

**Polona Kelava**

## Vocational socialisation and the legitimacy of educating in vocational training

**Abstract:** This paper intends to discuss the relationship between educating and socialisation, as well as the relationship between vocational educating and vocational socialisation. The focus is on the definitions of the two notions, more specifically, it will be discussed whether there is a clear distinction between the two terms, especially from the perspective of the intentionality of the process in order to clarify the application of the terms in practice. An example is provided to show that socialisation aims in vocational training often include educational (vocational) aims. The example is further discussed in relation to vocational ethics, which allows for the legitimisation of (vocational) educating.

**Key words:** educating, vocational educating, education, vocational education, socialisation, vocational socialisation, vocational ethics, legitimacy of (vocational) educating

UDK:

*Polona Kelava, Educational Research Institute, Ljubljana; e-mail: polona.kelava@guest.arnes.si*

## Introduction

According to E. Hughes, founder of sociology of work, »*Division of labour*, being one of the most fundamental of all social processes, finds one of its most explicit expressions in occupations.« (1994:23). However, he adds that from the perspective of sociology, it is only a coincidence that the distribution of labour appears to be technical (ibid. 24)<sup>1</sup>. This basic definition and its implications (cf. Hughes, 1994:19-88) point to the significance of occupations for society, and also the consequence for its individual members. If a specific occupation represents one of the key components of an individual's life, and vocational identity represents one of the key components of an individual's identity (cf. Muršak, 1991, 1993, 1994), then it is necessary to dedicate special care to the preparation for future occupation.

Modern systems of education and (practical) training are predominantly oriented towards at a rather accurate preparation for specific occupations (whether it includes alternations or not), in order to enable the individual an easier and better placement in *society* during his or her transition to working life. This goes beyond mere education, teaching and learning, or the transfer of knowledge. It also presupposes the acquisition of certain working and social competencies that are more or less directly related to work (a specific occupation), where *educating* is understood to be an integral part. These systems should thus include *educational* preparation for a specific occupation. Where can socialisation, vocational socialisation and vocational educating be placed? The question is, whether this is in accordance with the anticipated historical disappearing (denying) of 'educating', or rather, how does this relate to its legitimacy.

Are we witnessing avoidance, or evasion of the use of the word educating, not only in vocational training, but also in the entire system of education (from upper secondary level onwards)? Among the declared aims of educating, sociali-

---

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Kavčič, 1987.

sation aims are expressed while educational<sup>2</sup> aims are not. To ask ourselves why this is so, we must first define the following notions – educating, socialisation, vocational educating and vocational socialisation. We immediately come across the (non-)intentionality of educating and socialisation. In certain definitions it clarifies the distinction between the meanings of the two terms; in other definitions the terms coincide in this point.

## Educating and Socialisation

Although there are differences in how the more notable authors define the relationship between educating and socialisation, the majority see educating as an intentional process. Let us mention a few examples. »The term *educating* denotes the planned activity of parents and teachers with the intention of influencing a child or young person in their development, where they may acquire a certain manner of behaviour which is necessary in order to perform various social functions and for the normal integration into social groups and the social community on a whole. With *educating*, established customs, habits and moral standards are transferred to young generations. Educating is an element of culture and is directly linked to education, teaching and learning.« (Bosanac, Mandić and Petković, 1977, p.410) The listed authors of *The glossary of sociology and social psychology* connect educating with formal instruction and unconditionally assign it intentional. Similarly, other authors, who understand educating as an integral part of socialisation, recognise the power and intention of educating. Durkheim (1981:42) defines educating as »systematic socialisation of the young generation«. Therefore in this sense, Durkheim emphasises that the aim of educating is to form or build a social being. From his subsequent discussion – that the task of educating is to complement the newly born, egoistic and asocial being with another being, who is capable of a moral and social life; and that educating allows for the transfer of very complex and diverse abilities that social life requires (ibid., 43-47) – the power Durkheim ascribes to educating is evident.

