requiring the parents to surrender the child to the diagnostic service, which had to make a recommendation within four weeks, which then had the force of law. The child was either put into the care of foster parents, sent to a children's home or correctional institution, admitted to a hospital, or was returned to the parents. Among the reasons for remanding a child to the diagnostic centre, hospital stay of the carer, poverty and eviction and homelessness ranked first, followed by neglect and delinquency. Moral hazards and parental conflict were rarely mentioned as a risk.[15] From oral histories of working class families and newsletters of the time it is known that the low-income families in Vienna viewed public welfare as a rather coercive system, which made social workers appear as hostile government agents. They tended to look down upon the poor, the unemployed and the addicts and seemed to be convinced that they were in need of the full measure of social control to bring them back to normal standards. The judgement of what was respectable,

---

[14] Gruber, Helmut, Red Vienna. Experiment in Working-Class Culture 1919-1934, OUP 1991, p.69
[15] Gruber, Helmut, Red Vienna. Experiment in Working-Class Culture 1919-1934, OUP 1991, p.71

orderly and decent on the part of the social worker was seen as rather arbitrary. Very often the fact of being poor, which was very widespread in Vienna at the time of the Great Depression, was sufficient cause to put a family on the at-risk register and to refer the children to the diagnostic service. Sometimes the transfer of the child to the centre resembled a police raid, with social worker and bailiff arriving unexpectedly to reduce the amount of parental resistance. The municipality's system of social control included child welfare, health care, the police and judiciary, as well as pedagogical institutions, such as kindergartens and after-school centres. The most intense application of the forces of social control took place in the largest municipal housing projects, where branches of many of the welfare agencies were located, such as mothers' and youth consultation clinics, kindergartens, health clinics, etc. But the large municipal housing projects can also be seen as the most convenient location for the provision of these social services.

The astonishing result of this enormous reform effort was the creation of a social metropolis with rather simple measures in just a few years, in a time of need and economic crisis. The quality of the result, the brevity of the experiment, the pressure under which it was carried out and the destruction from outside after 1934 make any later criticism look unfair. The social policy of Red Vienna was basically positive and aimed at opening up chances for everyone. Julius Tandler saw the social worker as someone who fulfilled a task in the name of the society and had to administer public funds. The receiver of welfare had a right to welfare and his/her relationship to the social worker was one of rights and duties. The general public had the obligation to provide welfare, and especially welfare to the young. Because the more you invested in the young, the healthier they were, the better prepared for life, the better educated they were, the more money could later be saved on prisons and lunatic asylums, Tandler said.

2.5. Educational Reforms of "Red Vienna"

The cultural and educational policy was dedicated to pedagogical experiments. The city of Vienna carried out six model experiments for a general school for all 10- to 14-year olds in order to break up the educational privileges of the well-to-do. The educational policy for primary schools heavily relied on the principle of the then new and revolutionary Montessori concepts: free provision of schoolbooks and equipment, creative and practice-oriented learning. The Pedagogical Institute was founded to train teachers and link teacher training to scientific research. The competing schools of experimental psychology, individual psychology and psychoanalysis were represented there. Vienna developed into the centre for developmental psychology and developmental therapy with the foundation of the Viennese Psychological Institute, where Charlotte and Karl Bühler worked.

In the 1920s and early 1930s a gigantic educational and pedagogical movement characterised Vienna which could not be found in any other city in those days. Ellen Kay called Vienna "the capital city of the child". In this place a variety of educational and pedagogical concepts were developed, public and private initiatives and institutions abounded. All this would not have been possible without the development of Freud's psychoanalysis and Alfred Adler's "psychology of the individual" Education was seen as a complex concept and had the highest priority, not only in the family, schools and day care centres, but also in cultural, sports and leisure clubs and party organisations.

The interesting characteristic of the Viennese school reform is its closeness to Alfred Adler`s individual psychology. It was better suited to the Social Democratic idea of education than Freud's psychoanalysis as it stressed the ideal of the "community man", is characterised by

unfailing optimism in education and an uncomplicated therapeutical method of explaining, teaching and counselling. Psychoanalysis on the other hand stresses the individual and is characterised by a rather sceptical stance towards the state and the community. Psychoanalytical methods developed in Vienna outside municipal institutions, except for August Aichhorn, who was an educational counsellor at the Public Welfare Office. One of the earliest and most important psychoanalytical initiatives was the children's home "Baumgarten" (1919/20), a boarding school for 300 war orphans between 3 and 16 years of age, initiated by Siegfried Bernfeld, a psychoanalyst and pedagogue. Anna Freud later said that that was the first attempt at applying psychoanalytical principles to education. Unfortunately the children's home had to be closed after nine months because of lack of funds. August Aichhorn also founded a home for young people immediately after the war in Oberhollabrunn. It was a radical reform-pedagogical project for the peaceful and violence-free education of neglected young people. He further set up a centre for education and youth counselling of the Vienna Psychoanalytical Society which he headed until 1938. It was a kind of psychoanalytical out-patient clinic, where children and young people with various problems concerning education, school and job were treated free of charge. Lots of experts worked there as counsellors. This society further promoted the training of teachers and educators, offered courses and published a magazine for psychoanalytical pedagogy, initiated by Anna Freud. Even Ludwig Wittgenstein was involved in the pedagogical reform project. He published a dictionary for primary schools in 1926.[16]

In order to improve the health of the working class children and adults sports clubs were founded and in Vienna many new public sports facilities were established, especially beaches on the Danube, swimming pools and sports grounds. Apart from famous outdoor and indoor swimming pools like the Amalienbad and the Kongressbad, several sports grounds were constructed, and the big Prater stadium. The cultural society "Children's Friends" (Kinderfreunde) tried to promote the education of the workers' children at an early age. They based their educational concepts on new pedagogical models, rejecting any kind of beating, promoted solidarity; parents and educators were supposed to co-operate. In 1929 the organisation had 100,540 members and concentrated on charitable child care, child welfare, holidays for children and group activities for the older ones modelled on the scouts.

In addition to the home, the traditional place for socialization of working-class children and youth in Vienna was the street, providing a variety of urban niches free of adult supervision and control. The reformers characterised the street as a place of disorder, promiscuity and decadence which posed a serious risk and from which the young had to be rescued. The rough and ready activities in which groups of children engaged in their "territories" was believed to lead to criminality. For boys this meant stealing and for girls the danger of prostitution.[17] It was claimed then that the proletarian family lacked the capacity for the proper rearing of the young generation due to inadequate living conditions, high divorce rates and the situation of both parents working outside the home. Interestingly enough, also adult authoritarianism was quoted as a reason why the working class family should not be entrusted with the education of their children. Therefore programmes for children and youth were at the centre of the reform programmes of Red Vienna. The main function of the above mentioned cultural society "Children's Friends" was to counteract the prevalent street socialization and to eliminate the involved risks for the six- to ten-year olds. Furthermore various supplementary educational facilities and programmes were initiated with the focus on after-school centres in which homework was done under supervision and community responsibility was instilled. The strict

[16] Göllner, Renate, Hauptstadt des Kindes und des Antisemitismus In: Riedl, Joachim (ed), Wien, Stadt der Juden, p. 129-143
[17] Gruber, Helmut, Red Vienna. Experiment in Working-Class Culture 1919-1934, OUP 1991, p.165

discipline and regimentation in these centres discouraged some children and especially older boys from attending them. "The Red Falcons" for children aged ten to fourteen were an adaptation of the regimented Boy Scouts with strict discipline, personal "purity" and obedience to the leader. By 1932 the organisation in Vienna numbered 6,000 boys. The Socialist Worker Youth was designed for the fourteen- to twenty-one-year olds and the guiding principles were abstinence, sexual sublimation and Puritanism. Their activities concentrated on sports and education. The Vienna organisation numbered around 10,500 young people in 1932. To prevent the risks of alcoholism, smoking, early parenthood and crime, the programme was somewhat directed towards the postponement of adulthood, which might have been appropriate for middle-class youth still involved in formal education, but was unrealistic for working-class youth who were considered as adults at their work places from the age of fourteen on.

