
Key Stakeholders of General Inclusive Education in Western Countries and Uzbekistan

Jalgasova Korkem Allamurat qizi
jalgasova.korkem1111@gmail.com
Master's student,
Berdakh Karakalpak State University

Annotation *This article presents a comparative analysis of the key stakeholders in general inclusive education within Western countries and Uzbekistan. Based on the theoretical foundations of comparative pedagogy, the study examines the roles, statuses, and interaction mechanisms of the child, parents, teachers, state bodies, and civil society. The analysis reveals that Western models are characterized by a horizontal, partnership-based structure where stakeholders operate with a high degree of autonomy and the child is recognized as a socially active subject. In contrast, the Uzbek model is undergoing a gradual institutionalization, initially shaped by a centralized, state-regulated vertical system. While normative frameworks are in place, the transition to a systemic, multidisciplinary, and collaborative model remains a crucial challenge. The article concludes that the effectiveness of inclusive education is not solely dependent on the presence of distinct actors but on the establishment of stable, systemic, and coordinated relationships based on mutual trust, shared responsibility, and joint decision-making.*

Keywords *Inclusive education, stakeholders, comparative pedagogy, Western countries, Uzbekistan, child-centered approach, partnership model, institutional cooperation*

G'arb mamlakatlari va O'zbekistonda umumiy inklyuziv ta'limning asosiy manfaatdor tomonlari

Jalgasova Korkem Allamurat qizi
jalgasova.korkem1111@gmail.com
Magistrant,
Berdax nomidagi Qoraqalpoq davlat universiteti

Annotatsiya *Ushbu maqolada G'arb mamlakatlari va O'zbekistondagi umumiy inklyuziv ta'limning asosiy subyektlari qiyosiy tahlil qilinadi. Qiyosiy pedagogika nazariy asoslariga tayangan holda, tadqiqotda bola, ota-onalar, o'qituvchilar, davlat organlari va fuqarolik jamiyati institutlarining roli, maqomi va o'zaro hamkorlik mexanizmlari o'rganiladi. Tahlil shuni ko'rsatadiki, G'arb modellari gorizontaal, hamkorlikka asoslangan tuzilma bilan ajralib turadi, bunda subyektlar yuqori darajadagi mustaqillikka ega va bola ijtimoiy faol subyekt sifatida tan olinadi. O'zbekiston modeli esa markazlashtirilgan, davlat tomonidan boshqariladigan vertikal tizim doirasida shakllanib, bosqichma-bosqich institutsional rivojlanish bosqichini boshidan kechirmoqda. Normativ-huquqiy baza mavjud bo'lsa-da, tizimli, fanlararo va hamkorlikka asoslangan modelga o'tish muhim vazifa bo'lib qolmoqda. Maqolada inklyuziv ta'lim samaradorligi faqat alohida subyektlarning mavjudligiga emas, balki o'zaro ishonch, umumiy mas'uliyat va birgalikda qaror qabul qilishga asoslangan barqaror, tizimli va muvofiqlashtirilgan munosabatlarni o'rnatishga bog'liq degan xulosaga kelinadi.*

Kalit so'zlar *Inklyuziv ta'lim, subyektlar, qiyosiy pedagogika, G'arb mamlakatlari, O'zbekiston, bola markazli yondashuv, hamkorlik modeli, institutsional hamkorlik*

Ключевые заинтересованные стороны общего инклюзивного образования в западных странах и Узбекистане

Жалгасова Коркем Алламурат кызы
jalgasova.korkem1111@gmail.com
Магистрант,
Каракалпакский государственный университет имени Бердаха

Аннотация *В данной статье представлен сравнительный анализ ключевых субъектов общего инклюзивного образования в западных странах и Узбекистане. Основываясь на теоретических положениях сравнительной педагогики, в исследовании рассматриваются роли, статусы и механизмы взаимодействия ребенка, родителей, учителей, государственных органов и институтов гражданского общества. Анализ показывает, что западные модели характеризуются горизонтальной, партнерской структурой, где субъекты обладают высокой степенью автономии, а ребенок признается социально активным субъектом. В свою очередь, узбекская модель переживает период постепенной институционализации, изначально формируясь в рамках централизованной, государственно-регулируемой вертикальной системы. Несмотря на наличие нормативно-правовой базы, переход к системной, междисциплинарной и коллаборативной модели остается ключевым вызовом. В статье делается вывод о том, что эффективность инклюзивного образования зависит не только от наличия отдельных субъектов, но и от установления стабильных, системных и скоординированных отношений, основанных на взаимном доверии, общей ответственности и совместном принятии решений.*