Bosanac, Mandić and Petković also define the relationship between educating and socialisation. »As opposed to socialisation (which is a broader notion and includes all social factors that form a personality), educating involves an institutionalised, more or less planned and systematic influence of the family and specialised institutions (kindergarten, school and other educational and cultural establishments), which leads to the acquisition of habits, manners of behaviour, internalisation of criteria, and, above all offers knowledge in an organised way.« (1977:410)

Even the following definition of educating as »a process of conscious transference of culture, in particular from older to younger generations« (Sociološki ... :728) does not concede non-intentionality within it.

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Katalog znanj..., 2004 and Programi ... 2008. (More on the issue later.)

*Educating* is therefore only intentional. It is a planned process of the formation of an individual in accordance with certain values and it occurs as a result of our activity, which is meant to »cultivate« certain values and supposedly takes place by following a certain value. The value »guides«, or directs educating'.<sup>3</sup>

(cf. also Medveš, 2000:187, 188.)

What can be said about intentionality or non-intentionality of socialisation, and consequently its relation to educating? As will be revealed, many authors attribute non-intentionality to socialisation, while at the same time they interpret other processes (most often educating) as its integral part, and these are (or can also be) intentional. This is a contradiction, as within something that is spontaneous, there is no place for »intentional«, planned elements, despite the fact that they may lead towards the same aims. Turning to how major authors define socialisation and its relation to educating, the topic of socialisation can be approached.

*Socialisation* is primarily the field of study of social psychology, sociology, sociology of knowledge, pedagogic sociology and other related sciences. As there are substantially less cases where we can find support for (exclusive) non-intentionality of socialisation and consequently for socialisation as a process parallel (and not subordinate or superior) to educating, in comparison to intentionality of educating, a few examples of the former interpretation of the relationship between educating and socialisation shall be examined.

According to *The glossary of sociology and social psychology*, socialisation is the process of the transformation of the biological individual into a social person. Therefore, »a group of organised and unorganised influences, a continuity of processes, the integrity of social interaction that causes the formation of such a personality that answers the needs of a specific type of society«<sup>4</sup> (Bosanać, Mandić and Petković, 1977:591-592). In its<sup>5</sup> analysis »organised« as well as »unorganised« »influences« are even more clearly included into socialisation.

Sociology of knowledge also places educating within socialisation, which should therefore be a »many-sided and consistent initiation of the individual

<sup>3</sup> It is important to note that we do *not* (at this point) discuss the effect of educating in accordance to (our) action or a certain value.

<sup>4</sup> The definition in the glossary is a contribution by V. Milanović.

<sup>5</sup> »Socialisation is thus a process of the formation of social motivation in the behaviour of the individual system of the subject. The process of socialisation is not programmed biologically, on the contrary it represents a functional reprogramming of bio-physiological potentials (...) with the content of social interaction and the social system, therefore the process of socialisation parallels the development of bio-physiological potentials. The process of socialisation is carried out through the learning process, more specifically through two basic modalities: a) on the basis of the subject's own activity and acquisition of experience through interaction with the environment in the context of the fulfilment of his or her needs and desires, and more generally through practice, b) on the basis of organised influences performed by society (family, social group, the state) through educating, school, ideology and value system. Socialisation is a very general process that involves various specific components, which can be interpreted as special processes. These are primarily internalisation, or introjections, educating, (learning/instruction) and acculturation.« (Bosanać, Mandić and Petković, 1977:591-592)

into the objective social world or into one of its spheres« (Berger and Luckmann, 1988:122). Bergant also derives from this social science and relates to it with the formulation that *socialisation* is »a process, in which a young (human) being from the early days of their life is introduced into a certain social group, through which he or she acquires the culture (manner of thinking, speech, manner of interpersonal communication, knowledge, beliefs, feeling, values, use of material goods, working areas etc.) that belongs to the group and which is usually part of a wider cultural environment. Through the process of socialisation, the child becomes part of the social and cultural environment in which they were born and which surrounds them.« (Bergant, 1994:16) It is clear that such an interpretation also includes the »intentional part of socialisation« – which is *educating*. Similarly, the general sociological definition of socialisation as a »process in which a dependent child gradually becomes self-aware, educated and is introduced into the culture in which they are born« (Giddens, 2000:25), presupposes the same. This is followed by the formulation that socialisation in its most general meaning »involves the transcendence of the separation of a phenomenon from other elements and the social entity. ... In this sense what is understood under the term socialisation is primarily the socialisation of the individual ..., their placement in society and culture, as well as their becoming 'a personality'« (Sociolški ..., 454). The same source (ibid.,728) also refers to educating as part of socialisation.