The idea of the reformers was that the function of parents was reduced to providing emotional ties and tenderness at home, for all other aspects of youth socialisation experts were provided. The whole effort of youth socialisation was revolutionary in the way that it brought together both sexes in various activities and even encouraged the "natural association" of the sexes. This was virtually unknown in Catholic Austria before. Yet the arising questions of sexuality were generally avoided or treated in an idealised way with an emphasis on postponement of gratification. The effectiveness of the concentration on sexual purity and sublimation was very limited. The main remedy for transgressions was sports, offered in the belief that physical health would lead to mental health. The sexes participated together in all sorts of activities, but no sexual interaction was expected to take place. This naiveté, Puritanism and blindness led to fierce critique of the whole youth programme, especially by Wilhelm Reich and Ernst Fischer, and was termed "the crisis of youth" between 1930 and 1933.[18] Reich claimed that the dominant bourgeois culture used sexual repression of the workers as a means of subjugation and the poverty of worker sexuality from abstinence to brutality is maintained by the conditions under which workers are forced to live. For youth, sexual deprivation led to a crisis which the socialist organisations evaded and even aggravated. Reich was of the opinion that attempts to sublimate youthful sexuality through sports and other activities left youth with sexual conflicts that frequently led to psychological disturbances and by that to new risks. Ernst Fischer charged that the socialist youth organisations added to the repressive mechanisms against youthful sexuality already existing in the dominant culture. Sports could not be a substitute for "all that was missing", especially not for the sexual drives of the young. Some socialist women, such as the sociologist Käthe Leichter and the psychologist Sophie Lazarsfeld seemed to agree with this criticism, although not openly.

Despite all these efforts at concealment, working-class children and youth were well-informed about sex, they talked about it rarely and then without reserve or shame. For working-class children sexuality was a matter-of-fact part of their daily lives and formed part of their experience from earliest years on. The source for sexual knowledge was the family and the street. Young people continually dipped back in later years into their street experiences, or these simply flowed along with maturation. They built on many improvised strategies for survival based on "street wisdom" learned earlier. Sexual relations there were as unsupervised as was the rest of their lives, when they were unemployed for instance.

It was the domain of birth control where working-class youth and adults needed most support, but this was denied by the social organisations. The methods of contraception available to workers were primitive, unreliable and dangerous. Abortion was practised widely as a form of

---

[18] Gruber, Helmut, Red Vienna. Experiment in Working-Class Culture 1919-1934, OUP 1991, p.169

birth control and posed an enormous risk for girls and young women as a threat to their health and a breach of the law (article 144). Yet Viennese judges seemed to have balked at punishing women who had undertaken these desperate acts. Only midwives or "Makers of Angels" with prior arrest or conviction records were given prison sentences of two to nine months in the years 1921-32. Clearly, life in cramped quarters and the resulting lack of privacy, put limits on sexual expressiveness and the use of contraceptives, apart from the costs. Under the typical conditions of working-class life of the young, not the feared promiscuity, but a sexual life of deprivation was the norm. In combination with widespread unemployment this situation led to a prevalence of psychological depression.[19]

3. CALCULATED RISK TAKING IN VIENNESE YOUTH WELFARE TODAY. AN ANALYSIS OF 13 QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS[20]

This research paper tries to find out how the approach to youth work has developed in Vienna over time and what the present perception is. In the course of two months (May to June 2009) thirteen topic-related interviews with various professionals involved in youth work in Vienna were conducted. The five main areas covered were youth welfare, forms of therapeutic and preventive youth work in schools, social work with young criminals, youth work in the context of addiction and finally, leisure time pedagogy and youth work. The interviewees work with children and young people in different public and private organisations. The scope of the interviews covered departments of the Vienna Youth Welfare Office, such as placement outside the family for children and youth at risk from 3 to 18 years of age. Furthermore psychotherapeutical work at kindergartens and schools for the age groups of 4 -17 for healthy as well as physically or mentally handicapped children formed part of the research analysis, as well as crime prevention work at schools and anti-aggression training provided by "Neustart". This organisation also works with young people with a criminal record from the age of 14 to 21. Representatives of the Vienna police force do not only act as mediators for young people with a criminal record or in danger of becoming criminal, they are also involved in prevention programmes at schools, which might be extended to individual mediation in families. Another important research focus was put on youth work with young addicts in the age groups of 16 to 21 and even up to 30 at the "Anton Proksch Institute" and "Dialog10", where a multi-professional team provides drug prevention and drug treatment services for young people from 12 to 18. "Ganslwirt", a low-threshold service provider for young drug addicts without any age limit was included in the study to add to the aspect of young people at risk of addiction. The harm reduction and risk reduction concept of this agency does not request

---

[19] Gruber, Helmut, Red Vienna. Experiment in Working-Class Culture 1919-1934, OUP 1991, p.176-177
[20] Based on interviews with:
Feuerstein, Lukas, social pedagogue (4 May 2009)
Sohlmann, Sigrid, psychotherapist (5 May 2009)
Löffelmann, Stefan, social worker & adventure pedagogue (8 May 2009)
Mayer, Werner, social pedagogue (11 May 2009)
Haiderer, Martin, social worker (11 May 2009)
Krones, Sabine, social worker & social manager (11 May 2009)
Neuburg, Florian, youth worker & sociology student (11 May 2009)
Salnikova, Natalja, youth worker (13 May 2009)
Koss, Christoph, social worker, jurist & mediator (14 May 2009)
Ertl, Martina, social worker (28 May 2009)
Bauer-Sebek, Brigitte, psychologist (5 June 2009)
Haltmayer, Hans, medical doctor (9 June 2009)
Sonvilla, Michael, policeman & mediator (16 June 2009)

abstinence; on the contrary, it aims at a safer use approach, among others through a needle exchange programme. Organisations which try to provide a haven for young people who have fallen out of the system were also examined, such as the youth shelter "a-way" of the Caritas that caters for young people between 14 and 18 with a possible extension until the age of 21. Leisure time pedagogical aspects were covered as well in the form of "wienXtra", the city's comprehensive leisure time programme for all Viennese children from 0-13 and their families. The city of Vienna not only finances a wide range of leisure time activities for all school children in Vienna free of charge or at a very low rate, the city also subsidises a variety of private charities catering for the young. As part of the leisure time focus professionals working in the independent youth centre "cult.café" for young people from 10-19 and in youth groups of the Viennese protestant community from 13 until 16 were interviewed.

The interviewees were asked five questions during these narrative interviews. First, on the forms of risk young people are exposed to and whether risky behaviour is used as a preventive tool in youth work and second, whether diversity- and gender-specific risk behaviour can be discerned. The third question focused on the definition of "open youth work" and the risks youth workers are exposed to in their work with children and young people. The fourth aspect of the interviews analysed the use and position of volunteers in youth work. Finally the risk for the community and the society as such in calculated risk-taking in youth work was investigated.

3.1. "Calculated Risk-Taking": An Analysis of Concepts in Youth Work that Use Risky Behaviour as a Preventive Tool

Professionals of the Vienna Youth Welfare Office working with abused and neglected children and youth who have to be placed outside the family see as the biggest risk for the young people that the administration does not act according to the desires of the young people. Their perceptions of reality and their desires often clash with the regulatory frame work of youth welfare and consequently their wishes can often not be fulfilled. In this environment calculated risk-taking cannot be applied as a preventive tool at all, as this would pose the danger of further traumatising already severely abused or neglected children. Children are only placed outside the family in Vienna, if the child's safety is no longer guaranteed at home and they are in the care of the system as short as possible and as long as necessary. The good practice catalogue is very extensive and rigid so that there is very little room for personal responsibility of the youth workers. Social work is strictly differentiated from social pedagogy and it is the task of social work to help the families cope with their problems in cooperation with the city's service institutions. The first aim is to help the families help themselves and mobilise all the internal resources. It is a fact that children and young people are becoming more psychotic and uncontrollable, also placements outside the family are slightly increasing despite the official aim of keeping the children inside the family as long as it is justifiable, which might also be seen as a form of calculated risk-taking: giving the family environment priority and avoiding institutional care if in any way possible.