Ключевые слова *Инклюзивное образование, субъекты, сравнительная педагогика, западные страны, Узбекистан, личностно-ориентированный подход, партнерская модель, институциональное сотрудничество*

Introduction

The development of inclusive education represents a fundamental shift in global educational policy, moving from a model of segregation to one that values diversity and equal opportunities for all learners. A critical factor in the successful implementation of inclusive education is the effective engagement and interaction of its various stakeholders. As noted by B.L. Wolfson, a comparative analysis of educational systems should focus on the functional relationships between the

individuals involved rather than the institutions themselves (Wolfson, 2003). This perspective places the actors – their roles, autonomy, and interactions – at the center of inquiry.

In Western countries, inclusive education has evolved into a complex, horizontally integrated system where the child, teacher, school administration, parents, and state bodies interact in a synergistic manner. This model is characterized by a high degree of autonomy at the school and community levels, which guarantees active participation from all

actors (Dzhurinsky, 2013). Conversely, the post-Soviet space, including Uzbekistan, has historically developed its special and inclusive education within a vertically structured, state-regulated model (Malofeev, 2011). This has resulted in a system where the autonomy of schools and other actors is more limited.

In Uzbekistan, while significant strides have been made in establishing a regulatory and legal framework for inclusive education at the state level, the functional cooperation among key stakeholders has yet to become a stable institutional mechanism. The practices of collaboration between teachers, specialists, and parents remain inconsistent and vary significantly by region. This discrepancy highlights a critical area for development.

This article aims to conduct a comparative conceptual analysis of the key stakeholders in general inclusive education – specifically the child, parents, teachers, the state, and civil society – in Western countries and Uzbekistan. By examining their roles, statuses, and the nature of their interactions through the lens of comparative pedagogy, this study seeks to identify the systemic differences between the two contexts. The findings will underscore the necessity of moving from a vertical, state-centric model to a horizontal, partnership-based model to ensure the sustainable and effective development of inclusive education in Uzbekistan.

In analyzing the subjects of general inclusive education, it is important to define the content of the concept of “subject” from the perspective of comparative pedagogy. B.L. Wolfson, in his work “Comparative Pedagogy,” emphasizes that, in the study of educational systems, the functional relationships between the individuals involved, rather than the institutions themselves, should be at the heart of the analysis. From this perspective, inclusive education is a system based on the interaction of individuals at different levels (Wolfson, 2003).

In Western countries, inclusive education entities are structured according to a multi-

level and horizontally integrated model. In this specific case, the child, the teacher, the school administration, the parents, and state bodies interact closely. A.N. Dzhurinsky, in a comparative analysis of educational systems, highlights that the level of autonomy among the actors determines the concrete effectiveness of inclusive policies. In Western models, the high degree of decision-making authority at the school and community levels guarantees the active participation of the actors (Dzhurinsky, 2013).

N.N. Malofeev, analyzing the evolution of special education systems, shows that inclusion in the post-Soviet space has long developed within a vertical model regulated by the state. In this model, the system of actors is more dependent on centralized management, and the autonomy of schools is relatively limited (Malofeev, 2011).

In Uzbekistan, the system of actors involved in inclusive education is still developing. Although regulatory and legal frameworks have been established at the state level, functional cooperation among actors has not yet become a stable institutional mechanism. In particular, the practice of cooperation between teachers, specialists, and parents varies from region to region. Thus, comparative analysis shows that, while in Western countries the inclusive education system is horizontal and integrative by nature, in Uzbekistan it manifests as an institutional system under gradual construction. The effectiveness of inclusive education is directly linked to the level of coordinated and egalitarian cooperation among actors.

In the general system of inclusive education, considering the child as the central subject is the main criterion of the philosophy of inclusion. The concept of subjectivity means that the child is recognized not only as an object of education, but also as a person actively participating in the educational process, with the right to make decisions and participate in social relationships. From the

perspective of comparative pedagogy, this issue reflects the humanistic orientation of national educational models and the priorities of social policy (Dzhurinsky, 2011).

