



MAKALE HAKKINDA**Geliş:****INCLUSIVE EDUCATION SYSTEM IN EUROPE AND IN KOSOVO****MAYIS 2017****Kabul:****Vedat Bajrami^a****AĞUSTOS 2017**

ABSTRACT

Inclusive education today is a main issue and requirement of all European institutions in the European Union, the European Council, among experts, NGOs and individuals. This research represents a study of different concepts and implementation of inclusive education in Europe and Kosovo. The paper is a result of a research of education systems, systems of support, legislation and evaluation of positive practice in the countries of the European Union and Kosovo. After the elaboration of the basic philosophy of inclusive education, which shows that inclusive education is the best solution to include the children with special educational needs (further SEN) in the education system, the main research questions were indentified for this study. The aim of the research, besides defining the most current definitions, is description of education systems of individual countries, practical review of inclusion of children with disabilities and children in multilingual environments, financial capabilities of implementation of inclusive process and prevalence of the groups of children engaged in the research. The research sample consists of 6 countries from Europe and Kosovo. The condition for the research countries to be included in the sample is based on the population number not being larger than 8 million. Because of the relevance of the comparative analysis, two older state members of the European Union were chosen (Austria, the Flemish and the French region of Belgium), two members of the European Union (Estonia and Slovenia), two Scandinavian countries (Finland and Norway) and Kosovo. Kosovo has received the status of a potential candidate for European Union membership.

Keywords: *Children with special educational needs, children with disabilities, inclusive education, European Union, Kosovo.*

Introduction

The European Agency for Special Needs and Inclusive Education (further the Agency), emphasizes that everything that is good for the children with special needs is actually good for all children (Meijer, 2003, p. 4). Throughout Europe there is a tendency of development of new forms of inclusion of children with SEN, who require additional support in order to participate in the regular education system. In the last thirty years, in Europe and the whole world in general, the number of countries which create education policies and financial resources intended for the children who do not have or access or their access to the regular education curriculum is obstructed from different reasons, is increasing. According to Terzi (2005, p. 444), most commonly these children are: children with SEN, children with learning difficulties and children from vulnerable groups (children in multilingual environments, poor and sick children). Defining the groups of children depends on the used classification and international organizations. It is understandable that the inclusion of all groups of children in ethnically heterogeneous society is a sensitive process that requires time and resources due to the relations between the dominant community and the minorities.

Children with Special Educational Needs (SEN) and Children with Disabilities

From the year 2000 in Europe, the term Children with Special Educational Needs (SEN) is used for the children who need additional support or adjustment in the teaching. A child with SEN can optimally develop its potentials only with intensive professional help and greater adjustment in the learning process. In the examined countries from this research, the following terminology for the children with special needs is used:

- Austria – children with special educational needs;
- Belgium (French region) – children with special need;
- Belgium (Flemish region) – children with special need;
- Estonia - children with special educational needs;
- Finland - children with special educational needs;
- Kosovo – children with special needs;
- Slovenia - children with special needs; and
- Norway – children with special educational needs (European Agency, 2010, 2012, 2014, OECD, 2009, 2007).

All the countries from this research have legislation concerning the children with SEN and terminology adjustments. Small number of countries uses the term “children with special needs”, but more of the examined countries chose the term “children with

special educational needs”, according to the social model which reduces the stigmatization and directs towards the educational process, in child’s best interest.

There is also the term “disabled children” or “children with disabilities” (United Nations, 2006, p. 3). According to the UN Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities - “Persons with disabilities include those who have long-term physical, mental, intellectual or sensory impairments which in interaction with various barriers may hinder their full and effective participation in society on an equal basis with others”. The World Health Organization has made a difference between three main concepts: Impairment – (impairment of psychological, physiological and anatomic structures); Disability – limitation or loss of functional abilities; Handicap – limitation as a result to interaction with unprepared environment (WHO, 1980, p. 14). The handicap represents a result of social and cultural process: it is a consequence of the individual with his physical and psychological characteristics (including some possible difficulty) and his individual history in a particular context.

