

Drage bralke, dragi bralci!

Jesensko in zapovrstjo že 103. številko *Družboslovnih razprav* tokrat odvarjamo rahlo drugače, kot smo napovedali v uvodniku aprilske številke. Splet nepričakovanih okoliščin je namreč nekoliko upočasnil produkcijo tematske številke s področja prostorske sociologije, tako da je pred vami nova netematska zbirka petih samostojnih znanstvenih prispevkov. Takšne rokohitrke spremembe načrtov niso samoumevne, saj uredništvo nima vedno »rezerv«, iz katerih bi lahko sestavili celotno številko. Tokrat smo z ekipo na srečo razmeroma zlahka našli rešitev za nastale zaplete, saj imamo zadnje leto na »lagerju« kar redno zalogo znanstvenih prispevkov. To po eni strani odraža previdno in redno uredniško delo, po drugi strani pa priča o prepoznavnosti revije, kar nas še posebej veseli.

Pri izboru v tukajšnjo številko uvrščenih prispevkov pa se je obenem pripetilo še prav prijetno naključje: kar dva, posledično tudi otvoritvena prispevka namreč vsebinsko že napovedujeta teme in dileme letošnjega sociološkega srečanja, na katerem bodo udeleženci in udeleženke med 19. in 21. oktobrom preizpraševale_i vprašanja in dileme dolgožive družbe in medgeneracijske solidarnosti. Poglejmo torej, kaj v branje ponuja septembrska izdaja *Družboslovnih razprav*.

Zdenka Šadl v prispevku z naslovom »Neformalna družinska oskrba starejših: novo področje diskriminacije pri zaposlovanju in na trgu dela« na izviren in luciden način opozarja na večplastno diskriminacijo na področju oskrbe starejših. Ta poteka predvsem v odnosu do zaposlenih, ki poleg formalnega dela skrbijo še za starejše družinske člane, potrebne oskrbe. Članek posledično izpostavlja ključne vire diskriminacije pri zaposlovanju in na trgu dela do zaposlenih z oskrbovalnimi obveznostmi, ki izvirajo iz številnih stereotipnih predstav o zaposlenih oskrbovalcih. Z njimi se srečujejo tako moški kot ženske, izhajajo pa iz obstoječih norm na delovnih mestih, organizacijske kulture, pomanjkljive politike do usklajevanja dela in oskrbe ter nezadostnih zakonodajnih rešitev. Koncizen pregled stanja na ravni odmevne in aktualne literature, zakonodajnih okvirov kot tudi dejanskih praks ponuja temeljito seznanjenost z omenjenim področjem, ki po avtoričinem mnenju postaja novo polje diskriminacije na trgu dela.

Drugi pogled na problematiko starejših ponudi prispevek Otta Gerdine z naslovom »Marginalizacija problemov starih ljudi kot odsev novičarskih vrednot: primer časopisa *Delo*«, ki skozi empirično kvantitativno raziskavo analizira pojavnost in razširjenost tematik o starostnikih v slovenskem časopisu *Delo* med letoma 2004 in 2018. Avtor ugotavlja, da problemi starejših v izbranem časopisu ostajajo na margini; na tej osnovi med drugim zaključí, da tematike s področja staranja ne dosegajo visoke novinarske vrednosti.

Naslednja dva prispevka sta za razliko od prvih dveh, ki sta v angleščini, v slovenskem jeziku in oba pokrivata polje edukacijskih študij. Katja Jeznik in Petra Gregorčič Mrvar v članku z naslovom »Šolska svetovalna služba v primežu prikritega kurikuluma« obravnavata rezultate kvalitativne študije med šolskimi svetovalnimi delavci s ciljem identificirati njihovo razumevanje, prepoznavanje in odzivanje na koncept prikritega kurikuluma. Avtorici utemeljujeta in opozarjata, da strokovni delavci pogosto slabo poznajo oziroma neustrezno razumejo ta koncept, ki pa je izjemnega razlagalnega pomena, saj razpira široko polje, s tem ko poveže strokovno znanje, razmerja moči in družbeni kontekst, v katerem delujemo.