In Western countries, the status of the child as a central subject has been constructed within the framework of the human rights paradigm. In the concept of inclusive education, the individual needs, abilities, and interests of the child are at the heart of the organization of teaching. N.N. Malofeev, analyzing the evolution of education, emphasizes that the modern inclusive approach aims to strengthen the role of the child not as a mere "recipient," but as a "socially active subject." In this context, an individualized educational path, adapted methods, and opportunities for participation play an essential role (Malofeev, 2011).

S.V. Alekhin considers the child's level of participation to be the primary indicator of the effectiveness of inclusive education. According to her, the child's physical presence in the classroom is insufficient; their ability to express their opinion, engage in dialogue, and make autonomous decisions within the educational process is a concrete indicator of their subjectivity. In Western models, this principle is integrated into pedagogical practice (Alekhina, 2014).

Although the child's status as the central subject is recognized normatively in Uzbekistan, this position is not yet fully established in practice. The educational process is often organized according to a teacher-centered model. Consequently, individualized educational guidance and the child's level of participation are not always fully guaranteed. Within the framework of developing inclusive education, strengthening the child's active role through concrete mechanisms remains a priority.

A comparative analysis shows that, while in Western countries the child is considered the strategic center of the inclusive system, in Uzbekistan this concept is gradually becoming institutionalized. The effectiveness of inclusive

education is not measured by the legal recognition of the child, but by their level of actual participation in the educational environment (Alekhina, 2014).

In the inclusive education system, the participation of parents and family is considered not only as an auxiliary factor, but also as an important social institution, with the status of a full-fledged actor. From the perspective of comparative pedagogy, the effectiveness of the inclusive process is directly linked to the level of coordinated cooperation between the child, the teacher, and the family. In this sense, parental participation in the educational process is assessed as a practical criterion of inclusion.

In Western countries, the family is institutionally strengthened as a full-fledged actor in inclusive education. N.N. Malofeev, analyzing the evolution of special education systems, observes that in modern models, parents participate in decision-making processes not as consultants, but as co-authors in the development of individualized educational programs. This cooperative model is based on the triad of "school-family-community" (Malofeev, 2011).

Although the role of the family in inclusive education is recognized by law in Uzbekistan, the cooperation mechanism is not yet fully institutionalized. In most cases, parents participate in the educational process not as decision-makers, but as observers or implementers. It is particularly important to systematically ensure parental involvement in identifying the child's individual needs and defining their educational path.

A comparative analysis shows that, while in Western countries the family is considered an integral part of the inclusive education system, this approach is developing gradually in Uzbekistan. To improve inclusive education, it is essential to strengthen the model of institutional cooperation between parents and schools, develop counseling services, and guarantee transparency of information (Malofeev, 2009).

In the general system of inclusive education, the teacher is the central practical actor. While the child is at the heart of the inclusive process, the teacher is its implementer and organizer. From a comparative pedagogy perspective, the success of inclusive education largely depends on the teacher's professional skills, methodological training, and inclusive culture.

In Western countries, the teacher is considered an autonomous and responsible actor in inclusive education. N.N. Malofeev, analyzing the evolution of educational systems, emphasizes that in the modern inclusive model, the teacher is not only a transmitter of knowledge but also a specialist who identifies the individual needs of the child, adapts the educational environment, and promotes social integration. In this context, the teacher's skills are not limited to disciplinary knowledge; they require expertise in psychology, differentiated instruction, and multidisciplinary collaboration.

In Western countries, the family is institutionally strengthened as a full-fledged actor in inclusive education. N.N. Malofeev, analyzing the evolution of special education systems, observes that in modern models, parents participate in decision-making processes not as consultants, but as co-authors in the development of individualized educational programs. This cooperative model is based on the triad of "school-family-community" (Malofeev, 2011).

S.V. Alekhin assesses parental participation in the monitoring of inclusive education as a distinct indicator. According to her, family activity has a positive effect on the child's adaptation and socialization within the school environment. In Western countries, counseling centers, psychological support services, and cooperation platforms have been established for parents (Alekhina, 2016).

Although the role of the family in inclusive education is recognized by law in Uzbekistan, the cooperation mechanism is not yet fully institutionalized. In most cases, parents

participate in the educational process not as decision-makers, but as observers or implementers. It is particularly important to systematically ensure parental involvement in identifying the child's individual needs and defining their educational path.