Inclusion

Europe and the world in general are facing a very different population of children and students with special needs. That requires making reforms in the education systems, in order to be achieved effective education for all children, and for the children with special needs especially. (Hegarty, 2003, p.121). In the last few years, the inclusion proved to be the best practice in Europe. The processes of inclusion have a great impact on the development of the society in general, due to the fact that they require changes of the attitudes and the environment, ie forming of such a societal system which enables optimal developmental possibilities for all members of the society (Viola, 2006, p.14). The success of inclusion depends on what happens to the child every day, every minute in the school environment, in the kindergarten or the local community where the child with special needs and its family live. When implementing the inclusive paradigm, of great importance are: the strategies of teaching used by the teachers and the educators in schools and preschools, the way the educational institution is run, the state policy, the vision of the legislative department, as well as the financial capabilities of individual country (Mitchell, 2008, p. 90). The basic principle of inclusive education is stated in the Salamanca Statement: “Regular schools with this inclusive orientation are the most effective means of combating discriminatory attitudes” (UNESCO, 1994, p. 9). Inclusive education is moving from the focus of one group towards overcoming barriers in learning and participation.

Inclusion is a new way of thinking. Instead of investing in special schools for children with developmental disabilities, many countries focus on inclusive education. They redirect their efforts toward:

- Support of all children in regular schools;
- Finding new ways of support for the teachers and the schools.

Discussions and decision making in the field of inclusion is influenced by the country politics. In this area are included representatives of the government and ministries, NGOs, parents and all others who accept the established legislation for inclusion, recognize the definition of inclusion and are aware of the intentions and objectives of educational system for children with special needs. Teachers and other professionals are usually not involved in that process and that is why the field of inclusion of children with special needs is a battlefield of various representatives from the countries who do not have the whole picture about the life of the children with special needs and their family (Tikondwe Kamchedzera, 2011, p. 3).

Inclusion – Integration

(Mainstreaming)

Mainstreaming represents inclusion of the child (person) in regular school or broader social environment with no previous adjustment on the special needs of the individual. This requires changes and adjustments of the regular education system and society, in order the special needs of the individual to be met. The question is how the children with special needs will engage in activities together with their peers when there are no prerequisites for the process to begin in preschool education. When USA had the same problem, they started a campaign in regular classes to provide a special education for the children with special needs. There was also an initiative for the preschool children with SEN to be provided special education services within the regular classrooms. The same happens in Italy for almost 35 years. The research made by Ladd (2005, p. 164), shows that the social acceptance increases the overall respect and appreciation among the peers.

Integration

The terms “mainstreaming” and “integration”, terms earlier used for when children with special needs were placed together with children with typical development, are often used as terms for inclusion, even though it is pointed out that they have a different meanings. There are authors who consider that both terms “mainstreaming” and “integration” have a same meaning, but different

from the term “inclusion”. According to those authors, inclusion means that the children with special needs are placed in the regular classroom during the whole school day, unlike the children in mainstream settings who spend a part of the school day following a special education program, but are included in the regular classrooms at the maximum extent possible (Dixon, 2005, p. 37).

Early intervention – early inclusion

Early intervention is most commonly associated with early inclusion. According to Guralnick (2000, p. 13), early intervention represents a support system of family’s model of interaction which stimulate child’s development. Early intervention has a preventive goal, which means that its actions reduce the cognitive, psychological, emotional and other disabilities of the child, prior the school enrolment (Blackman, 2003). In the literature there are groups of children who are included in early intervention programs (Golin&Ducanis, 1981, p. 25). These children can be separated in two main groups:

- Children at risk under the age of three which are suspected to have permanent developmental disability in different areas (cognition, motorics, communication);
- Children with disability which can be easily identified; such as deafness, blindness, cognitive impairment, cerebral palsy.

Many studies showed that early learning is cumulative and that the basic skills gained through early childhood are very important for learning skill acquisition later at school (Landry, 2005, p. 33). Due to the fact that the number of children at risk and children with special needs is increasing in all the parts of the world, new strategies and approaches for all children have to be considered. In that way the preventive role of early intervention will be accomplished, which is very important in the preschool years. Once again: Everything that is good for the children with special needs is good for all other children as well (Meijer, 2003).

Research subject

The subject of this research are the characteristics of education systems in the European countries and Kosovo, as a condition for better inclusion of children with special needs in regular education systems.