An interesting aspect in youth welfare is the aging group of professionals, of teachers, social workers and pedagogues who work with young people in Vienna. They are on average between 40 and 45 and they set the standards of what is considered a "normal family". They were brought up at a time when continuity and stability were of utmost importance, but the family and the social structure have totally changed in the last 10 to 20 years. The concept of family and the social structure on which Vienna's youth welfare is based does not exist any more. Professionals and above all the regulatory framework have difficulties to adapt to these

new situations and to cope with them, and this is one of the reasons why more and more children come to the attention of the authorities. Interestingly, the family situation of many of the professionals in youth welfare also does not meet the standards of the "normal family" as defined in the legal and regulatory framework. As the paradigms have changed, a new attitude towards youth work would be required before new methods are devised. The attitudes of the professionals, the methods and the familial reality do not go together any longer, the current concept of what a "normal family" is like is simply wrong. A wider concept of "social systems" instead of the classical family should be the reference point. Children should not be placed outside because the flat is too small or the single mother cannot earn enough. It cannot be denied that today education is a female obligation much more than it ever was and that fewer women are married or are living in a permanent partnership, which results in increasing poverty rates of single mothers. Shared flats, where children at risk are placed should replace the traditional family, which is basically a wrong concept today. The traditional family does not exist any more, so it cannot be considered a standard, yet it still has priority in social work. A systemic re-orientation and new aims for youth welfare in Vienna would be urgently needed, but there is a lack of participation and willingness to reform. These new aims should address questions such as, what is a relationship today, when is the assistance of the welfare office really desirable and needed, what should an innovative shared flat with eight children placed outside the family look like. There is a lot of potential in Vienna's youth welfare, if you consider that 580 social pedagogues and around 160 social workers work with families in Vienna's Youth Welfare Office, it just has to be exploited.

In psychotherapeutical work with children risky behaviour is used preventively but mostly in one-to-one situations, not in a classroom environment of so-called "mosaic classes" with a high degree of anti-social behaviour and ADHD (attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder) children because the resulting aggression levels might be uncontrollable. The psychotherapist observes a considerable increase in aggression and violence at schools in Vienna, especially psychical violence, such as bullying, but also extortion, stealing and physical violence, especially in secondary schools for the 10-14 year-olds and "Polytechnischen Lehrgängen" for the 15 to 16 year-olds, which are schools for the less gifted children. But also in the more challenging schools that prepare children for the A-levels such incidents increase. In this way children and young people are exposed to a certain degree of risk at school, of being bullied, hurt and even raped. To combat these risks weekly therapeutical sessions are scheduled in such "mosaic classes". In one-to-one sessions with unbalanced children calculated risk-taking methods in the form of provoking reactions of the children are applied in order to create an environment where the psychotherapist is asking too much of the children, either physically or mentally, so that he/she can then work with their reactions. Another form of calculated risk-taking in this field of work is the refusal to give in to the wishes of the children and then to work with the reactions.

In their work with young criminals probation services do not use calculated risk-taking as a method. Too much risk-taking has already happened in the lives of these young people; the professionals attempt to contain their risk-taking. They do not see themselves as working in a social-pedagogical institution, but in a probation service. The mediators and specialists in prevention of the police force focus on personal responsibility in their trainings. They do not tell the young people: "You shall not steal!" because they know they might steal and they probably have already stolen, but they point to what happens if they steal and in that way they try to point out to the young people that it is always their personal decision how they act.

Drug prevention and drug treatment of young people has developed from a rigidly controlled set-up to an approach of calculated risk-taking in so far as young clients are offered an environment where they can acquire risk competences. This is extremely important because we all live in a world full of risks and not in a risk-free environment. This is especially true for young people who have come in contact with illegal drugs. In industrialised countries a clear differentiation of white – black, true – false, safe – dangerous has been established in the minds of people. If the traffic light shows green it is safe to cross the road, if it is red it is dangerous, I do not have to check myself. Where the amber light has been abolished, there is not even a phase in between, where I have to make sure whether it is still safe or not for me to walk or drive. The amber light still leaves room for personal responsibility. The traffic lights can be seen as an image for the approach to drug prevention in Vienna. Young people with drug problems need secure areas, as everyone does, where they can withdraw to, where they can feel safe and can think. Then there is the so-called "death zone", the area of extreme danger. In between there is an important "grey area", where experiences are made, where they can tread on new grounds, and that is risky, but not necessarily life-threatening. In this area a lot of learning takes place, an exchange between the secure sphere and the spheres where experiences are made. Here the professionals encounter circles of learning of young people, there is integration, there is regression, and they have to cope with these ups and downs in their youth work. Calculated risk-taking means that young people can make experiences in areas where they are not stable and secure. The professional offers safe havens, but if he/she does not allow calculated risk-taking, the transfer of experiences to an independent and secure life outside just does not happen. The professional creates an environment and prepares a situation where the young client can make decisions, where his/her personal responsibility is called for: shall he/she act in this way or not? So in this way professionals do use calculated risk-taking as a preventive tool to enable clients to cope with their addiction independently and self-reliably. The professional consciously allows the client to enter into a process, where he/she steps on new ground and has to make a decision independently. In this way the client is offered a more or less safe experience with a follow-up self-reflection process. The social worker accompanies the client in many areas, where they both move on highly risky territory. Consequently there has to be a trade-off between the possibility for the client to make a risky experience and the safety for the social worker to minimise the danger. In drug therapy clients experience many restrictions, such as no mobile phones, no pocket money, no passes, which constitute a problem for the clients but are therapeutically of utmost importance. This restriction of the freedom of movement and communication is risky if the transfer to life after the drug therapy is not made. If you want the clients to change their lifestyle you have to create first a somewhat unstable and risky environment where they are forced to assess the situation and then make the right decisions. Originally many therapists felt it would be too risky to allow clients to make those experiences, to work with calculated risk-taking, but now professionals are trying to help the clients acquire risk competences. In drug prevention sessions even old rituals of ecstasy experienced within a group, supported by a group, such as in shamanism, might be addressed when making the distinction between experiencing ecstasy like in free climbing or Parkour sports, where young people can feel their bodies and calculate risks, as opposed to illicit drug consumption. But these methods can only be applied in prevention and not in drug treatment.

In private youth shelters, such as "a_way", there is very little regulation and few restrictions because these are the very last destinations for the young people when there is nowhere else to go to. Here the focus is on the young people. These centres form a last safety net for youth that has completely fallen out of the youth welfare system as they cannot be integrated in any pedagogical institution and have fled their familial surroundings. They are exposed to numerous risks and they bring these risks with them to these low-threshold institutions. Their

risk exposure is manifold; they succumb to various forms of illicit drug consumption, which results in manifold forms of risky psycho-social behaviour, such as violent aggression attacks of boys directed towards others or auto-aggression attacks of girls, such as eating disorders, scratching and various forms of drug abuse. In this setting the social worker has to assess what kind of risky behaviour is still tolerable and when is a medical intervention necessary.

The multi-professional team of "Dialog10" use calculated risk taking in their psycho-social work, not in their medical work, where this method would not be applicable. A completely controlled environment would not be desirable in this low-threshold drug prevention centre. On the contrary, personal responsibility is of utmost importance; e.g. that the clients keep their appointments, make contact to peer groups, act responsibly. The highest risk they are exposed to apart from their addiction is the return to old habits, cramped housing, old sets of friends and abusive partners. As this is a common trait the aim of the professionals is to strengthen the clients, so that they can cope with and survive under those conditions.