Vsebinsko most s temami v predhodnih prispevkih vzpostavlja četrti prispevek Nike Ferbežar in Marka Gavrilovskega Tretjaka z naslovom »Med sovraštvom in tišino: izkušnje LGBT+ oseb v primarnem, sekundarnem in terciarnem obdobju izobraževanja«, ki med drugim razkrivata množičen vpliv predsodkov in negativnih izkušenj s sovraštvom in nevidnostjo LGBT+ oseb na različnih stopnjah izobraževanja. Prek osebnih intervjujev avtorja tako opozorita na ključne dejavnike tveganja, še posebej pa na pomanjkljive systemske ukrepe in prevladujočo odsotnost varovalnih dejavnikov, ki je običajno odvisna od medvrstniške podpore in osebne zavzetosti učiteljev oz. zaposlenih.

Številko zaključujemo z aktualno tematiko s področja okoljskih vprašanj. Dora Matejak v prispevku v angleščini z naslovom »Oblikovanje trajnostne potrošnje hrane v EU: kritična analiza individualizacije odgovornosti« kritično analizira krovno strategijo evropskih politik trajnostne potrošnje hrane. Ugotavlja, da ta pretirano individualizira odgovornosti potrošnikov, s čimer posledično namesto reševanja okoljskih vprašanj pogloblja ali celo vnaša nove oblike družbene neenakosti.

Kot običajno celotnemu svežnju prispevkov sledi sklop recenzij znanstvenih monografij, ki ga v nadaljevanju v ločenem pozdravnem uvodniku predstavlja naš novi urednik recenzij Rok Smrdelj.

V imenu celotne uredniške ekipe vam želimo prijetno branje!

Tanja Oblak Črnič in Natalija Majsova,
sourednici *Družboslovnih razprav*

Dear readers!

This autumn's 103rd issue of *Social Science Forum* proceeds in a slightly differently way than described in the April issue. A series of unexpected circumstances has slowed down production of the theme-based issue concerned with the field of sociology of space. Instead, this issue brings a collection of five independent scientific papers. Such hastily changed plans are not natural because the editorial team does not always have "reserve" available from which to assemble a complete issue. Fortunately, the solution the team found to these procedural "challenges" was relatively easy as scientific papers have been submitted in larger numbers over the last year. This at once reflects the careful and regular editorial work and also the journal's growing visibility, which we find particularly pleasing.

At the same time, the papers selected for this issue may also be seen as a pleasant coincidence: two of them – namely, the opening ones – already foreshadow the themes and dilemmas of this year's annual meeting of Slovene Sociological Association where between 19 and 21 October participants will be questioning matters pertaining to a long-living society and intergenerational solidarity. So, let's have a look at what the September edition of *Social Science Forum* has to offer.

Zdenka Šadl's article "Informal Care for the Elderly: A New Frontier of Discrimination in Employment and the Labour Market" considers in an original and illuminating way the multifaceted discrimination in the field of care for the elderly found in employment and the labour market. The article describes the key sources of discrimination against employees who hold caring responsibilities, which stem from stereotypical perceptions of carers who are employed, flexible working arrangements, weak policies regarding work coordination, and insufficient legislative solutions. A concise overview of the situation on the levels of relevant and current literature, legislative frameworks and actual practices provides thorough knowledge of this area which, in the author's opinion, is becoming a new field of discrimination in the labour market.

Another perspective on problems faced by the elderly is provided by Otto Gerdina's paper "Marginalisation of Older People's Problems as a Reflection of News Values: The Case of the Newspaper *Delo*", which analyses the incidence and prevalence of topics about the elderly in the Slovenian newspaper *Delo* between 2004 and 2018 through an empirical quantitative study. The author finds that the problems of the elderly remain marginalised in the newspaper and, among others, concludes that topics related to ageing do not meet high journalistic values.