Methodology

As a base for the methodology of the research was used analysis of international documents, reviews and evaluations. Analysis of education development processes in the last 20 years, which are fundamentals for policy creation and assessment of the situation, represent one of the most important elements of this research. The following methods are used in this research:

- Method of theoretical analysis based on the description of the systems of

- education;
- Method of comparison;
- Methods of descriptive statistics based on the obtained statistic data represented in frequency (f).

Sample

The education systems in 7 different countries are included in the research sample:

- 2 countries members of the European Union (Austria and Belgium, Flemish and French region);
- 2 recent members of the European Union (Estonia and Slovenia);
- 2 Scandinavian countries (Norway and Finland);
- 1 Balkan country (Kosovo).

The countries included in the research have a population of up to 8 million. The base for the research analysis are the databases of EUROBASE – National system overviews on Education in Europe and on going reforms (www.eurydice.org) and European Agency for people with Special Needs and Inclusion education (www.european-agency.org), Eurostat, OECD. The data were obtained through:

- Literature studying;

Review of children with SEN

Table 1 – Education of children with SEN in the examined countries in 2010 (*Resource*: European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education, SNE Country data, 2010 - November 2012, EURYDICE, 2012)

Country	Inclusion		Segregation		Special classes in ES		Total number of students in %	
	Number f	%	Number f	%	Number f	%	Number f	%
AUSTRIA	15.773	2,0	11.787	1,5	965	0,12	28.525	3,6
BELGIUM (Fl)	8.245	1,0	46.091	5,30	N	N	54.336	6,3
BELGIUM (Fr)	220	0,03	30.773	4,50	N	N	30.993	4,5
ESTONIA	5.611	5,0	3.365	3,0	1.459	1,30	10.435	9,3
FINLAND	24.137	4,3	6.782	1,2	14.574	2,6	45.493	8,1
KOSOVO	101	0,02	450	0,10	523	0,12	1.074	0,24
NORWAY	41.552	6,7	1.929	0,30	5.321	1,0	48.802	7,9
SLOVENIA	7.275	4,5	2.829	1,7	400	0,24	10.504	6,5

N is missing

Table 2 shows the ratio of children set in inclusive forms of education (inclusion), in classes within the special institutions (segregation) and in special classes within regular schools in the countries included in the research for the academic 2010/2011. The results from the table indicate that Norway has the largest number of children in inclusive schools, 6.7%, followed by Estonia, Slovenia, both regions of Belgium and Kosovo. Belgium (Flemish region) has the highest percent of children educated in special institutions

- Monitoring of statistics and statistical databases.

Results

Inclusion of children with SEN

There are various practices in Europe, but in most of the countries exists two track system for the children with special educational needs. That means that the school systems are organized so that the specialized institutions enable the inclusion. Europe increasingly seeks to develop the forms and mechanisms of systems that could include children who cannot participate in the regular education system. Next are shown the main features of all groups of children involved in the research in the countries mentioned in the sample: Austria, Belgium (fl), Belgium (fr), Estonia, Finland and Slovenia (as European Union members), Norway (a Scandinavian country) and Kosovo (Balkan country).

Europe

Through charts and explanations tables of children with SEN are shown, in EU countries and other European countries and Kosovo.

(segregation), 5.3% and 4.5% in the French region. The lowest percent of segregation appears in Norway by 0.30% and Finland, 1.20%. Regarding the segregation, Slovenia and Austria are almost at the same level, approximately 1.5%. The numbers about special classes in regular schools point out Finland where traditionally exists positive practice in this area, with 2.6%, followed by Estonia with 1.30% and Norway with 1%. The other countries do not have significant deviation regarding the inclusion in special classes. If we analyze the total number of children with SEN, we can conclude that

it is the highest in Estonia, Finland and Norway, then the Flemish region of Belgium, Slovenia, Austria, the French region of Belgium and Kosovo. The high number of children with SEN in

Scandinavian countries indicates that the identification of the children is clearly determined on a level of the local communities.