Risk reduction and harm reduction are at the centre of the day care centre for drug addicts "Ganslwirt" and not calculated risk-taking. They put the focus on the prevention of serious illnesses related to drug consumption and on information for the clients concerning the consequences and harms resulting from the use of various drugs and the involved health risks. They try to minimise the risks and provide the clients with basic services, such as washing their laundry, taking a shower, receiving medical care anonymously and free of charge. They further offer needle exchange, first aid trainings and brochures about the effects of drugs and diseases related to drug consumption, how to prevent overdoses, etc. No drug substitution therapy is offered at the "Ganslwirt" because this can never be low-threshold, but is subject to strict legal rules and regulations. All the measures are geared towards harm reduction and not drug prevention or withdrawal, so in a way they are taking the calculated risk of accepting the addiction of the clients and dealing with it.

In leisure time pedagogy and youth work calculated risk-taking is quite common, especially in sports activities, nature experiences and also in prevention programmes tackling drug consumption, aggressive behaviour, bullying, which are carried out in cooperation with the "Helpers Vienna", a consortium of all rescue and aid organisations, where a "Vienna Scout" diploma can be earned by the children. Many projects make use of calculated risk-taking methods in anti-aggression and drug prevention programmes and now increasingly in dealing with the dangers of electronic media and the illicit use of personal data of children and young people. The general concept of a social spatial approach includes a growing demand for transparency and participation. Leisure time activities must be placed in the wider context of the profound social changes and new challenges of the post-modern youth generation. A vocal and proactive youth is increasingly prepared to acquire public spaces by various social spatial methods and new forms of urban sports, like Parkour, i.e. "any obstacle, physical or mental, can be surpassed", free running, tricking or "buildering", i.e. climbing the outside of urban structures. The risk to be calculated is clear: Not all of these activities are in line with legal regulations. So some specific spatial youth work methods are required, such as common exploration of the urban social regions by youth workers and the "traceurs", a mobile needle project or a clique-raster to develop spatial awareness.[21]

The independent youth centre "cult.café" is the only one of Vienna's youth centres with a pronounced approach to calculated risk-taking. It is a low-threshold institution in an inner city district which offers alcohol (only beer and wine) and allows smoking from the age of 16 on

---

[21] Krisch, Richard, Sozialräumliche Methodik der Jugendarbeit, Juventa, Weinheim 2009

with ID check. After a trial phase the permission to sell alcohol and to smoke was included in the rules of the youth centre with the involvement of the young people in the decision making process. They call their approach "risflecting", a combination of risk and reflection, which should move away from the concept of protecting young people from risks towards young people's ability of coping with risks. Feedback after the trial phase showed an astonishingly low consumption of alcohol. 60 to 70 youths come to the centre every day and the over 16 year olds drank 1-2 alcoholic drinks a day. The introduction was discussed with the young people and many younger ones warned against the selling of alcohol because they feared the drunken behaviour of the older ones. Yet in a secret ballot they together with the youth workers voted for the introduction and after the trial phase in a second secret ballot the vast majority voted for alcohol consumption. Accompanying rules ware introduced, such as no alcohol sales between 16.00 and 18.00 and a limit of three drinks for everyone, but the youth workers reserve the right to decide whether a person would be served an alcoholic drink. Half a year after the introduction feedback showed that the atmosphere in the youth centre had not deteriorated. Youth workers feel that the new situation has provoked many discussions with young people about alcohol consumption and abuse and the older ones act as role models for the younger ones in limiting the consumption of alcohol. In this way the youth workers believe that they are closer to the every day reality in Vienna, where alcohol consumption in society is wide-spread. All the city's youth centres nevertheless strictly prohibit alcohol consumption and smoking. Visitors have to comply with those strict rules, also verbal abuse is prohibited. A police ban is pronounced if a young person breaks the rules of the youth centre.

In youth groups of religious organisations a certain form of risk-taking can be discerned as well, in the form of pedagogical leisure time activities, where a project framework is designed, but the outcome is open. The exposure to certain often unpleasant topics has priority over the preferences of the young people. They for instance first rejected the participation in a project dealing with death, but then appreciated the experience in the same way as the project "One day in the life of an asylum seeker".

3.2. Diversity- and Gender-Related Risk-Taking among Children and Young People

In most fields of youth work no distinct differentiation in risk-taking can be made between either boys and girls or children with and without migratory background. Experts in youth welfare see no significant differences in risky behaviour over time, but the exposure to risk has increased significantly in the way that young people have become an economic factor and a variety of products from Alco pops to mobiles are specifically designed for them and marketed to them. Another current tendency is the spread of anti-social behaviour because no one, not the parents, not the society, feels responsible for pointing out limits to some young people and enforcing rules. They often do not feel part of a social community, where solidarity is required and where everyone is responsible for the condition the community is in. If they are then caught in a criminal offence, their future is ruined, they have a criminal record; they cannot get an apprenticeship or a job. So these young people are doubly traumatised, by their parents and by society. The social workers and social pedagogues are too busy redefining their own position to act and their status in society is rather irrelevant, anyway.

Generally younger children are more risk-averse, whereas older children are more risk-prone and interested in probing into risky "adventures". Yet girls remain rather risk-averse also later on, while boys tend to take more risk and to act as "lonesome fighters" when growing up.

What can be seen concerning gender-diversity is a slight narrowing of the huge gap between boys and girls actively involved in violent acts. Aggressive behaviour of girls is approaching that of boys. "Neustart" launched the first anti-aggression group for girls. It's the first time that girls act aggressively and violently in public; the percentage is very low, nevertheless. 90 per cent of all assaults are still committed by boys and male youths. Another interesting new trend is the female leadership of mostly boy gangs, which shows a reversal of past tendencies, namely a new dependence of boys upon girls.

In drug therapy institutions for young people two thirds are male and one third female. The reason for this imbalance is the fact that boys find access to drug therapy institutions more easily than girls, probably due to the fact that boys get caught in criminal acts to finance their addiction while girls usually finance their drug consumption via illegal prostitution. In this way many of them are caught up in abusive relationships and have few possibilities to quit. Addicted girls are less visible to the authorities and aid organisations because it is easier for them to find lodgings in a relationship with a man who sexually exploits them and acts as their "protector". In general, girls in risky situations still tend to be auto-aggressive, while boys direct their aggressions towards others. Boys often have problems talking about the precarious conditions they live in, such as prostitution, and develop all kinds of repressive techniques to negate the squalid reality they live in. Girls tend to start taking drugs earlier than boys, but boys catch up with them later on. At an early age girls are much more risk-prone with respect to drugs than boys – a reversal of their general risk-averse behaviour. But considerably more young female drug users make use of preventive health measures than male youths. Although girls start their drug consumption earlier and much more intensively, they tend to stabilise later on, at least for some time, when they get pregnant for instance, while male youths become chronic heavy drug users to a higher degree.

Boys as well as girls like boasting about their binge drinking but in the youth centre "cult.café" still little alcohol is drunk, and definitely more by boys than by girls. This, of course, does not reflect the situation outside the youth centres, where young people are increasingly prone to binge drinking. When sex education projects are offered, girls tend to be much more interested in reducing sex-related risks and take matters much more seriously than boys.

Concerning diversity-related risk-taking what is observable is a different way of settling disputes among young people with a migratory background and indigenous youth. Varying from country to country, school boys with a Serbian, Albanian or Turkish background rather use knives in quarrels, whereas girls of Austrian descent sometimes act as gang leaders. Young male drug addicts with a migratory background carry an additional burden if they cannot meet the expectations of their culture's male role model. Sometimes misunderstandings and conflicts arise between them and female therapists. An additional problem for addicts is the fact that refugees and illegal immigrants cannot receive drug therapy. The percentage of young people with a migratory background among young drug addicts is approximately 12 per cent, much lower than their percentage in the Viennese population, which is one quarter. The reason for this low percentage might be the functioning social networks and the extended family, where the young people can seek refuge if they cannot stay with their parents any more. On the other hand they also lack knowledge and information about the services offered in the city. If the young people then decide to take advantage of the services of drug centres, they usually come in groups and they normally have other consumption patterns than indigenous youths. Intravenous drug use is not so wide spread among youths with a migratory background, they use other channels and they consume heroin nasally, which is less risky. Young people from former Yugoslavia find access to drug

prevention centres more easily; they often even come with their relatives, while among Turkish youths the information about centres is not widespread. "Dialog10" found out that Turkish youths even sold the telephone number of the institution, although it can be found in any directory. Turkish girls only find access to the centres when they have completely fallen out of their social network. The reason seems to be that for young Turks it is difficult to believe that these centres really guarantee anonymity and do not represent public authorities. Intravenous drug consumption is more wide-spread among migrants from the former Soviet Union; they also show a relatively high appetite for risk. The proportion of female young addicts is very low in this group, though.

