

Blaž Mesec, Gabi Čačinovič Vogrinčič

## ANALIZA KRONOLOŠKIH IN INTERAKCIJSKIH VZORCEV

KVALITATIVNA ANALIZA DELA Z OBVEZNO

Iz urednikove beležke

V prvem članku Blaž Mesec in Gabi Čačinovič Vogrinčič predstavljata enostavno metodološko orodje za analizo delovanja socialne službe v posameznem primeru. Na primeru, ki sta ga izbrala, se razločno pokaže, da se to delovanje ukvarja s posledicami problema in ne s problemom samim, kaj šele z njegovimi vzroki. To metodo lahko priporočamo ne le za analizo delovanja posamezne službe v posameznem primeru, temveč tudi za evalvacijo služb, saj je kriterij njihove učinkovitosti oz. uspešnosti (vsaj z vidika uporabnikov) res samo njihovo delovanje v vsakem primeru (tj., ob vsakem problemu) posebej.

Če na to navežemo prispevek Franca Hribernika, nam najprej pade v oči nenavadno dejstvo, da pravzaprav ni nobene službe ali ustanove, ki bi jo bilo mogoče trdo prijeto zaradi nizke prometne varnosti na naših cestah. Problem je očiten, vendar nam ni znano, da bi sprožil oblikovanje kakšnega kriznega tima ali vsaj delovne skupine, ki bi se z njim ukvarjala kaj več ko sporadično (in seveda z obveznim tarnanjem).

Naslednja dva prispevka sodita na področje antropologije, ki je (s katerimkoli pridevkom, zlasti pa seveda kot socialna ali kulturna) eno izmed pomembnih izhodišč socialnega dela. Če poskušamo povzeti to povezavo v nekaj besedah, lahko rečemo, da je poznavanje človeških navad, predstav, verovanj, predsodkov, stereotipov, kulturno specifičnega obnašanja itn. nujno ne le zato, da lahko pristopimo k osebi na zanj relevanten način, temveč tudi za samo identifikacijo problema, ki pogosto (če ne po sami logiki stvari) ni zgolj stvar objektivnih okoliščin, ampak je stvar posameznikove udeležbe v njih. To lahko pokažemo na primeru obeh prispevkov. Temo, o kateri govori Zoja Skušek – nove reproduktivne tehnologije –, bi lahko enostavno povzeli tako, da je znanost razvila metode, s katerimi lahko pomaga, da imajo otroke ljudje, ki jih sicer ne bi mogli imeti. To samo po sebi ni noben problem, bi lahko rekli, saj imajo ti ljudje od tega očitno korist; problem nastane zaradi tega, ker nove reproduktivne tehnologije načenjajo nekatere uveljavljene kulturne obrazce, zlasti seveda tega, kaj je starševstvo. Prav tako ni kakšen poseben problem dejstvo, da so nekateri ljudje istospolno usmerjeni; problem nastane, če jih kultura, v kateri živijo, zavrača, obsoja in zatira. To se dogaja tudi s pomočjo reprodukcije stereotipov, ki sta jih obdelala Andrej Zornik in Katerina Mirovič.

S prispevkom Sladane Ivezić nadaljujemo prispevke s področja skupinske psihoterapije. Avtorica sicer dela v bolnišničnem okolju, kar nedvomno vnaša nekatere posebnosti, vendar je njen prispevek za nas pomemben v dveh pogledih: prvič, ker v psihiatriji dela veliko socialnih delavk in delavcev (tudi s skupinami), in drugič, ker so – če pustimo problem žargona ob strani – temeljne ugotovitve uporabne pri delu z velikimi skupinami nasploh.

V drugem delu svoje analize odgovorov na vprašalnik o novih socialnih službah/dejavnostih pride Srečo Dragoš do nekaterih zelo zanimivih sklepov o razliki med službami/dejavnostmi iz posameznih sektorjev in o vlogi države v sistemu, v katerega te službe/dejavnosti sodijo. Branje priporočamo ne le instancam, ki jih po službeni dolžnosti zanima, kako se različne službe razvijajo in kako delujejo, temveč tudi in še zlasti izvajalcem samih teh dejavnosti, kot prispevek k njihovi samo-evalvaciji.

### Editor's Notes

In their paper, Blaž Mesec and Gabi Čačinovič Vogrinčič present a simple methodological tool for the analysis of the work of a social service in an individual case. The example they choose clearly shows that this work deals with the consequences of a problem and not with the problem itself, much less with its causes. The method may be recommended not only for the analysis of a service's performance in a particular case but also for the evaluation of a service, because its performance in a given case (i. e., in face of an actual problem) is the only pertinent criterion of its efficiency or successfulness (at least from the users' point of view).

However, if we try to relate the above with Franc Hribernik's contribution, we at once realise that there is in fact no service or institution which could be taken responsible for the low degree of safety on our roads. The problem (in the number of deaths and injuries) is quite evident, but we are not aware of any crisis team or working group that would deal with it more than sporadically (and of course with dutiful moaning).

The following two papers belong to the field of anthropology which is (either as social or cultural anthropology) one of the important background disciplines in social work training. If we try to summarise their link in a few words, we may say that knowledge of human habits, representations, beliefs, prejudices, stereotypes, culturally specific behaviours etc. is necessary not only so that we can approach a person in a manner relevant to him or her, but also for the very identification of a problem, for the latter is often (if not by the logic of things) not merely a matter of objective circumstances, but a matter of the person's participation in them. We can demonstrate that (with the risk of stating the obvious, as well as of simplifying) on the example of both papers. First, the theme discussed by Zoja Skušek – new reproductive technologies – might be summed up simply by saying that science has developed techniques which can help the people who otherwise couldn't have children. This by itself does not seem to be a problem; it arises because the new reproductive technologies challenge several established cultural patterns, notably that of parenthood. Second, the fact that some people are homosexual needn't represent a problem at all; but it necessarily arises when the culture in which they live renounces, condemns and suppresses them. This takes place through, among other things, the reproduction of stereotypes treated by Andrej Zornik and Katerina Mirović.

Sladana Ivezić's contribution continues our series of papers about group therapy. The author, indeed, works in a hospital setting which undoubtedly brings in some specificity, but her contribution is relevant for us on two accounts: first, there is a great number of social workers working (with groups as well) in psychiatry, and second, because – the problem of jargon aside – the fundamental findings are applicable to the work with large groups in general.

In the second part of his analysis of the responses to our questionnaire on new social services, Srečo Dragoš arrives to some very interesting conclusions regarding the differences between sectors as well as the role of the state in the system to which these services belong. Reading is recommended not only to the agencies whose job it is to take interest in how different services develop and act, but also and particularly to the providers of services as a contribution to their self-evaluation.