Among the sciences, social psychology probably deals with the problems of socialisation most thoroughly, as it positions social learning and socialisation as one of its central objects of research (cf. Rot, 1968 and 1983), thus it is also of interest how it defines socialisation<sup>6</sup>.

Havenka (1968:81), for example, defines the process of *socialisation* as »the development of a personality that is actualised through the process of learning«, as well as emphasising the restricted meaning of the term *socialisation of personality*, which refers to the learning of such behaviour that is desirable, acceptable and valued in a specific society. In this case, the notion of *socialisation of personality* appears to coincide with the notion of *educating* (ibid.). Simultaneously, the same author (ibid.,110) states that the term »*socialisation of personality*« refers to the forms and contents of social influence in the process of the formation of identity, as well as the fact that human generation necessarily and naturally evolve in society«. Thus, the author allows for elements of educating or intentionality within socialisation. His equating of intentionality and non-intentionality at a certain point and in a certain field of their activity does not take into account the possibility of educating and socialisation as being two separate processes, which in this concrete example, strive towards the fulfilment of the same or familiar values. This point later will be returned to.

The presented definitions allow for non-intentionality of socialisation as well as for intentionality of educating, however, they are not exclusive.<sup>7</sup> We can sum

<sup>6</sup> Cf. also Urh, 2001:24-32.

<sup>7</sup> Similarly A. Gutmann (2001), in relation to democratic educating, believes that at least a part of socialisation is intentional e.g. in connection to the issue he speaks about »wrong manners of so-

up that most authors allow for intentionality as well as non-intentionality within socialisation, however, we have already assumed that such a view does not hold.

Haralambos and Holborn (2001) provide a more neutral definition. »In a group of peers an inexperienced child learns, through the interaction with others and through children's games, how to adapt to accepted manners of behaviour in a group and to observe the fact that social life is based on rules.« (ibid., 12) However, the authors do not define the relation of socialisation to educating.

In all the above definitions a fact has to be pointed out – all definitions attribute non-intentionality to socialisation relatively – except in the case when we wish to establish socialisation intentionally, in accordance with a certain purpose or value. Thus, they place within an unintentional process a point of intentionality (-educating), which is contradictory and thus unacceptable. (cf. also Medveš, 2000)

As the above definitions indicate, at least to a certain extent, we can conclude that socialisation and educating are two *parallel* processes, which can otherwise lead to the same goals (and are probably more effective in this case)<sup>8</sup>. However, they are distinctive in one feature – intentionality. If educating is intentional and guided by certain values and thus defined in relation to ethics, it follows that socialisation, as a process taking place among individuals (peers) spontaneously at each moment of contact, is an unintentional process, which is impossible to control (guide).

## Vocational Socialisation – Vocational Educating – Vocational Ethics

Approaching the core of the subject, the focus of interest can be placed on the parallels between the above statements and vocational socialisation and educating. A clear definition of *vocational educating shall also be given*. In the practice of vocational and professional training, the term vocational educating is no longer used.

Let us examine the following example – in our catalogues of knowledge standards for subjects that are taught in the programmes of vocational training (these are programmes that are still performed but are gradually being phased out), the listed educational (vocational) aims are not expressed, while the aims of vocational socialisation are.

Let us take a look at *socialisation aims* (according to the corresponding informational aims) within the operational aims of the subject »engineering« in the programmes of secondary vocational education for the following occupations – sign painter, chimney sweep, construction worker specialised in dry-fitting, stonemason, (brick)kiln manufacturer, house painter, mechanical engineer, carpenter and bricklayer.

cialisation« that parents may choose for their children. Such a definition goes along with those that were already mentioned.