A comparative analysis shows that, while in Western countries the family is considered an integral part of the inclusive education system, this approach is developing gradually in Uzbekistan. To improve inclusive education, it is essential to strengthen the model of institutional cooperation between parents and schools, develop counseling services, and guarantee transparency of information (Malofeev, 2009).

In the general system of inclusive education, the teacher is the central practical actor. While the child is at the heart of the inclusive process, the teacher is its implementer and organizer. From a comparative pedagogy perspective, the success of inclusive education largely depends on the teacher's professional skills, methodological training, and inclusive culture.

In Western countries, the teacher is considered an autonomous and responsible actor in inclusive education. N.N. Malofeev, analyzing the evolution of educational systems, emphasizes that in the modern inclusive model, the teacher is not only a transmitter of knowledge but also a specialist who identifies the individual needs of the child, adapts the educational environment, and promotes social integration. In this context, the teacher's skills are not limited to disciplinary knowledge; they require expertise in psychology, differentiated instruction, and multidisciplinary collaboration (Malofeev, 2011).

S.V. Alekhin highlights the teacher's reflective role in evaluating the effectiveness of inclusive education. According to her, a teacher in an inclusive setting must be prepared to revise their methods, adapt the educational process to the individual needs of each child, and foster cooperation. In Western countries, an institutional system of initial, ongoing, and

professional development training for teachers is in place (Alekhina, 2014).

In the overall system of inclusive education, the State and administrative bodies appear as strategic actors. While the child, the teacher, and the school are considered the actors in practical terms, the State is the entity that defines inclusive policy and implements it institutionally. From the perspective of comparative pedagogy, the development of inclusive education is directly linked to political will, regulatory and legal frameworks, and funding mechanisms (Dzhurinsky, 2014).

B.L. Wolfson emphasizes that, within the framework of comparative analysis of education systems, state priorities in educational policy decisively influence the formation of national models. In Western countries, inclusive education has been elevated to the status of a state policy, based on human rights and equal opportunities. The state then supports the inclusive process not only by creating a regulatory framework, but also by providing financial support, training specialists, and establishing a monitoring system (Wolfson, 2008).

A.N. Dzhurinsky, in a comparative study of educational models, observes that the level of centralization influences the practical effectiveness of inclusive policies. In Western countries, the state defines the broad strategic directions, but practical decisions are often made at the level of schools and local communities. This horizontal management model fosters the autonomy of stakeholders (Dzhurinsky, 2014).

In Uzbekistan, inclusive education is developing under the impetus of the state. The regulatory and legal framework is in place, and the state manages inclusive policies centrally. While this situation allows for the systematic implementation of reforms, it can sometimes restrict local initiative and autonomy. It is therefore essential to find a balance between centralization and local independence.

N.N. Malofeev, analyzing the role of the state in the education system, emphasizes that the sustainability of inclusive policies will only be effective if they benefit from long-term strategies and resources. The development of inclusive education requires coordination of financial, methodological, and human resource policies at the state level. Comparative analysis shows that, while in Western countries the state plays a supporting and coordinating role in the inclusion process, in Uzbekistan it is the main initiator of reforms and the management center (Malofeev, 2011). In order to improve inclusive education, it is important to combine centralized management, local initiatives, and the activities of various entities.

Considering inclusive education solely within the framework of state policies or school practices does not allow for a full understanding of its social dimension. Modern educational theory emphasizes that inclusive education cannot fully develop without the participation of civil society. From this perspective, public organizations, non-profit non-governmental organizations, expert groups, and the media are also considered actors in inclusive education (Wolfson, 2008).

B.L. Wolfson, in a comparative analysis of education systems, notes that society's attitude toward education determines the stability of the national model. In Western countries, inclusive education has developed not only as a school reform but also as a social movement. Non-governmental organizations actively participate in creating an inclusive environment by protecting children's rights, supporting parents, and ensuring public oversight (Wolfson, 2008).

A.N. Dzhurinsky emphasizes that civil society participation in education systems strengthens the principles of democratic governance. In Western countries, public institutions appear as actors that complement and frame state policy. This situation protects the inclusion process from any dependence on unilateral administrative decisions (Dzhurinsky, 2014).