Following the first two papers in English, the next duo are in Slovenian and both concern educational studies. Katja Jeznik and Petra Gregorčič Mrvar in "School Counselling Service in the Grip of a Hidden Curriculum" discuss the results of a qualitative study among school counsellors with the aim of identifying their understanding, recognition and response to the hidden curriculum concept. The authors point out while this concept is often poorly known or inadequately understood by practitioners, it holds great explanatory value since it opens up a wide field by linking expertise, power relations and the social context in which we are living.

The fourth paper by Nika Ferbežar and Marko Gavrilovski Tretjak is entitled "Between Hate and Silence: The Experiences of LGBT+ People in Primary, Secondary and Tertiary Education". The article builds a bridge with the themes covered in the earlier papers, inter alia revealing the massive impact of prejudice and negative experiences of hate and invisibility of LGBT+ people on different levels of education. Through personal interviews, the authors highlight the key risk factors, notably the lack of systemic measures and prevailing absence of protective factors, which typically depend on peer support and the personal commitment of teachers or staff.

We conclude this issue with a topic in the field of environmental protection. Dora Matejak critically analyses the overarching strategy of European policies on sustainable food consumption in an article in English entitled "Towards Sustainable Food Consumption in the EU: Critical Analysis of Individual Responsibility". She argues that the strategy over-individualises consumers' responsibilities, thereby deepening or even introducing new forms of social inequalities instead of addressing environmental issues.

As usual, the set of contributions is complemented with several reviews of scientific monographs, as presented below in a separate welcome editorial prepared by our new reviews editor Rok Smrdelj.

On behalf of the entire editorial team, we wish you pleasant reading!

Tanja Oblak Črnič and Natalija Majsova,
co-editors of *Social Science Forum*

Recenzija kot »dialog z različnimi občinstvi«

Spoštovane bralke, spoštovani bralci!

O pomenu pisanja recenzij družboslovnih in humanističnih monografij v neoliberalnih pogojih nastajanja akademske vednosti, ki jo poganja imperativ kvantitativne akumulacije znanstvenih točk in citatov, je v eni izmed predhodnih števil DR/SSF razmišljal že moj predhodnik Klemen Ploštajner. Takole je povzel trenutni status recenzentskega dela: »Da je postopek recenziranja knjig vse bolj odrinjen na stranski tir, akt njihovega pisanja vse bolj razvrednoten, delo na njih pa prekarizirano, je zgolj odraz razgradnje akademske skupnosti v razmerah prisilne hiperprodukcije znanstvenih objav« (str. 11). Kolega Ploštajner ni ostal le na ravni kritične osvetlitve žal nezavidljivega položaja recenzentskega dela kot oblike akademske prakse, ampak je tudi izpostavil, da so recenzije knjig »pomembno orodje ohranjanja dialoške narave produkcije vednosti« (ibid.). Če povzamem s svojimi besedami: dialog je ključna prvina nastajanja akademske vednosti, recenzija knjig pa je kot »orodje dialoga z različnimi občinstvi« verjetno ena izmed najbolj dialoških form med akademskimi žanri (ibid.). V prvi vrsti je orodje dialoga med recenzentom/ko in avtorjem/ico/i recenziranega dela, v drugi pa med recenzentom/ko in širšo akademsko skupnostjo. A tisto, kar razlikuje recenzijo knjige od večine žanrov akademskega pisanja, je njena zmožnost, da lahko zaradi zelo kratke forme in komunikativnega sloga vzpostavlja dialog tudi z neakademske občinstvom. Prek kritične in poglobljene refleksije najnovejše knjižne produkcije namreč daje vpogled v najnovejša spoznanja tudi tistim bralcem/kam, ki niso nujno neposredno del akademske sfere.