Male youths with a migratory background might suffer under the burden of being the successor of the head of the family clan and in that way they get in conflict with the law. Especially Turkish male youths can sometimes not cope with the clash between a traditional life style demanded by the family and the modern way of life here. Even riskier is the situation of young illegal immigrants because they often earn their livelihood with criminal dealings and drug sales. They run an extremely high risk, especially if they are young Africans and if they are caught, they are either threatened with deportation or they do not receive any help after release from prison and they are not eligible for probation services. There seems to be little difference in the active application of arms between indigenous youths and youths with a migratory background according to the police, but youths with a migratory background tend to be more heavily armed, though, and use weapons more in threatening postures as part of their criminal repertoire.

The free of charge leisure time activities offered by the city of Vienna attract many children and young people with a migratory background, as well as the youth centres. Also here it is evident that boys are rather prone to risky behaviour in any form than girls. The Pakour scene in Vienna is dominated by boys and the city offers programmes to improve the risk competence of the boys who are active in this sport. The youth workers in the youth centre "cult.café" estimate that 80 per cent of the visitors are young people with a migratory background due to word-of-mouth propaganda and their larger circles of friends. Furthermore the drinks are much cheaper than anywhere else, apart from the alcoholic drinks which are considerably dearer. The youth workers in the youth centres have to deal with conflicts among different minorities and also with prejudices of indigenous youth, which pose a certain but manageable risk. The risk of alcohol abuse among youths of an Islamic background is substantially lower than among other young people.

3.3. Definition of "Open Youth Work"

In the interviews with the thirteen professionals in youth work "open youth work" was quite consistently defined as low-threshold access to services that put the client at the centre of attention. In youth welfare the opinion was voiced during the interviews that youth work also requires clear rules and clear limits with respect to educators and children because children feel lost in an open system which does not give them clear directions. Another aspect that was highlighted with regard to youth welfare was the need of children to create their own world without risks. They therefore need free spaces to make experiences, to test their ideas, these spaces are rare in a modern city, but social work does offer some of them through leisure time projects and activities. Without such free spaces young people have no chance to organise society in a new way according to their dreams and they might replace ideals with consumer goods, alcohol and drugs.

"Open child and youth work" further implies that offers of leisure time activities, projects and services are free of charge or very cheap and target groups that usually do not take up such activities; and that also gender-specific projects are offered. Open youth work means that the social workers take the side of the young, they represent their interests. Another important aspect of open youth work is the participation of the young clients; they should have a stake in the projects designed for them. The young people have a chance to be part of the decision making process if possible, to be able to participate and not just accept or consume.

In crime prevention and the work with criminal young people three preventive levels have to be differentiated: the primary and secondary preventive level is low-threshold open social work, the offer of leisure time activities to establish contacts with endangered youths, to build relationships via street work. So these two levels would represent open social work, whereas the tertiary preventive level sets in when a crime has already been committed and the state orders the probation service to interfere. But contrary to the much more regulatory and restrictive system of probation in the United Kingdom, the Austrian probation service can act confidentially, there is no link to the police and the authorities have to disclose relevant material to the probation service, not vice versa. For the police prevention is crucial. Open youth work for them means a reduction in the level of aggression and confrontation, a less restrictive way of dealing with young people. A more open and harmonious approach to youth has proved to be much more successful, no matter how aggressive they might have been before. Many of them have negative experiences with police procedures and police handling, so for the police specialists in prevention de-escalation is of the highest priority: with threatening gestures you do not achieve anything with these young people. On the contrary, they are astonished and relieved to encounter another sort of policeman or policewoman after all the negative experiences they have made, and it is interesting to see that young people long for contact persons in the police force and appreciate the link to the police. The combination of open social work and police work has been a success story since its introduction three years ago.

Open social work in drug centres was defined in the interviews as an approach, where the social workers try to receive the client in the situation where he/she is in right now, offer an easy and open access to the service institution, even without appointments, and demand little from the young client in the beginning of relationship building. The social worker has to accept the client's way of life and living conditions as they are and listen carefully to what the clients want and what they do not want. This kind of social work demands a lot of sensitivity and empathy on the part of the social worker; he/she should avoid any form of demanding and controlling approach at this stage. It is crucial to convey to the client that the social worker is interested in him/her as a person and that he/she can come to the centre any time, whatever might have happened.

Another aspect of open youth work is the open access to all activities without membership and the openness with respect to all religions and ethnicities and the lack of differentiation between boys and girls. The openness towards all kinds of topics that the young people might come up with is a further key issue of open youth work.

3.4. Risks Youth Workers Are Exposed to

The interviewees identified three main areas of risk they encounter in their youth work: first physical risks, second psychological risks and finally legal risks.

In youth welfare social workers often have to deal with very difficult, psychotic children and violent outbursts are common. On average one social worker or social pedagogue is responsible for four to five children and in this context situations do arise, where youth workers are physically attacked. In youth welfare the rules and regulations for procedures and the risk catalogues are very extensive, yet if you just stick to the rules at all times, this can impair the success of youth welfare work seriously, because first contact and a relationship have to be established with these severely traumatised children and youths. After the death of baby Luca and the accusations against the Youth Welfare Office in Tyrol, the body of rules and the catalogue of risk management have been further extended and now the placements outside the family are even more rigidly executed. The dilemma for the social workers is the current situation where a closed and heavily regulated system of administrative placements is opposed to the open and less regulated system of foster care and shared flats. This causes a lot of tensions and raises the demand for even more regulation to legally protect the social workers. Unfortunately, this development has resulted in the reverse effect, because you cannot improve systems by filling them up with rules and regulations and by that making them inflexible and inefficient. Every party involved in youth welfare is trying to act in a way that would protect itself legally; there is no room for manoeuvre, no room for initiatives, no room for personal responsibility any more. If everyone is just occupied with finding new rules and regulations to protect themselves and no one takes overall responsibility, the system is bound to deteriorate.

A certain risk of client aggression against social workers has to be calculated. Social workers may be distressed by threats during their interventions in the context of child protection. Parents often show a non-compliant behaviour and try to avoid the involvement of formal authorities in what they consider their private issues. Due to their cultural or religious traditions, immigrants often refuse any cooperation with female social workers, who are thus endangered to become victims of verbal abuse or even physical violence, so they need efficient coping strategies to handle such situations.[22]

The police for instance just do what keeps them safe: they take endangered children out of the family environment and then pass them on to youth welfare. Before this regulatory mania has set in there was more "open social work" in youth welfare possible, more personal responsibility was required. Different points of view were brought into a case and procedures that were seen as not quite efficient could be reversed or redirected more easily. This is now no longer possible, because rigid and complex rules of procedure narrow the room for manoeuvre for the social workers. Rules offer security, but also exclude personal responsibility and initiative. Basically now the aim of youth welfare is the general well-being of the young and not the individual well-being. Where human relationships are concerned rigidly regulated procedures hinder efficient youth work and just serve as tools to protect the professionals from legal hazards. This is not necessarily to the benefit of the young client. But what has to be considered as well is the fact that going beyond rules and regulations bears a serious risk for the client as well as for the professional. The rigid regulatory framework has in fact led to a reduction in physical assaults on social workers, the physical as well as the legal risk has been minimised. If there are violent outbreaks in a shared flat the children or youths are placed elsewhere, the social workers remain. So institutionally, the social workers are protected to a maximum extent. The drawback of the current state our society is in, which is dominated by the media, is the importance of good PR of youth welfare. It is crucial for youth welfare to be positively perceived by the public and give the impression that the welfare of every child in Vienna is guaranteed, but we have to face the fact that social workers in

---

[22] Littlechild, Brian, Lassen sich Sozialarbeiter von den Klienten einschüchtern? Sozialmagazin, 33. Jg. H.6. 2008, p 12 – 22

youth welfare deal with heavily traumatised children living under unimaginable living conditions. These children live with a totally distorted image of family life and then are transferred to the youth welfare office where they encounter another unrealistic image of family life, namely that of social work, as discussed in chapter 3.2. This social work perception of family life that is far from reality does not really constitute a systemic social work approach because it lacks the participatory character.