N.N. Malofeev considers the social partnership model essential within the education system. According to him, the success of inclusive education depends on the level of cooperation between the state, schools, and society. Expert teams and counseling centers, in particular, play an important role in addressing the specific educational needs of children (Malofeev, 2011).

In Uzbekistan, citizen participation is gradually developing. Non-governmental organizations and social projects contribute to popularizing inclusive education and promoting a positive attitude within society. However, a comparative analysis reveals that the institutional impact of civil society remains limited compared to Western countries. A comprehensive understanding of the challenges of inclusive education requires considering it as a system of social cooperation. While the state and schools constitute the main practical mechanism, public and civil institutions confer social legitimacy upon the inclusive approach. Strengthening the role of these actors in the Uzbek model can prove to be an important factor in ensuring the sustainable development of inclusive education.

The existence of distinct actors is not sufficient for the effective implementation of inclusive education; systematic and stable interaction among them is essential. In modern educational theory, inclusive education is interpreted as an open socio-pedagogical system. In this system, the child, parents, teacher, school, state, and society appear as interconnected and complementary actors.

B.L. Wolfson, in a comparative analysis of educational systems, emphasizes that institutional coordination among actors determines the effectiveness of the national model. In Western countries, inclusive education is based not on top-down management, but on a model of horizontal cooperation. In this model, the opinions of parents, specialists, and the public are taken into account in the decision-making process.

Thus, a child's educational path is built on a consensus among the various stakeholders (Wolfson, 2010).

A.N. Dzhurinsky emphasizes the importance of democratic governance and partnership relationships in the education system. According to him, a balance between stakeholders guarantees the stability of the inclusive environment. If dialogue between school and family is interrupted, the inclusion process can become rigid and formalized (Dzhurinsky, 2014).

N.N. Malofeev emphasizes that the system of educational and remedial support in inclusive education relies on multidisciplinary cooperation. Optimal results are only possible when the activities of specialists (psychologists, speech therapists, occupational therapists) are coordinated with those of the school and parents. From this perspective, the concept of an inclusive education stakeholder is not individual, but systemic (Malofeev, 2011).

In Uzbekistan, the cooperation mechanism between different stakeholders is still developing. A comparative analysis shows that, despite the central role of the state and educational institutions, the institutionalization of family and community participation is not yet fully systematized. This highlights the need to strengthen the horizontal partnership model.

From a systemic perspective, it is recommended that relationships between stakeholders in inclusive education be based on the following principles: mutual trust, transparency of information, shared responsibility, and joint decision-making. Such a model transforms inclusive education from an administrative process into a platform for social cooperation (Wolfson, 2010).

Thus, systemic relationships between stakeholders are essential for the effectiveness of inclusive education. While the experience of Western countries demonstrates the primacy of a multidisciplinary and partnership-based model, the progressive institutional

strengthening of this model is an urgent necessity in Uzbekistan.

This chapter examines the role of stakeholders in inclusive education in Western countries and Uzbekistan, using a comparative conceptual analysis. The results of this analysis show that inclusive education is not merely a pedagogical practice, but rather a multidisciplinary social system.

First, in Western models, the child is recognized as the central actor in inclusive education, and their educational needs are met through individualized pedagogical strategies. This approach is based on the paradigm of person-centered education. In Uzbekistan, this principle is also reinforced normatively, but in practice, the full institutionalization of the child-centered model remains a crucial challenge. Second, in Western countries, the participation of parents and families is based on a partnership model, and they actively participate in the decision-making process. In Uzbekistan, this participation is mainly limited to consultation, and it is necessary to elevate it to the level of a genuine institutional partnership.

Third, teachers and schools are considered the key players in establishing an inclusive environment. Comparative analysis has shown that specific teacher training and mechanisms for collective cooperation directly influence the stability of the inclusive process (Malofeev, 2011).

Finally, the state and society, as institutional actors, play a significant role in shaping inclusive education policy. While Western models favor decentralized management and public oversight, in Uzbekistan, state management holds a dominant position.

Thus, the comparative analysis of actors in inclusive education confirms its systemic nature and underscores that its effectiveness relies on stable and coordinated cooperation among them.