Segregation – Inclusion ratio

Table 3 – Number of children in inclusion and special institutions in 2010 (*Resource: SNE DATA, European Agency, 2010*)

Country	Generation of students	Inclusion f	%	Special institution f	%
AUSTRIA	802.519	15.773	2,0	11.787	1,5
BELGIUM - Fl.	871.920	8.245	1,0	46.091	5,2
BELGIUM – Fr.	687.137	220	0,03	30.773	4,4
ESTONIA	112.738	5.611	5,0	3.365	3,0
FINLAND	559.379	24.137	4,3	6.782	1,2
KOSOVO	301.486	101	0,03	831	0,27
NORWAY	615.883	41.552	6,7	1.929	0,31
SLOVENIA	162.902	7.275	4,5	3.229	2,0

N is missing

In order the inclusive process to be assessed, the inclusion-segregation ratio is of great significance. This ratio is related to the definition of SEN used in different countries and the support organization in the local community. Austria adopted the general definition and there are classified only the severe disabilities. The data in Belgium (both regions) show high number of children set in special institutions. In Finland it is recognizable that generally the children are set in inclusive models of education with approximately 4.3%. This fact is due to the highest number of children set in special classes within regular schools and only 1.2% set in

special institutions. In Estonia there is a lower ration between regular and special education. In this country only 5% of the children are in regular schools and 3% are enrolled in special schools. Norway has a long tradition of inclusive education system. Only 0.31% of the children are in special institutions and 6.7% of them go to regular schools. The same ration in Slovenia is 1:2 in favor of inclusion. We can conclude that in all of the countries from this research the process of inclusion develops positively except in the both regions of Belgium.

Analysis of the legislative framework

Table 3 – Children with SEN legislation in the examined countries (*Resources: Data Eurydice 2012*)

Country	Status	General legislation	Special legislation
AUSTRIA	EU	✓	✓
BELGIUM	EU	✓	✓
ESTONIA	NEU	✓	✓
FINLAND	SC	✓	
KOSOVO	BA	✓	
NORWAY	SC	✓	
SLOVENIA	NEU	✓	✓

The table shows the way countries approach the inclusion of children with SEN in the legislative framework. The countries which have general education legislation approach have more developed inclusive schools. Such countries are Finland, Norway and Kosovo. Some of the countries decided to regulate the SNE by both general and special legislation (Austria, Belgium, Estonia and Slovenia).

LEGEND:

EU – European Union member country
 SC – Scandinavian country
 NEU – Recent (new) European Union member country
 BA – Balkan country

Discussion and interpretation of the data

Analysis of inclusion-segregation ratio

The data regarding the education of students with SEN in Europe indicate that only 2% of SEN students are educated in segregated environments. It is difficult to assess the extent to which a progress has been made considering the number of segregated students and inclusive provisions in European countries. However, over the last few years, countries with relatively greater special needs in the education system, in separate cases, showed a continuous increase in the number of students in segregated environments, which now implement inclusive policies. In order to understand the inclusive processes as a whole, in some countries it is necessary to apply the processes of

inclusion and segregation. Table 17 displays that Belgium has a high percent of children with SEN in special schools. In Estonia, 5% of the children are in regular schools and 3% in special schools. This result can be changed in the further period, taking into account that since 2008, there are reforms and changes in progress. Finland characterizes with the fact there are many children in inclusive forms of education, around 4.3%. This percent mainly refers to children from separate classes in regular schools, and only 1.2% are in special schools. In Norway, the total number of children with SEN rose from 5.7% in 2004 to 7.9% in 2010. Slovenia is specific because the percent of children in special school remains constant for years (2%), but the number of included children is increasing. The data about Kosovo indicate that the children with SEN are not properly identified. Because the legislative framework in Kosovo is in use, the reason about that could be the badly developed network of the Commission for identification of the children. Norway has a long tradition of inclusive education system. Only 0.31% of the children are in special institutions and 6.7% go to regular schools. When we analyze the data from the countries in this research, we can conclude that some are more oriented toward inclusion than others. Also, some of the countries are differently oriented in the implementation process or are currently in a process of education reforms. The data showed strong segregation trend in Belgium and Estonia. In this research, most oriented countries towards inclusion are Austria, Finland, Slovenia, Norway and Kosovo. The statistical significance of the obtained data in individual countries have to be taken into consideration, regarding the previous statement, especially the data from Kosovo. In this context, there is a dilemma about the monitoring, diagnostics and operation of the Committee for the evaluation of children with disabilities.