The physical risk for professionals in dealing with young addicts is lower than generally perceived, but there is of course a highly aggressive potential in these young people, who have fallen out of the system altogether. The drug centre "Dialog10" has experienced violent conflicts among clients and also assaults on professionals, yet in the four and a half years of its existence the service centre itself has undergone a considerable learning process in dealing with aggression of drug addicts in their adolescence and the number of violent attacks has significantly fallen since the start. Uncontrolled aggression is quite common in this environment because of a dangerous concentration of risk factors, such as the hormonal changes during adolescence, drug consumption and drug withdrawal. Risk containment for the employees is of highest priority in "Dialog10" and security measures and risk catalogues are continuously assessed and further developed in the multi-professional team.

In drug therapy the professionals have to have a highly developed risk competence, which means they should not stick to rules and regulations slavishly, but they have to adapt their approach to the client's needs. There has to be a differentiation in the methods applied according to the situation in which the client is in. Personal responsibility is of highest priority in this field of work and therefore the scope of individual decision making is much wider than elsewhere. Yet there are clear rules concerning the setting, such as an environment without any temptation, but there has to be scope for self reflection and the freedom to discover the truth about oneself and to remain authentic.

The youth shelter "a_way" is the last resort for young people and that might be the reason why they only counted three assaults in the three and a half years after the opening of the shelter. Nevertheless, the psychical risk for the youth workers in such shelters is extremely high. There is a lot of psychological pressure, few resources and no realistic success perspectives, which makes social work in this field unrewarding. The young addicts reject any form of therapy or care, more or less, there are no institutions they can go to after their stay at "a_way" and in this shelter they can only remain for five nights per month. This measure is necessary because otherwise they cannot stay there anonymously and would have to be referred to another low-threshold institution. Legally social workers in such youth shelters run risks as well, due to the anonymity of the clients, who might be illegal immigrants or might be searched by the police or by their families or have fled from other institutions. In such a shelter the need for a secure place for the young and the demands of authorities clash and the social workers have to make the difficult decision how to proceed in every case individually.

The psychological pressure in an open setting of a drug service centre is much higher for social workers because they are exposed to the moods and emotions of the young addicts more than the medical personnel, which is better protected, probably due to the higher esteem of the clients for doctors and their urgent need for medical care. At the drug centre "Ganslwirt" the labour turnover is extremely high, only few employees stay on the job longer. In social work with young addicts the concept of physical risk has to be extended to a health risk the professionals are exposed to, as well. The young drug and alcohol addicts are often psychotic and infected with HIV and hepatitis, so any physical attack on a care worker means

a severe health risk and has to be avoided at all costs. That's why the check lists for dealing with aggressive clients are continuously revised and adapted and all cases of violent attacks are documented for later reference. Employees attend de-escalation seminars and they can veto the stay of a client in the centre if they feel threatened. Despite the high health risk involved in the services provided, such as needle exchange, blood tests etc., fortunately no employee has ever been infected.

Another legal risk in dealing with young addicts was mentioned by the interviewees, namely the clients' high risk of committing suicide. It is a difficult decision which the medical and social work personnel have to make quite often, whether a client is suicidal and therefore has to be referred to a psychiatric institution against his/her will. The compulsory admission has to be certified by a public health officer. With psychotic patients the personnel has to decide whether they constitute a physical danger to themselves or to others in which case they have to be referred to a psychiatric clinic with the help of the public health officer and the police. The social workers are exposed to the highest risk during the time they have to detain the patient in the centre until the police arrive. Social workers are rarely involved in court cases, if so mostly as witnesses. When a young female drug addict reports a rape, this has to be documented in the centre, a medical check up is made, evidence has to be put together and the client has to be informed and consulted. Legally more risky for the social workers are conflicts of young clients with their parents. Because they have to decide, at what point they have to inform the legal guardian, which the clients often do not want. On the other hand the young people might risk ending up on the street if they do not return to their legal guardians.

Youth centres complain that relationship work with the young has become more difficult since the introduction of the legal obligation of disclosure: social workers have to report every criminal offence they hear about. Yet relationship building is the heart piece of every form of youth work, especially the work in youth centres. Here the young people tell the social workers about petty crimes, assaults, drug abuse and the social workers discuss these issues with them because they need someone to talk to. So the young people need the security that the youth worker does not report the offences he/she is told about. Often they tell about violence at home, but do not want the police or the youth welfare office to interfere. Despite the new law no social worker has yet been in legal trouble for not reporting incidents he/she was informed about confidentially. Youth workers in youth centres also run a high psychic risk as they act as buffer between the young people and the local community, the police and politicians. In this clash of interests the youth workers take the side of the young people. Politicians want them off the street, but the youth workers do not see themselves as custodians of these young people. They want to offer them public space to which they have a right, where they can buy food and drinks they can afford, where they can get practical advice and they also want to do the lobbying for the young people. So there is a high degree of involvement and commitment required which leads to stress and burnout syndromes. The aggression of the youth is rarely directed towards the youth workers, that is a rarity. The risk of assault is of course present in youth centres because also psychotic youths tend to frequent these centres, but the better the relationship with the youth worker, the lower the risk of physical attacks. As already mentioned above, the risk of burnout is considerably high in youth work as well as in youth welfare. Social workers are confronted with tragic life stories of children and young people and social workers are often the scapegoats, where the young people try to rid themselves of their frustration. They have to watch more or less helplessly how children are robbed of their lives' chances. The role as a substitute family, night duties, weekend duties, further burden the professionals and this psychic risk can only be contained by efficient team building and supervision, which is provided and the working conditions as such are satisfactory.

In probation service the physical risk for social workers is nearly non-existent, too. In its 51-year existence there was no case of physical assault at "Neustart". Their security guidelines and the risk catalogue try to minimise the risk for the social workers, especially if they visit penal institutions or clients at home. A more important reason why there are no violent conflicts here might be the social work attitude of appreciation: appreciating the client as a person, but condemning the deed. Confidentiality plays an important role in preventive as well as probation work with young people. This confidentiality clause protects probation officers legally in the same way as priests and lawyers are protected. There is no obligation for probation officers to report incidents to the police. It is their personal decision and responsibility whether they do so or not. A steering model of risk-oriented case management primarily concerns the clients` relapse-risk and helps to reduce re-offence.[23]

Psychotherapists in schools feel they encounter a considerable amount of physical violence in their work; they might be hit and kicked by healthy children, but also severely attacked by handicapped youths who are often unable to control their bodies. The physical risk is very often underestimated by therapists themselves, when they bring themselves into risky situations during therapies. Therapists further encounter legal risks when trying to uncover abuse and violence against children and youths. So they tend to take more time and observe situations longer before they report an abuse, just to be really sure that there is a need to interfere. Therapists deplore the above mentioned procedures of the youth welfare office, where children are often too soon referred back to their families because therapists believe that the biological family is not necessarily the best environment for a child.

In leisure time youth work only legal risks are discernable for youth workers, especially in the field of adventure pedagogy and various sports activities. Here lots of security rules and regulations have to be complied with, and many projects would not come about if all regulations were met. Legal practice has shown that the youth workers are legally protected in case of accidents if they can prove that they have done everything possible to prevent accidents.