<sup>8</sup> Or less effective when guided by different or even contradictory values.

Socialisation aims of the subject »engineering«, among other things, determine that a student or apprentice should: develop a positive attitude towards the profession, ... , form his or her interests and standpoint in any specific area of vocation, ..., become aware of the professional co-responsibility in the engineering business, especially in planning construction objects, recognise the necessity for an organisational hierarchy and the connection between all co-workers, ..., develop personal as well as professional responsibility, ..., develop ecological awareness, ..., develop an awareness of personal professional and moral responsibility, ..., develop a positive attitude towards cultural heritage, ... . (Katalog, 2004)

In newer catalogues of knowledge standards, for the school year 2008/09, socialisation aims, as a special category within operational aims, are left out. However, they are presented in the directional aims of the module.<sup>9</sup>

In individual socialisation aims, we can easily recognise the demand for intentional and planned educational activity in accordance to specific (vocational) values. Why can it be seen, on the higher secondary stage of education, an evasion/avoidance of educational aims, or rather the aims of vocational educating despite the obvious contradiction?

On the other hand, Muršak already posed the question of the justification for planned adaptation of the individual with regards to the demands of professional work during their preparation for it as well as during their later professional activity (1991:389)<sup>10</sup>.

Yet, this is how we act – it is expressed in the catalogues of knowledge standards, while the true nature of these aims remains concealed. At the higher secondary stage of education, obvious educational aims are attempted to be hidden. This includes specific (vocational) values as well, as the concealment of the term socialisation and the avoidance of using the term educating. Is educating (at this stage of schooling) not legitimate any more? Why is this not expressed in official documents, even when the educational element is evident?

Let us begin with the definition of the origin and development of *vocational identity*, which is the basic result of vocational socialisation, where the process is twofold. »On the one hand, planned vocational activity takes place, which through the processes of vocational educating tries to produce such effects of vocational socialisation, which would as best as possible suit the vocation or type of individual with a certain occupation; and the task of education and training is to prepare the individual for it. On the other hand, vocational socialisation takes place. This is not planned and thus relates to a 'spontaneous' development of vocational identity. The two processes together constitute vocational socialisation as a whole, ...« (Muršak, 1991:395)

<sup>9</sup> Cf. also Programi ..., 2008.

<sup>10</sup> This contradiction is not going to be discussed more in detail here. And again, the objecting to the *justification for planned adaptation of the individual with regards to the demands of professional work* would not be approached through denying of the necessity of educating and vocational educating. But the awareness of this dimension and the extent of the problems of vocational identity as a whole should be noticed.



*Vocational educating*<sup>11</sup> according to Muršak, »is a process of intentional and systematic development of qualities that are characteristic of a certain vocation, and simultaneously conscious and intentional influences on the formation of vocational identity, or rather, on the course of the processes of vocational socialisation – at school or workplace, at practical training during the working process, or during working practice. The term 'planned' or 'guided' vocational socialisation can also be used« (2002:84), and we can observe that just the same as with *socialisation*, the non-intentionality of *vocational socialisation* is inconsistent. However, it also becomes clear that intentionality, or an outline of the aims of educating is acceptable.

If we thus agreed to vocational educating at the higher secondary stage of education, we would contribute to the achievement of the aims of vocational educating, provide a more appropriate output and try to at least partly 'direct' the process of vocational socialisation. This does not theoretically correspond to our former arguments about the delineation of educating and socialisation on the basis of intentionality, however, to deny vocational educating in the (educational) practice of vocational and professional training as existing in the catalogues of knowledge standards for vocational and professional training, is even more questionable.