Nekako tako bi ubesedil prve asociacije ob branju Ploštajnerjevega uvoznika in ob premišljevanju o uredniški viziji, ki ji nameravam slediti pri urejanju knjižnih recenzij. Tudi v prihodnje bodo recenzije v *Družboslovnih razpravah* pokrivalo širok spekter znanstvenih disciplin, avtorjev, založb in nacionalnih kontekstov z namenom vzpostavljanja bogatega intelektualnega dialoga, ki bo temeljil na vključenosti različnih glasov. Recenzentsko dejavnost morajo pri tem enako zastopati tako mlajši kot tudi že uveljavljeni/e raziskovalci/ke in profesorji/ice. Pisanje recenzij je za mlajše kolege/ice lahko ena prvih priložnosti za vzpostavitev lastnega glasu v akademski skupnosti. Enako pomembni so tudi glasovi že uveljavljenih sodelavcev/k, ki lahko zaradi dolgoletnega delovanja na določenem področju rigorozno presojujejo aktualno knjižno produkcijo.

Pluralizem glasov pa je treba zagotavljati tudi na ravni izbire knjig za recenzentsko obravnavo. Čeprav so recenzentski presoji najpogosteje podvržene knjige slovenskih založb, pa so zaželene tudi razprave o delih, ki izidejo v tujini,

še posebej če so jih napisali/e slovenski/e avtorji/ice. Prav tako so k pisanju recenzij vabljeni/e tudi tuji/e avtorji/ice. Z vključitvijo glasov zunaj nacionalnih okvirov bodo razširjene meje znanstvenega dialoga, obenem pa bo zagotovljeno, da relativna majhnost slovenske akademske skupnosti, za katero so značilni tesni kolegialni odnosi, ne bo pomenila ovire pri konstruktivnem in nepristranskem ocenjevanju znanstvenega dela.

Predstavljene uredniške smernice so bile deloma že upoštevane pri pripravi bloka recenzij knjig v tej številki reviji DR, ki prinaša obravnavo dveh zbornikov in dveh znanstvenih monografij. Nina Cvar recenzira zbornik *Artificial Intelligence, Social Harms and Human Rights*, ki je pomemben prispevek k razumevanju fenomena umetne inteligence z vidika prava in človekovih pravic. Lucija Klun kritično pretresa zbornik *Migrant Children's Integration and Education in Europe: Approaches, Methodologies and Policies*, ki ponuja analizo naslovne problematike v različnih nacionalnih kontekstih. Nina Perger pod drobnogled vzame monografijo Vlada Kotnika z naslovom *Trans(spol)nost: Arheologija trans/vednosti*, ki jo sestavljajo štiri sklopi na temo trans vednosti, trans zgodovin, trans teorij in trans medijev. Primož Krašovec pa se posveča monografiji *Za Marxa*, enemu najpomembnejših zgodnjih del Louisa Althusserja. Tudi v prihodnje bodo recenzentski bloki obsegali najmanj štiri besedila.

Naj na koncu tega uvodnika prav vse lepo povabim k branju tega bloka kot tudi k soustvarjanju produktivnega dialoga, v katerega se lahko vključujete kot pisci/ke recenziranih knjig, kot njihovi bralci/ke ali pa preprosto kot spremljevalci/ke družboslovno-humanistične knjižne produkcije. Če naletite na pomembna tuja ali domača dela, za katera menite, da si zaslužijo pozornost, nas lahko nanje opozorite, tudi če jih ne nameravate recenzirati. Dobrodošle so tudi recenzije recenzij, ki lahko spodbujajo nadaljnje razprave o določenem delu. Vabljeni, da s svojimi predlogi, komentarji, uvidi in priporočili prispevate k uresničevanju predstavljene uredniške vizije – s tem boste prispevali k sooblikovanju takšne akademske skupnosti, ki kljub neizogibnim pritiskom po hiperprodukciji znanstvenih besedil ohranja pomembne dialoške prakse, ki so nujne za vitalen razvoj družboslovno-humanistične misli.

Rok Smrdelj,
urednik recenzij knjig, *Družboslovne razprave*

Literatura

Ploštajner, Klemen (2021): Poziv: recenzije monografij na temo epidemija in družba. *Družboslovne razprave*, XXXVIII (99): 11–17.