Analysis of the legislative framework

One of the main aspects is how the countries approach the inclusion of children with SEN in the legislative framework. Mostly the approach is related to the definition of the groups of children. Countries that have more general definitions tend to determine the rights of these children in the general legislative framework that regulates the education of all children. Thus on a declarative level, they are moving closer to the inclusive education and the concept "Schools for All" mentioned in the Salamanca Statement. In table 16 can be seen that most of the countries included in the research have combined legislative framework, which includes a mix of general and special education laws. Such countries are Austria, Belgium, Estonia and Slovenia. Only Finland, Norway and Kosovo regulate the education in the general legislative framework. From the above it can be concluded that the countries which have a basis for such a

legislative framework are the countries that have a good general economic situation, tradition of inclusion of vulnerable children and have adopted general definitions of children with SEN (except Kosovo).

Overall assessment based on the data collected for individual countries

The data for the analysis in this paper show that EU Member States have no difficulty in collecting data, ie in the data collection are included other European institutions as well as non-EU countries. The collection of data at European level for the Member States are carried out according to the same methodology and the same standards at regular intervals.

Conclusion

One of the biggest challenges in the last twenty years, given the growing number of children with SEN in regular schools is how to provide necessary support on a local level and how to be established services of support. According to Muijsu (2011), the education system is under pressure to make a change that would allow inclusion of all children. Through our analysis, we tried to identify the various supports the children from different groups receive in the education system: **children with SEN**. We took into account that the countries, as well as the education systems, differ in terms of tradition of inclusive education, attitude towards human rights and financial opportunities (Mitchell, 2008). The countries relevant for this research have a population of up to 8 million: Austria, Belgium (old EU members), Estonia, Slovenia (new EU members), Finland and Norway (Scandinavian countries) and Kosovo (Balkan country). This criterion was taken into account because of the reliable comparisons of education systems. Data collection for this area is a task that requires time. That is due to the existence of non-standard statistical bases, different definitions of children with SEN and the procedures for their identification on the one hand and the sensitivity of the identities of the children and their families on the other. The collection of other data used in the research is obtained from the statistical bases of the European Agency for the education of persons with disabilities and inclusive education, bases OECD and EURYDICE and statistical databases of the Ministry of Education in Kosovo. The data are presented in tables and are expressed in structural percent. For the statistical analysis in the empirical part, the following statistical methods were used: frequency (f); structural percent (%). Considering that this is a case study, there is a greater risk with the statistical results. The practical value of this research is the development of foundation for practical proposals regarding the establishment of the legislative framework. The overall analysis showed that there is a positive orientation towards inclusive processes in all countries, including

Kosovo. Due to the economic situation and increasing population migration, the inclusion process happens at a slower rate. All education reforms in the countries of Europe have occurred because of the increased number of children with SEN. Because of this phenomenon there is a need of creating a new ways of conducting researches of the students that are going to be good for all children (students). One important thing for the initial comparison of the status of children with SEN in separate countries is the basic definition. From this can be concluded the direction in which the inclusive education goes and the attitude of the social environment towards diversity. Environments that have a long historical tradition in the field of inclusion often have a favorable economic situation. Examples for such countries are Austria, Belgium, Norway and Finland. Estonia is also moving towards that direction. In the basic definition, in Kosovo are stated 8 groups of children with SEN. Slovenia has a well-established system for identifying children with SEN and provides enough support in the classroom and outside of it.