The same author defines vocational socialisation as »the process of formation of vocational identity, which begins already in the schooling period and continues throughout the individual's career. The attitude towards work and understanding of the self in relation to work is formed and developed in the process.« (Muršak, 2002:83) And further, »In addition to the real situation in the processes of work, the referential community in which the individual works, and where dynamic group relations are formed among the members of the same social group that provides the individual with feedback information about their work and renders possible the processes of interpersonal identification, is of vital importance for the formation of vocational identity.« (ibid.) This definition does not allow for any possibility of vocational socialisation. It is, however, complemented by the definition of socialisation aims (that are as a rule included in vocational socialisation), which encompass »the development of social and cultural standards of vocational activity and communication, as well as procedure standards; the development of vocational or professional identity and responsibility; development of motivation and capacity for team-work, for co-operation and problem-solving, as well as the development of elements of corporate identification and social integration in a company or working community« (ibid., 117). If we were consistent, we would refer to these aims as »educational« and not as »socialisation« aims.

Berger and Luckmann do not actually speak with the intention of defining vocational socialisation. They indeed tackle its components in an interesting

---

<sup>11</sup> The author originally uses the term vocational education, which is also more commonly used. Here is, on the other hand, used the term vocational educating, since this expression is more consistent with the entire text and its argumentation.



way. They first delineate primary from secondary socialisation<sup>12</sup>, and further define secondary socialisation as follows, »*Secondary socialisation* is the internalisation of institutionalised žunderworlds', or žunderworlds' based in an institution. Its extent and character are therefore limited with the complexity of the division of labour and accompanying distribution of knowledge.«<sup>13</sup> (1988:129) This definition undoubtedly relates to elements of vocational socialisation. We similarly recognise a space for educating in the statement that »the fact that secondary socialisation processes do not presuppose a high degree of identification (with others, comm. P. K.) and that its content does not possess the quality of inevitability (as is necessary with primary socialisation, comm. P.K.)« can be »pragmatically useful, as they allow for a rationally and emotionally controlled sequence of learning« (ibid.,134). If we take into account that in complex institutions highly classified systems of secondary socialisation exists, which also presuppose different categories of (corporate) staff (ibid.,136), we know that at least a part of the values, which support and maintain such systems, can be transmitted methodically – through educating; while a part is transmitted through unintentional socialisation. The statement in relation to socialisation that, »it is possible to transform subjective reality« (Berger, Luckmann, 1988:145), allows for the conclusion that it can take place intentionally and/or unintentionally. Haralambos and Holborn (2001:12) interestingly conclude that in western society, »the system of education, working community and peer groups (their members have a similar status and are often of the same age)« (ibid.) are also among the factors affecting *socialisation*. The essence is the transfer of values, which is partly also intentional, where every time the values need to be rethought and re-evaluated<sup>14</sup>.

We can affirm with certainty at least that *vocational socialisation* represents a very important part of *socialisation* in general. From what was said to this point beneath this subtitle, it is possible to paraphrase that often sources present elements of intentionality also in vocational socialisation, and that vocational educating as well as its defined goals are often hidden under the notion of »vocational socialisation«.

As has already been indicated, educating and socialisation are two separate notions and processes, which can lead to the same goals, and are in this

---

<sup>12</sup> »*Primary socialisation* is socialisation, to which the individual is exposed in their childhood, and with the help of which they become part of society. *Secondary socialisation* is then any further process that introduces the already socialised individual into new spheres of the society in which they live.« (Berger and Luckmann, 1988:122)

<sup>13</sup> It should be added that Berger and Luckmann interpret secondary socialisation as »acquisition of knowledge that derives from specific social roles. These roles are directly or indirectly rooted in the division of labour.« (1988:129) They also add that »secondary socialisation requires the acquisition of vocabulary that derives from specific social roles, which in the first place means the internalisation of meaning that structure established explanations of behaviour within the institutionalised area« (ibid.)

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Haralambos, Holborn, 2001:12. »At the beginning of their professional life a young joiner, teacher or accountant soon learns the rules of the game and skills at their job. If they changed their jobs, they would join another professional group and would have to learn new skills as well as accept different manners of behaviour and clothing.« (cf. also Muršak, 1991:391)

case more effective. A similar conclusion can be applied in the case of vocational educating and vocational socialisation.