Conclusion

This comparative analysis of the key stakeholders in inclusive education reveals that the system is not merely a collection of pedagogical practices but a complex, multidisciplinary social system. The effectiveness of this system is predicated not only on the presence of distinct actors but on the establishment of stable, systemic, and coordinated relationships among them. The experience of Western countries demonstrates that a horizontal, partnership-based model, where the child is a socially active subject, parents are co-authors of the educational process, and teachers are autonomous professionals, provides a robust foundation for sustainable inclusion.

The analysis has yielded several key findings:

1. **Centrality of the Child:** In Western models, the child is recognized as the strategic center of the inclusive system, with educational pathways built around their individual needs and active participation. In Uzbekistan, while this principle is normatively recognized, the transition from a teacher-centered model to a fully institutionalized child-centered practice remains a crucial challenge (Alekhina, 2014).
2. **Role of Parents and Family:** Western systems institutionally strengthen the family as a full-fledged actor, involving them in decision-making as co-authors of individualized educational programs. In Uzbekistan, parental participation is often limited to consultation or observation, and elevating it to a genuine institutional partnership is essential (Malofeev, 2009).
3. **Teachers as Key Implementers:** The teacher is the central practical actor. Western countries have established institutional systems for initial and ongoing training that equip teachers with the skills for differentiated instruction and multidisciplinary collaboration. The

success of inclusive practices in Uzbekistan is directly linked to the development of such professional and methodological support systems (Malofeev, 2011).

4. **State and Civil Society:** Western models favor decentralized management where the state plays a supporting and coordinating role, complemented by active civil society participation, which acts as a driver for social change and public oversight. In Uzbekistan, the state remains the primary initiator and management center. Strengthening the role of public organizations and fostering a culture of social partnership are vital for

the sustainable development of inclusion (Wolfson, 2008).

Ultimately, the comparative analysis confirms that inclusive education is a systemic phenomenon. Its success hinges on moving beyond a vertical, top-down management structure towards a model of horizontal cooperation built on mutual trust, transparency, shared responsibility, and joint decision-making. (Wolfson, 2010). For Uzbekistan, the path forward lies in strengthening the institutional mechanisms that foster these relationships, ensuring that all stakeholders – the child, the family, the teacher, and the community – can function as equal and active participants in the educational process.

References:

1. Wolfson, B. L. (2003). *Comparative Pedagogy*. Moscow: Publishing House of the Russian Academy of Education. Available at: <https://search.rsl.ru/ru/record/01002087625>
2. Dzhurinsky, A. N. (2013). *Comparative Education: Challenges of the 21st Century*. Moscow: Prometheus. Available at: <https://www.mgpu.ru/publication/sravnitel'naya-pedagogika-vyzovy-xxi-veka/>
3. Malofeev, N. N. (2011). *Special Education in a Changing World: Europe*. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye. Available at: https://ikp-rao.ru/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/malofeev_n.n.-evropa.pdf
4. Dzhurinsky, A. N. (2011). *Pedagogy of Interethnic Communication and Comparative Education*. Moscow: Sputnik+. Available at: <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=22437188>
5. Alekhina, S. V. (2014). *Inclusive Education: History and Contemporary State*. Moscow: MGPPU. Available at: https://mgppu.ru/project/inclusive/books/Alekhina_2014.pdf
6. Alekhina, S. V. (2016). "Parental Participation in the Monitoring of Inclusive Education". *Inclusive Education: Practice and Research, No. 2*. 35-45. Available at: <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=27349234>
7. Malofeev, N. N. (2009). "The Role of the Family in the System of Special Education". *Almanac of the Institute of Correctional Pedagogy, No. 12*. 270-275. Available at: <https://almanac.ikp.ru/articles/almanac-12-04>
8. Dzhurinsky, A. N. (2014). *Education in the Modern World: Comparative Analysis*. Moscow: Prosveshcheniye. Available at: <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=23337792>
9. Wolfson, B. L. (2008). "State Priorities in Educational Policy: A Comparative Analysis". *Pedagogy, No. 7*. 230-238. Available at: <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=13072074>
10. Wolfson, B. L. (2005). "Civil Society and Education: Problems of Interaction". *Comparative Education, No. 3*. 190-198. Available at: <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=11771556>

11. Wolfson, B. L. (2010). "Institutional Coordination of Actors in Educational Systems". *Pedagogical Education and Science*, No. 5. 160-165. Available at: <https://www.elibrary.ru/item.asp?id=15254101>