

Sonja Žorga

KAJ LAHKO PONUDIMO PROSTOVOLJCEM IN ZAKAJ

MODEL MENTORSKE SUPERVIZIJE V NEPOSREMNEM

Iz urednikove beležke

Pričujočo številko vpeljuje *Sonja Žorga* s prispevkom, v katerem med drugim proučuje, kaj motivira ljudi, da se odločijo za prostovoljno delo. Na to se navezuje esej prostovoljca (študenta socialnega dela) *Jožeta Frkača*, ki nam med vrsticami odgovarja tudi na vprašanje, ali in kako so ta pričakovanja izpolnjena. Stvar — kakor pove Frkač z metaforo »poljubi se na svoja usta« — ni brez protislovij, in morda je lahko prav njihova analiza koristna za načrtovanje priprav prostovoljcev, s katerim se ukvarja Žorga.

Jelka Škerjanc tokrat analizira nekatere nove službe za ljudi s posebnimi potrebami in ugotavlja, da se pri njih bolj ali manj subtilno še vedno ohranjajo nekdanja razmerja moči. To ne kaže nujno na nepripravljenost teh služb, da bi vpeljali nov odnos in nove priložnosti za svoje uporabnike, nedvomno pa kaže na vztrajnost določenega diskurza moči, ki obvladuje naše predstave o tem, kako je treba »delati z uporabniki«, in ki ga pogosto posredujejo družbeni okviri, v katerih se nove službe sploh lahko vzpostavijo. Tudi ta članek ima izkustveno vzporednico v eseju, in sicer *Bože Napret*, ki med drugim ugotavlja strategije, s katerimi lahko vodstvo take službe ohranja razmerja dominacije, tudi če so njeni cilji izrecno drugačni.

Če smo že omenili predstave, »kako je treba delati z uporabniki«, lahko dodamo, da o uživalcih drog pogosto vlada stališče, da je »edino mrtev uživalec dober uživalec«, pri čemer je besedico »mrtev« blagohotno zamenjala besedica »bivši«; večina ukrepov proti uživanju drog je namreč (po modelu zdravljenja alkoholizma) usmerjena v doseganje ali vzdrževanje abstinence. Toda s stališča socialnega dela je ta cilj neuporaben, saj, prvič, terapija ni v ožjem dometu socialnega dela, in drugič, problematika, ki zadeva socialno delo, ni uživanje drog, temveč je socialna izključenost (aktivnega) uživalca, ki je v veliki meri posledica prav gornjega stališča in ima seveda tudi nadaljne posledice na uživalčevo ravnanje in življenje. Zato *Peter Stefanoski* predstavlja socialno delo, ki akceptira uživanje drog, ali morda natančneje, ki »akceptira« človeka in mu pomaga, ne glede na to, ali uživa droge.

Vida Miloševič-Arnold predstavlja rejništvo, kot ga je spoznala v ameriški državi Indiana, in ga primerja s situacijo na tem področju pri nas. Pomembna ugotovitev iz te primerjave pa ne zadeva same organiziranosti rejništva, temveč to, na čem ta organiziranost v Indiani temelji: ne (zgolj, moramo dodati) na politični volji in ustreznem stihijskem načrtovanju, temveč na raziskavah situacije, potreb in možnosti. Čeprav nikakor ne moremo zanikati, da ima zadnjo besedo vendarle politična volja, tako racionalen pristop najbrž še dolgo ne bo značilnost načrtovanja služb (za otroke ali odrasle) pri nas...

In nazadnje nam *Franč Udovič* ponudi nekaj tehničnih pripomočkov za pravično odmerjanje preživnine za otroke po razvezi staršev; brez dvoma bodo prišli prav strokovnjakom, ki se ukvarjajo s to problematiko, na splošno pa članek opozarja, da se administrativno reševanje tudi takih problemov počasi umika konsenzualnemu.

family is described in detail, as well as special kind of housing called therapeutic. The author presents the principles guiding US businesses and professional practice in this form of child care, as well as the way in which supervisors and decisions in professional work are conducted, all of which is strongly linked to research.

Editor's Notes

The present issue is introduced by Sonja Žorga's contribution on voluntary work, in which she also discusses the motivation for it. This is linked to the essay of volunteer (student of social work) Jože Frkač who, between the lines, responds to whether and how these expectations are fulfilled. The issue – represented by Frkač's metaphor »kiss yourself on the lips« – is far from free of contradictions, and perhaps their analysis could be useful for planning the training of, and working with, volunteers, which is also one of Žorga's topics.

In her paper, Jelka Škerjanc analyses several new services for the people with special needs and finds in them a more or less subtle continuation of the former relations of power. This does not necessarily indicate unwillingness of those services to introduce a new kind of relationships, but it certainly indicates the insistence of a certain discourse of power dominating our ideas about »how to work with users« and often contained in the very social framework determining the establishment of new services. This paper, too, has its experiential parallel in an essay: Boža Napret, among other things, studies the strategies by which the management of such a service can maintain the relations of domination, even though its aims may be different.

Having mentioned ideas about »how to work with users«, we may add that a not uncommon attitude towards users of illegal drugs is »only a dead drug-user is a good drug-user«, in which »dead« has benevolently been replaced with »former«. Namely, most measures against drug-using (modelled after the treatment of alcoholism) aim at achieving or maintaining abstinence. From the standpoint of social work, however, this is useless, since, first, therapy is not within the general scope of social work, and second, social work as such is not concerned with drug-using itself but with social expulsion of the user which is to a great extent a consequence of the above attitude, as well as generates further consequences for the user's conduct and life. In this respect, Peter Stefanoski presents social work that accepts using drugs, or rather, accepts and helps the person regardless of his or her taking drugs.

Vida Milošević-Arnold presents fosterage in Indiana, USA, and compares it with the situation in this field in Slovenia. An essential difference, however, does not concern the organisation of fosterage itself but its preliminaries: in Indiana, it does not seem to be based on mere political will and correspondingly impetuous action but on research of the situation, needs and possibilities. Though it can hardly be denied that political will does have the last word, an approach as rational as this will probably remain uncharacteristic for the planning of services (either for children or adults) in this country for a long time yet...

Finally, Franc Udovič offers some technical tools for a just assessment of alimonies for children after the divorce of their parents; they will no doubt be convenient for the professionals who have to deal with it, but generally, the paper makes it clear that administrative solutions of like problems slowly make way for the consensual ones.