Returning to the definition of vocational identity, two key sources of a successful formation of vocational identity (Muršak, 1991), and above all, some major advantages of their uniform operation can be seen. If then the aims of *vocational educating* as well as the *working environment*, with the help of which the individual is *socially initiated* into a specific occupation strive towards the same values, vocational educating and socialisation would be more effective, they would achieve their aims, while the individual will form a positive vocational identity.

Here, we are led to think about *vocational ethics*, which is »ethics that is formed and used in a social group in order to level relationships inside the group and the relationships with other groups. The specific activity and status of a certain vocation represent the basis for vocational ethics. ... Vocational ethics is usually not in contradiction with generally prevailing social ethics; it only specifies its general rules by using them according to the specific relationships in the occupation that it regulates. Vocational ethics usually develops from a distinct awareness of honour because of the association to a certain vocation, which strengthens the sense of belonging.« (Sociološki ..., 1982:500)

If we can not deny the existence of vocational ethics, it is even more difficult to deny vocational educating. If ethics exist, then values also exist. And where there *are* values, it is worth to derive educational aims from them – in the case of vocational ethics these are *aims of vocational educating*, in order to at least neutralise – if not advance – the situation, when spontaneous vocational socialisation is negative (cf. Muršak, 1991:397); or rather to reinforce the effects of positive socialisation with a tendency towards the same positive vocational values.

### **Legitimacy of 'Educating' in Vocational Training?**

»The question of legitimacy (of educating, comm. P. K.) was originally a question of ethic intentionality.« (Medveš, 2000:189) If the question of legitimacy was once asked, as today it is not discussed *at all* in relation to educating as a whole, then even more so it needs to be reconsidered at the secondary stage of education. Our discussion is primarily guided by the fact that educational aims, at this stage, are »masked« into socialisation aims. Why is this so; why do we avoid the term »educating« at this stage? Do we need an »excuse« in order to *educate*?

As a matter of fact, it is »difficult to imagine the connection between pedagogy and ethics ever to be broken« (ibid., 191), which does not mean that certain questions and problems relating to the issue are not posed (Medveš, 2000). These, however, do not indicate a categorical denial or abandoning of educating on the basis of any ethics, nor does it indicate the abandoning of educating for it to be legitimate. As an answer to the absence of values, which today questions the

legitimacy of educating in accordance to ethics<sup>15</sup>, Medveš (ibid.) emphasises that educating needs to be developed as a problem of constant public confrontation of the individual with values, and not their rejection.

As the function of vocational training is to prepare the individual for their job (which is in the future going to represent a great and important part of their life, while vocational identity is going to be among the most important components of their identity), it should in this sense comprise of at least a part of vocational educating. The setting of aims/goals of *vocational educating* appears to be reasonable and justifiable, with the intention of achieving vocational socialisation – which already takes place at school or at workplace during practical training – it would be as successful as possible and would contribute to the formation of vocational identity as thoroughly as possible (cf. Muršak, 1991). And if it is legitimate as well (cf. Medveš, 2000. cf. also Pavlović, 2000), and a teacher is »bound to acquaint the children (and pupils, comm. P.K) with values in their educational practice and ... to teach them moral communication« (Medveš, 2000:195), it follows that the acceptance of »non-educating« would be unjustifiable – which also applies for vocational educating, but above all it would be in contradiction to the ethical imperative of a particular vocation.

We cannot, however, avoid the fact that it is a completely different matter of discussion, whether a teacher is going to be successful in »tuning children's moral judgement, emotions, will and behaviour with general principles that the teacher follows« (ibid.). This is the space where *socialisation* as unplanned, unintentional and spontaneous plays a necessary role. This component of influence upon the child or pupil is out of our control; the educational component is therefore so much more at the centre of attention of the system of education. Although it cannot be neglected that the effect of educating cannot be controlled or foretold, we can not reject educating, or substitute it with other terms. If ethics remains the basis of educating, and vocational ethics the basis of vocational educating, and socialisation, which cannot be controlled, affects »the desired result of educating«, we should at least try to move towards such goals of educating and socialisation that would formally correspond. It is necessary to consider whether it is appropriate to substitute *educating* with *socialisation*, and whether this means the evasion of appointing legitimacy to educating.