3.5. Volunteers in Youth Work

Basically one can say that the only areas where volunteers are recruited for youth work are the field of leisure time pedagogy and related social work and the probation service. In all other areas social work professionals dominate the field of youth work, and to a lesser extent, pedagogues, psychotherapists, psychologists and other professions specialised in youth work. The city's leisure time activities do not recruit volunteers at all, but they employ free lancers older than 18 years of age for leisure time projects. In youth centres internships are offered and also conscientious objectors performing community service are recruited, but as they are untrained, they mostly work in catering services.

Employing volunteers in youth work poses a challenge for the professionals because they sometimes have to deal with enthusiasts who over-estimate themselves or with self-made adventure pedagogues who make their own rules. They constitute a danger for the professionals because the quality of youth work might suffer on the one hand and on the other hand they are much cheaper for the institutions than the professionals. Otherwise, volunteers

---

[23] Mayer, Klaus, Riskante Bewährungshilfe? Sozialmagazin, 33 Jg. H. 10. /2008, p 24 – 34

have to be seen as an expression of an emancipated society, where individuals take responsibility for the conditions this society is in, and it is the duty of social work professionals to take this risk and allow volunteers to dedicate their time and energy to youth work. In youth welfare very few volunteers are recruited, but experience has shown that if they are trained well and put in the right positions there is no risk for the clients, but if volunteers were to fulfil their personal dream of society, this would be harmful for the children. One interview partner regretted the lack of volunteers in youth welfare. Firms propagate their corporate social responsibility in the form of donations to children's charities, but they do not offer an exchange of personnel for a limited time period, for instance to establish an organisation, to set up IT services or offer trainings. But basically the opinion prevails that society should not invest in youth welfare with the help of volunteers, but society should invest more into children, their education, leisure time facilities, playgrounds etc., because people with a helper syndrome who volunteer for youth work are very damaging for traumatised children and their effort results in exactly the opposite of what their original intention was. Social internships of young people would be the better solution because these young people are at an age, when such experiences can be extremely rewarding and useful for their lives later on.

The probation service "Neustart" started as a private charity in 1957 and originally worked with volunteers only. At present it employs 600 professionals and 800 volunteers. The organisation has strict assessment criteria and provides extensive training for volunteers. Professionals lead the teams and discuss the cases with the volunteers. Certain cases are not referred to volunteers, such as sexual offenders, with the exception that the volunteer has a special training in, for instance psychotherapy or psychiatry. In this way volunteers allow "Neustart" to recruit persons with special competences. Volunteers never work on more than five cases, on average there are two to three and they have to undergo continuous training. Most of the volunteers are specialists in certain professions who use the network of the organisation. They receive a small expense allowance. An average volunteer stays with the organisation for five to six years and works on five to ten cases. They are not cheaper for the organisation, but "Neustart" feels that it is important to involve the society and profit from the commitment of people with special competences, be it linguistic or social. The employment of volunteers further enables the organisation to function in remote areas and to involve specialists with rare qualifications.

Private charities, such as Caritas employ many volunteers, but very few in youth welfare work because young people in precarious living conditions are very vulnerable and irresponsible decisions of untrained volunteers could have lethal consequences for them. So volunteers are usually recruited for jobs in leisure time projects or soup kitchens. The criteria for recruitment have to be very selective. One condition is social and pedagogical basic competences and another some work experiences in a social field. In that way the organisation tries to prevent volunteers from being recruited for youth work who want to use the work as a means to gain self-awareness.

The city of Vienna generously subsidises cultural, religious and political organisations that cater for young people, and these organisations mostly work with volunteers and are restricted to members only. Most of these organisations have a long tradition of youth work in clubs, such as the "Scouts", the "Red Falcons", etc. and act very professionally; they train their volunteers and carry out extensive quality checks. This area of youth work can be seen as an additional offer to the projects and organisations provided by the city, which cater for socially disadvantaged children much more than youth clubs do. There is no real competition between those two fields of leisure time youth work and one interviewee stated that the risk of

employing people in youth work who are on a self-awareness trip is not really higher in the youth club field. Youth clubs of religious organisations also recruit volunteers, which can be problematic, as mentioned by one interview partner: firstly, they are sometimes only one or two years older than the young people attending club sessions, they have secondly no training and thirdly no experience. They are often rejected by the young people themselves because they do not trust them. As a result, a professional now has to work together with the volunteer and the training with respect to leisure time pedagogy and media handling has been intensified there, too.

3.6. Calculated Risk-Taking & the Risk Involved for Society

There is consensus among all interviewees that calculated risk-taking and open social work do not pose a risk to society at all, on the contrary. A more lenient and understanding approach in youth work produces a softer reaction from the young, while too many harsh rules, as for instance in the United Kingdom cause aggressive reactions from youth, e.g. the phenomena of knifing in London, the spread of anti-social behaviour and feral kids. But the trend towards regulating every aspect of social work has also reached Vienna and in some ways an interview partner wishes again for more "Balkanisation" in social work practice here. This underlines an interesting trend in recent decades: While in the financial service sector total deregulation was the call of the day until the crash of 2008, the social service sector has undergone increasing over-regulation and has been swamped with rules and regulations, quality checks and extensive risk assessment catalogues. Will there be a reversed trend after the global economic crisis? We can probably assume that there will be no or few changes in both sectors.

Some believe that there is generally no risk for society; the risk is borne by the children and young people. There is the hypothesis that a society needs social deprivation for its survival as a negative role model. Others are of the opinion that these deprived children are a lost resource of society and in that way constitute a risk for this society. Much more preventive work has to be carried out. More psychologists should be employed at schools to work with disadvantaged children therapeutically. Pedagogues and parents should be better trained because they are often insecure and helpless in dealing with difficult children. If you start prevention early you might avert the harshest consequences of social deprivation and neglect. A special focus has to be put on families with a migratory background because their children are often disadvantaged in the Austrian school system and are consequently robbed of any future career chances. If the first six years of a child's life are wasted, you can only contain the damage afterwards but you cannot reverse the negative trend any more. Some children of migrant families are doing very well in Vienna because the family is success-oriented, but children from families with a very traditional background are struggling, most of all because they lack language skills. The early acquisition of German has to be a prime target in Vienna's youth work and the fair distribution of indigenous children and children with another mother tongue from early kindergarten age on. Here a lot of support should be given to pedagogues and teachers and sufficient funds have to be raised.

Calculated risk-taking in social work offers the chance for a change in society with respect to dealing with endangered youth. More self-reflection, more personal responsibility can improve the social climate. Of course you have to prepare the ground well first, but then calculated risk-taking averts damage from society. Shopping centres for instance are designed for young people to attract them and to make them buy consumer goods they do not really need, and then the managers of the shopping centres are astonished and enraged that the

young people use these open spaces to let off steam and go on a rampage, occupy public space for themselves. The sarcastic opinion was voiced during the interviews that it is riskier for society to allow all parents to bring up their children without any conditions. Many of the disadvantaged children are raised in an atmosphere of permanent change, they have never experienced continuity and so they cannot meet with the expectations of the social pedagogues. As more and more parents are unemployed or do unskilled and unrewarding work, those children lack an appreciation of the concept of work; they cannot see a job as something satisfactory. Many are raised by single parents who either juggle two or three low-paid jobs or are unemployed and often afraid of losing the temporary partner. That's why they have no time at all to look after and care for their children. So proper free of charge full time care from an early age on in kindergartens and schools has to be provided to give those kids a chance in life, which means more open social work is needed to protect the society in future.