A book review as a “dialogue with different audiences”

Dear readers,

In a previous issue of DR/SSF, my predecessor Klemen Ploštajner reflected on the importance of writing book reviews in the social sciences and humanities in the neoliberal circumstances of academic knowledge production driven by the constant need to accumulate scientific points and citations. He described the current status of book reviews as follows: “The fact that the process of reviewing books is increasingly marginalised, the act of writing them devalued, and the work on them precariously positioned, merely reflects the degradation of the academic community in the conditions of forced hyperproduction of scientific publications.” (p. 11). However, my colleague Ploštajner not only remained on the level of critically highlighting the unfortunately unfavourable position of book reviews as a form of academic practice, yet also emphasised that book reviews are “an important tool for preserving the dialogical nature of knowledge production” (ibid.). To sum it up in my own words: Dialogue is a key element in the production of academic knowledge, and the book review, as a “tool for dialogue with different audiences”, is likely one of the most dialogic forms among academic genres (ibid.). Primarily, a book review serves as a tool of dialogue between the reviewer and the author(s) of the reviewed work and, secondarily, between the reviewer and the broader academic community. Yet, what distinguishes book reviews from most academic writing genres is their ability to engage in dialogue with non-academic audiences because of their concise form and communicative style. By providing critical and in-depth reflection on the latest books to emerge, such reviews also offer insights into the most recent findings to readers who do not necessarily come from the academic sphere.

This is how I would formulate my initial associations after reading Ploštajner’s editorial and pondering the editorial vision that I intend to adhere to while editing book reviews. However, in the SSF journal book reviews will continue to encompass a broad spectrum of scientific disciplines, authors, publishers, and national contexts, all with the aim of fostering a rich intellectual dialogue based on the inclusion of diverse voices. The activity of reviewing should be equally represented by both younger and established researchers and professors. For younger colleagues, writing reviews can provide one of the first opportunities to establish their own voice within the academic community. Equally important are the voices of already established colleagues who, because of their longstanding commitment to a particular field, can rigorously evaluate the current book production.

Ensuring a plurality of voices must also be a factor in the selection of books for review. While most reviews are of books published by Slovenian publishers, works published abroad are also welcome, especially if written by Slovenian authors. In addition, authors who are not from Slovenia are also invited to contribute reviews. Including voices from beyond national borders broadens the horizon of scholarly dialogue while assuring that the relative smallness of the Slovenian academic community, characterised by close collegial relationships, is not an obstacle to constructive and unbiased evaluation of scholarly work.

The editorial guidelines presented have already been partly taken into account while preparing the book review section in this issue of SSF, which covers reviews of two edited volumes and two monographs. Nina Cvar reviews the edited volume *Artificial Intelligence, Social Harms and Human Rights*, which provides a significant contribution to understanding the phenomenon of artificial intelligence from the perspectives of law and human rights. Lucija Klun critically examines the edited volume *Migrant Children's Integration and Education in Europe: Approaches, Methodologies and Policies*, offering analysis of the title topic in various national contexts. Nina Perger scrutinises the monograph *Trans(spol)nost: Arheologija trans/vednosti* by Vlado Kotnik, containing four sections covering topics related to trans knowledge, trans histories, trans theories, and trans media. Finally, Primož Krašovec delves into the work *Za Marxa*, one of Louis Althusser's most important early works. In the future, the book review section will continue to include at least four texts.

As I conclude this editorial, I would like to invite you all to engage in a productive dialogue in which you can participate either as authors of the books reviewed, as readers of the books reviewed, or simply as followers of social science and humanities book production. If you come across noteworthy books and edited volumes that you believe deserve attention, you may bring them to our notice, even if you have no intention of reviewing them. Reviews of reviews are also welcome since they can stimulate further discussions about a given book. You are encouraged to contribute to the realisation of the editorial vision presented here through your suggestions, comments, insights and recommendations. By so doing, you will be helping to shape an academic community that, despite the inevitable pressures of the hyperproduction of scientific texts, still maintains significant dialogic practices crucial for the vital development of social sciences and humanities thinking.

Rok Smrdelj,
Book Review Editor, *Social Science Forum*

References

Ploštajner, Klemen (2021): Poziv: recenzije monografij na temo epidemija in družba. *Družboslovne razprave*, XXXVIII (99): 11–17.