If educating is thus legitimate, then vocational educating is legitimate as well. If we define vocational educational goals, then we must say that we are

---

<sup>15</sup> Medveš »questions« the legitimacy of educating in accordance with ethics in the treatise *Legitimacy of education in the public school* (2000) so as to re-establish this relation and justify it under the present circumstances. He asserts that up to the middle 19<sup>th</sup> and 20<sup>th</sup> century »ethics was the source on which pedagogy grounded its legitimacy« (ibid., 190). Cultural pedagogy later posed the question of legitimacy of educating on the basis of ethics, in which »there is (always) evidence of social influences, and within them finally also outlines of adherence to particular political doctrines, ...« (ibid.), which can definitely be disputed; (as) it can lead to an oversimplified conclusion of the illegitimacy of educating. Despite the crisis in values disregard for educating or »non-educating« is not acceptable. It would be easier and more justifiable to consider/think about values. This applies to professional education as well.

educating for a vocation. We would thus acknowledge both components of the formation of vocational identity as well as legitimise a planned introduction of vocational ethics into practice through appropriate educational aims.

In vocational and professional training, it therefore is more appropriate to lay greater emphasis and put more energy into the consideration of ethics, values, (vocational) professional ethics and professional (vocational) values.

Regarding the disclosed arguments it is concluded and suggested that relationships between educating and socialisation would be rethought and newly established. The authorisation of this rethinking is based on the legitimacy of (vocational) educating as well as on evident resting of vocational educating on vocational ethics, according to which the catalogues of knowledge standards, other materials and, nevertheless, the attitude of staff, who shape everyday life of vocational education in Slovenia, must be adapted correspondingly.

## References

- Althusser, L. (1980): Ideologija in ideološki aparat države. In: Ideologija in estetski učinek. Collection. Skušek-Močnik, Z. (ed.) Series: Marksistična teorija kulture in umetnosti. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
- Beck, U., Brater, M., Daheim, H. (1980): Soziologie der Arbeit und der Berufe. Grundlagen, Problemfelder, Forschungsergebnisse. Reinbek bei Hamburg: Rowohlt.
- Bergant, M. (1970): Teme iz pedagoške sociologije. Series: Misel in čas. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
- Bergant, M. (1994): Nove teme pedagoške sociologije in sociologije reforme šolanja. Series: Razprave Filozofske fakultete. Ljubljana: Znanstveni inštitut Filozofske fakultete.
- Berger, P. L., Luckmann, T. (1988): Družbena konstrukcija realnosti. Razprava iz sociologije znanja. Ljubljana: Cankarjeva založba.
- Bosanac, M., Mandić, O., Petković, S. (1977): Riječnik sociologije i socijalne psihologije. Zagreb: Informator.
- Dubar, C. (1993): Poklicna socializacija današnje mladine: krize in spremembe. In: Sodobna pedagogika. Vol. 44, No. 1 – 2, pp. 69 – 77.
- Durkheim, É. (1981): Vaspitanje i sociologija. Series: Biblioteka »Saznanja«. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.
- Giddens, A. (2000): Sociology. Cambridge: Polity Press in Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.
- Gutmann, A. (2001): Demokratična vzgoja. Series: Civitas. Ljubljana: Slovensko društvo raziskovalcev šolskega polja.
- Haralambos, M., Holborn, M. (2001): Sociologija. Teme in pogledi. Ljubljana: DZS.
- Havenka, N. (1968): Socijalizacija ličnosti. V: Socijalna Psihologija. Rot. N. (ur.) Series: Biblioteka »Radnički univerzitet« Priručnici. Beograd: Izdavačko preduće »Rad«, pp. 77 – 110.
- Hughes, E. C. (1994): On work, race, and the sociological imagination. Series: The Heritage of sociology. Chicago, London : University of Chicago Press.