8. References

- Blackman, J. A. (2003). *Early Intervention: An Overview*. In Odom. Baltimore: Brookes Publishing.
- Dixon, S. (2005). Inclusion – Not segregation or integration is where a student with special needs belongs. *Journal of Educational Thought*, 39(1), 33-53.
- European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education, (2012). *Special Needs Education Country Data 2012*, Odense, Denmark: European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education.
- European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education, (2011). *Teacher Education for Inclusion Across Europe – Challenges and Opportunities*, Odense, Denmark: European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education.
- European Commission, DG Education and Culture (2011). Thematic Working Group 'Teacher Professional Development': Report of Peer Learning Activity: Policy Approaches to Defining and Describing Teacher Competences Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (2005) *Teachers Matter: Attracting, Developing and Retaining Effective Teachers*. Paris: OECD
- Eurostat, (2012). The statistical office of the European Union Eurostat and are based on data from the EU-SILC survey, had a reorganisation on 1 January 2012. *Europe in figures – Eurostat yearbook 2012* presents a comprehensive selection of statistical data on Europe.
- Golin, A.K, Ducanis, A.J, (1981). *The Interdisciplinary Team, A Handbook for the Education of Exceptional Children*. Rockville, MD: Aspen.
- Hegarty, S. (2003). Inclusion and EFA: Some perspective from outside education: International conference on inclusive education, Hong Kong, 16. – 19. 12. 2003.
- Ladd, Gary W. (2005). *Children's peer relationships and social competence: A century of progress*. Yale University Press.
- Landry, S. H. (2005). *Effective Early Childhood Programmes: Turning Knowledge into Action*, University of Texas Health Science Center, Houston.
- Meijer, C.J.W. (2010). *Special Needs Education in Europe: Inclusive Policies and Practices*. Middelfart: European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education.
- Meijer, C. (2003). *Inclusive Education and Classroom Practices*. Middelfart: European Agency for Development in Special Needs Education.
- Ministarstvo obrazovanja, nauke i tehnologije (2011). *Strateški plan obrazovanja na Kosovu*, Priština.

Ministarstvo obrazovanja, nauke i tehnologije (2010). Strateški plan za razvoj inkluzivnog obrazovanja na Kosovu, Priština.

Mitchell, D., Morton, M. & Hornby, G. (2010). Review of the literature on Individual Education Plans. Report to the New Zealand Ministry of Education. Christchurch: College of Education, University of Canterbury.

Mitchell, D. (2008). What really works in special and inclusive education. Using evidence – based teaching strategies. London: Routledge.

Mitchell, D. & Desai I. (2005). Diverse cultural contexts for inclusive education in Asia. In D. Mitchell (ed.), Contextualizing inclusive education: Evaluating old and new international perspectives (pp. 166-201). London: Routledge.

OECD, (2007). Students with Disabilities, learning, difficulties and disadvantages: policies, statistics and indicators. Paris: OECD.

OECD, (2009). Students with Disabilities, learning, difficulties and disadvantages in the Baltic States, South Eastern Europe and Malta, education policies and indicators. Paris: OECD.

OECD, (2010). Sicknes, disability and work: breaking the barriers. A 2010. synthesis of findings across OECD countries. Paris: OECD.

Terzi, L. (2005). Beyond the Dilemma of Difference: The capability Approach to Disability and Special Educational Needs. *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, pp. 443-458.

Tikondwe Kamchedzera, E. (2011). Education of pupils with disabilities in Malawi's Inclusive secondary schools: policy, practice and experiences. Doctoral thesis, Warwick: University of Warwick, Institute of Education.

UNESCO, (2007). Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expressions: Possible Statistical Implications? This paper is an expert discussion paper on the possible statistical implications of the UNESCO Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expression.

UNESCO-IBE, (2008). *Conclusions and recommendations of the 48th session of the International Conference on Education (ED/BIE/CONFINTED 48/5)* [online] Available at: <<http://www.ibe.unesco.org/en/ice/48th-ice-2008/conclusions-and-recommendations.html>> [Accessed 13.06.2012]

UNESCO, (2009). *Policy Guidelines on Inclusion in Education*. [online] Available at: <http://unesdoc.unesco.org/Url/cgibin/ulis.pl?catno=177849&set=4A9F89E7_2_250&gp=1&ll=1> [Accessed 21.01.2013]

UNICEF, (2013). UNICEF Report on the State of the World's Children 2013 The Rights of Children with Disabilities.

United Nations, (2006). Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities. New York: United Nations.

Viola, S. G. (2006). *Inclusive education: A system level and classroom level approach*. [online] Available at: <<http://www.ums1.edu/viola/publication.html>> [Accessed on: 1. 9. 2011]

WHO. (2007). World Health Organization (WHO ICF for Children & Youth). International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health Children and Youth Version (ICF-CY). Geneva: .

Kuccnika, M. Sh., Kids, Parents and Power Struggles: Winning for a lifetime, Quill, (Naučni tekstovi, Porodične teskobe i pokušaj bekstva, Goggle), 2001

Pašalić Kreso, A., Koordinate obiteljskog odgoja, Saarajevo, 2004