In the medium term the lack of apprenticeships and jobs for young people is a really serious risk for society, because this is a signal to young people that there is no place for them in this society, they have to rely on social benefits for the rest of their lives. This causes a vicious circle because as young parents they pass on this attitude to their children. The situation is worse for young addicts who do not earn a living, they have no training and they have never worked, so they are not eligible for unemployment benefits or social benefits. Consequently they end up financing their addiction with shop lifting, other petty crimes and prostitution. By offering them low-threshold services calculated risk-taking in social work takes them at least for some time off the street and in that way reduces the risk for society. When for instance a drug centre opens in a district, the neighbourhood feels endangered, even if the centre is as inconspicuous as possible. If then the clients steal in the nearby supermarket, the organisers of the centre are blamed. But the clients would go shoplifting in any super market and near the centre the social workers are at least there to intervene and work with the culprits. In fact, the presence of a social organisation reduces the risk for the community, it does not enlarge it. Where there is a space for problematic youth, where professionals work with them, the risk for society is always minimised. Organisations like "Ganslwirt" offer care and consultation for young drug addicts who have completely fallen out of the system, so they would be on the loose and a risk for society otherwise. Here they have a point of reference, a safe place to go to and are not out on the street posing a risk to the neighbourhood. The organisation has to be low-threshold because people end up here who cannot survive in any regulatory institutional framework. If the social workers imposed rigorous rules on them, they would just disappear and the social workers would lose contact to them. The social workers observe the clients to assess the condition they are in and to guess what they might need. There are no contracts, no agreed aims, offers are made, but they do not have to be accepted. This approach is needed to keep in contact with young drug users and by that to relieve society of the risk they pose if they are out on the street.

Also in public space calculated risk-taking in youth work minimises the risk for society. In offering open space to young people and creating projects with their participation in these locations, devastation in the city can be reduced substantially. The key to the success of projects for young people in public space is the cooperation of youth workers with the young people themselves. If they are involved in setting up the sites and in administering them, they do not devastate these facilities. Often problems that young people cause are problems of public space, namely the lack of public space open to them. In creating public space for the young one always has to take into account that someone or something else is displaced, e.g. quiet space for the elderly or a thoroughfare. Youth workers have to attempt to incorporate the whole community to compensate such displacement effects. In one park in Vienna they launched a generational project, where the elderly residents of an old people's home nearby

ran games stations for the very young. Youth workers try to support young people in acquiring public space for themselves because this serves as a preventive tool. The city of Vienna employs around 1000 people to mediate conflicts in communities and between generations, promote the communication with young people, to organise projects and games in public parks. These social workers attempt to settle all kinds of conflicts in the city, but whenever possible try to take the side of the young.

Neighbourhoods often feel harassed by the youth, by the noise they cause, which results in xenophobic outbreaks against youth with a migratory background, which further criminalises them and prevents their integration. Open youth work in youth centres for instance acts as a preventive tool in so far as it gets the young people off the street, builds relationships and involves them. The interviewees were of the opinion that there is not more youth crime in Vienna, but that the people tend to report offences to the police much more frequently, and especially if young people with a migratory background are involved. This results in a criminal record for those young people and prevents them from ever getting an apprenticeship or an employment, so they will be a burden for society for the rest of their lives. A new trend can be discerned concerning young female crime, which was nearly non-existent before. These violent girls seem to reinterpret their roles as girls and see themselves as the "stronger gender". The lower the threshold of social services for the young the more chances there are for an open dialogue between social workers and endangered youth. Social workers get to know more about their clients because they feel safe, they know what they say will not be reported to the police, they will not be disciplined or controlled. This opens up a chance for social work to initiate changes in their lifestyles and by that reduce the risk for society. Young people quickly adapt to a coercive system: if the authorities come up with rigorous rules, early intervention is endangered or prevented. Also the Vienna police are convinced that the risk for society is reduced and you achieve much better results in tackling youth crime if you use open, low-threshold methods than if you use restrictive methods in dealing with them. This close cooperation between school, social work and police prevention officers has proved to be a recipe for success.

4. CONCLUSION

In Viennese youth work a development can be observed from a paternalistic and restrictive approach in the 1920s and early 1930s to open youth work and calculated risk-taking today. Currently a trend towards much stricter regulation, rigid risk assessment catalogues and inflexible good practice rules according to Anglo-Saxon models can be discerned. In parts this recent development seems to be a return to earlier forms of youth work and strict regulation and control in Vienna. While the financial world was characterised by continuous and excessive deregulation in the last years until 2008, the social field has been subject to increasingly more rigid regulation, which is deplored by many professionals as this trend limits necessary flexibility in youth work considerably.

Nevertheless, open youth work and calculated risk-taking methods are applied in many fields of youth work in Vienna in various ways with great success. There is much less confrontation, lower juvenile crime rates, less radicalisation and less violence in Vienna than in other big multicultural European cities, but still there is a lot to be done to adapt youth work to new family structures and new social trends. For example a lot of efforts have to be made to integrate young people with a migratory background, but much has already been achieved, which is proved by the fact that youth workers see little difference in risk exposure between

indigenous youth and youth with a migratory background, on the whole. Viennese social workers and other professionals in youth work somehow silently resist too rigid regulation efforts – not openly, but very effectively -, which might be a Viennese characteristic already discernable in earlier centuries. There still is a lot of independent decision- making and self-responsibility in youth work, which results in a more flexible and personalised approach and has proved to be beneficial for the young clients. The work of volunteers is sometimes viewed sceptically by the professionals, but in several fields of youth work the organisations are open to various forms of involvement of the society and some even wish for more volunteer work in youth welfare.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Achleitner, Friedrich, Siedlungshaus und Volkswohnpalast, In: Riedl, Joachim (ed.), Wien, Stadt der Juden, Zsolnay 2004

Csáky, Moritz, „Was man Nation und Rasse heißt, sind Ergebnisse und keine Ursachen". Zur Konstruktion kollektiver Identitäten in Zentraleuropa, in: Kakanien revisited, A.Francke Vlg. 2002

Ehmer, Josef, Familienstruktur und Arbeitsorganisation im frühindustriellen Wien, Vlg. für Geschichte und Politik 1980

Göllner, Renate, Hauptstadt des Kindes und des Antisemitismus In: Riedl, Joachim (ed.), Wien, Stadt der Juden, Zsolnay 2004

Gruber, Helmut, Red Vienna. Experiment in Working-Class Culture 1919-1934, OUP 1991

John, Michael, Mosaik oder Schmelztiegel? Bemerkungen zu Migration, Multikulturalität und Assimilation im Zeitalter Kaiser Franz Josephs, Beiträge zur historischen Sozialkunde 2/91

Krisch, Richard, Sozialräumliche Methodik der Jugendarbeit, Juventa, Weinheim 2009

Littlechild, Brian, Lassen sich Sozialarbeiter von den Klienten einschüchtern? Sozialmagazin, 33/H.6, 2008

Mayer, Klaus, Riskante Bewährungshilfe? Risikoorientiertes Assessment- und Interventionsprogramm. Sozialmagazin 33/ H 10, 2008

Mit uns zieht die neue Zeit. Arbeiterkultur in Österreich 1918-1938, Vlg. Habarta & Habarta 1981

Müller-Funk, Wolfgang, Kakanien revisited, A. Francke Vlg. 2002

Papathanassiou, Maria, Zwischen Arbeit, Spiel und Schule. Die ökonomische Funktion der Kinder ärmerer Schichten in Österreich 1880-1939, Vlg. für Geschichte und Politik 1999

Pirhofer, Gottfried, Sozial-und Gesundheitspolitik im Roten Wien, In: Riedel, Joachim (ed.), Wien, Stadt der Juden, Zsolnay 2004

Sablik, Karl, Julius Tandler – Mediziner und Sozialreformer. Schendl, Wien, 1983

QUALITATIVE INTERVIEWS

(Ranked according to interview dates)

Feuerstein, Lukas, social pedagogue (4 May 2009)
Sohlmann, Sigrid, psychotherapist (5 May 2009)
Löffelmann, Stefan, social worker & adventure pedagogue (8 May 2009)
Mayer, Werner, social pedagogue (11 May 2009)
Haiderer, Martin, social worker (11 May 2009)
Krones, Sabine, social worker & social manager (11 May 2009)
Neuburg, Florian, youth worker & sociology student (11 May 2009)
Salnikova, Natalja, youth worker (13 May 2009)
Koss, Christoph, social worker, jurist & mediator (14 May 2009)
Ertl, Martina, social worker (28 May 2009)
Bauer-Sebek, Brigitte, psychologist (5 June 2009)
Haltmayer, Hans, medical doctor (9 June 2009)
Sonvilla, Michael, policeman & mediator (16 June 2009)