- Katalog znanj za predmet gradbeništvo v programih srednjega poklicnega izobraževanja črkoslikar, dimnikar, izvajalec suhomontažne gradnje, kamnosek, pečar – keramik, slikopleskar, strojnik gradbene mehanizacije, tesar in zidar. (2004): [http://www.mszs.si/slo/solstvo/ss/programi%202004/programi/Spi/model\\_sk\\_iz\\_v\\_pr\\_v\\_grad/dimnikar/KZ\\_gradbenistvo.htm](http://www.mszs.si/slo/solstvo/ss/programi%202004/programi/Spi/model_sk_iz_v_pr_v_grad/dimnikar/KZ_gradbenistvo.htm).
- Kavčič, B. (1987): *Sociologija dela*. Series: Družboslovje. Ljubljana: Delavska enotnost.
- Medveš, Z. (1991): Pedagoška etika in koncept vzgoje. Part 1. In: *Sodobna pedagogika*. Vol. 42, No. 3 – 4, pp. 101 – 117, and Part 2. In: *Sodobna pedagogika*. Vol. 42, No. 5 – 6, pp. 213 – 226.
- Medveš, Z., Kodelja, Z. (ur.) (1991): *Vzgoja v javni šoli*. Collection. Ljubljana: Znanstveno in publicistično središče.
- Medveš, Z. (2000): Legitimnost vzgoje v javni šoli. In: *Sodobna pedagogika*. Vol. 51, No. 1, pp. 186 – 197.
- Muršak, J. (1987): Izobraževanje odraslih v funkciji novih oblik profesionalne socializacije. Intervju s francoskim raziskovalcem dr. Claudom Dubarom. In: *Sodobna pedagogika*. Vol. 38, No. 1 – 2, pp. 74 – 79.
- Muršak, J. (1991): Problemi poklicne socializacije. In: *Sodobna pedagogika*. Vol. 42, No. 7 – 8, pp. 389 – 398.
- Muršak, J. (1993): Razvoj kvalifikacij in problemi poklicne socializacije. V: Medveš, Z., Muršak, J. *Poklicno izobraževanje: problemi in perspektive*. Ljubljana: Slovensko društvo pedagogov in Znanstveni inštitut FF, pp. 229 – 281.
- Muršak, J. (1994): Pojem in pogoji razvoja alternacije v poklicnem izobraževanju. In: *Sodobna pedagogika*. Vol. 45, No. 9 – 10, pp. 461 – 473.
- Muršak, J. (2002): *Pojmovni slovar za področje poklicnega in strokovnega izobraževanja*. Ljubljana: Ministrstvo za šolstvo, znanost in šport, Urad RS za šolstvo, Center RS za poklicno izobraževanje.
- Pavlović, Z. (2000): Je vzgoja v (javni) šoli legitimna? Kakšna vzgoja? In: *Sodobna pedagogika*. Vol. 51, No. 1, pp. 178 – 185.
- Programi srednješolskega izobraževanja 2008/2009 (2008): [www.mss.gov.si/si/delovna\\_podrocja/srednjesolsko\\_izobrazevanje/programi\\_v\\_ss/](http://www.mss.gov.si/si/delovna_podrocja/srednjesolsko_izobrazevanje/programi_v_ss/)
- Rot, N. (ur.) (1968): *Socijalna Psihologija*. Series: Biblioteka »Radnički univerzitet« Priročnici. Beograd: Izdavačko preduzeće »Rad«.
- Rot, N. (1983): *Osnovi socijalne psihologije*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva.
- Sociološki leksikon. (1982): Lukić, R. D. (ur.) Beograd: Savremena administracija. Urh, I. (2001): *Oblikovanje poklicne identitete*. Master's thesis. Ljubljana: independently published.
- Vzgoja v javni šoli. (2000): *Program srečanja*. Pripravljeni referati. Ljubljana: Slovensko društvo pedagogov.