

ADOLESCENT PERCEPTION OF FAMILY DYSFUNCTION IN SERBIA AND MONTENEGRO BY GENDER AND AGE

MACANOVIĆ Nebojša¹, ĐUKANOVIĆ Borislav², KOVAČ Vesna³,
DRAGOJEVIĆ Arsen⁴

¹ University of Banja Luka (BOSNA i HERCEGOVINA)

² University of Donja Gorica in Podgorica (CRNA GORA)

³ JU OŠ “Šunjo Pešikan” – Trešnjevo, Cetinje (CRNA GORA)

⁴ Ipsos Strategic Marketing, Belgrade (SERBIA)

JEL: ZOO

DOI: 10.5937/intrev2202113M

UDK: 316.362(497.11:497.16)

316.362.1-055.52-055.62

COBISS.SR-ID 71620617

ABSTRACT

In this study, the authors use a specially constructed Family dysfunction Scale to examine the spread and structure of familial disorders on samples of 2803 respondents from Serbia and 1123 from Montenegro. Given that it is about a normal, non-clinical population, more than 4/5 of respondents report good or very good family relationships, while 15% of cases report disturbed family relationships.

In order to examine family dysfunctionality, we subjected the 17-item scale with answers in the form of a five-point Likert-type scale, to Varimax factor analysis. The scale, which is being used for the first time, has shown excellent metric properties. Two factors stood out; the first, much stronger, which carries 55.64% of the variance and the second, much weaker, which carries 8.19% of the variance. On the first factor, 8 items were singled out with very high saturations, which provide a picture of cohesive and functional families. On the second factor, also with high saturations, six items describing weakly cohesive, emotionally disturbed and alienated families stood out.

Using the T test between the samples of Serbia and Montenegro on the Scale of family dysfunction statistically significant differences were found on 8 of 17 items. In the sample from Montenegro, quarrels, physical conflicts, stressful situations, alienation and lack of understanding between family members are significantly more common. The authors find the reasons in a prolonged chronic socio-economic crisis that led to atypical distributions of family roles and authority, synergistically with some anachronistic collective-psychological patterns in Montenegrin households in the last three decades.

Keywords: Scale of family dysfunction, adolescents, Serbia, Montenegro

INTRODUCTION

In the socialization of children, family functionality and dysfunctionality are given great importance.

On the one hand, the family can be a positive factor in the proper socialization of the child, and on the other hand, it can be a negative factor that leads to the appearance of socially maladjusted behaviour, and deviant behaviour often occurs in adolescents. Some authors even point out that deviance is “a symptom of disturbed family relations and inadequate parenting” (Jugović, 2011:399). Many researchers, in our country and in the world, have studied the perception of adolescents towards family dysfunction, but also the influence of family factors on the emergence of deviant forms of behaviour among young people (Beane, 2008; Benbenishty and Avi Astor, 2005; Howells and Rosenbaum, 2008; Ljubičić, 2014; Macanović, 2020b, Macanović, Dujaković, 2019; Vasiljević-Prodanović, 2016; Zloković, 2014) bearing

in mind that the family represents a psychosocial milieu reflecting social values. In such research, it was observed that the factors at the family level that directly contribute to the strengthening of aggression and the emergence of deviant behaviour in children are: misunderstanding and frequent quarrels of parents, violence in the family, lack of communication in the family, rigid discipline, incompleteness of the family, poor socioeconomic status, isolation of the family from environment, lack of parental supervision, lack of social support from parents, positive attitude of parents towards violence, etc.

Families in Serbia, Montenegro, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Macedonia are in the process of transition from a traditional to a modern family. Father is no longer the only breadwinner in the family.

By employing a woman, her primary roles as wife, mother and housewife were expanded. The woman becomes an important bearer of the economic stability of the family, which requires a redistribution of responsibilities and obligations of the parental couple. The expectations of men and women within the family, which were shaped by (traditional) models of the functioning of families of origin, are also changing. The woman wants to achieve equality, which is consistent with a significant economic contribution to the family. The man tries to maintain the position of authority in the family.

These changes are a source of internal stress and a strong catalyst for the dynamics of partner and family relationships and affect the structure of the family and the distribution of roles within it. It is not possible to stop the changes in the family from the patriarchal to the modern one, and the multitude of changes destabilizes the modern family. Therefore, it is necessary to provide the necessary support on the way to these changes. Such changes also reflect on adolescents and their views on family relationships and their dysfunctionality (Macanović, 2020a).

In the light of all the mentioned changes, in this paper we will present the perception and attitudes of adolescents towards family dysfunctionality. Adolescents' perception of their parents depends to a great extent on the type of family relationships, communication, material conditions, level of education, family structure, demographic circumstances, but also the social environment itself in which adolescents grow up (Macanović, 2015).

In our definition, family dysfunctionality is the broadest content framework for looking at deviant phenomena in at-risk families, which is why we wanted to avoid different criteria of researchers in the definition of this term, whether they stem from different theoretical orientations, or from different empirical-methodological approaches or because of both.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

We specially constructed the scale of family dysfunction for the needs of this research, and that is why it is being used for the first time. That is why this research necessarily had an exploratory character, and the goals represent research landmarks rather than stemming from a more solid theoretical and hypothetical basis.

The first objective is a quantitative analysis of the Scale of family dysfunction.

The second objective is to examine the metric and structural properties of the Scale of family dysfunction.

The third objective is to examine the differences and similarities on the items of the Scale between Serbia and Montenegro.

METHOD

SAMPLES

It is about two appropriate samples of adolescents from the first to fourth grades of secondary schools from Serbia and Montenegro, obtained by voluntarily completing an electronic survey. The research was conducted in the midst of the Covid-19 pandemic - from May to November 2020.

The total number of adolescents included in this research is 3.828, of which 2.803 are from Serbia and 1.123 from Montenegro. Out of 2803 adolescents from Serbia, 46.3% are male and 53.7% are female.

Out of 1123 adolescents from Montenegro, 406 (36.2%) are male and 717 (63.8%) are female.

Although female adolescents dominate in both samples, the prevalence in the sample from Montenegro is pronounced, almost twice as high. It can be assumed that female adolescents in Montenegro are more oriented towards family and family relations than male adolescents, which probably influenced the fact that they preferred to accept the electronic survey.

RESEARCH INSTRUMENT

For the purposes of this research, we constructed the Scale of emotional instability, which contains 18 statements with answers in the form of a five-point Likert scale from 1 as the lowest level of agreement with the statement, to 5 as the highest level of agreement with the statement. The scale is given in Table 1.

Data processing and analysis methods

The data were processed in the SPSS program. In addition to descriptive statistics, T test, ANOVA, and Varimax factor analysis were used.

SCALE OF FAMILIAL DYSFUNCTION ON THE TOTAL SAMPLE

Seventeen responses to the Scale of family dysfunction contains 17 questions in a five-point Likert-type scale (Table 1).

Table 1. Scale of family dysfunction on the total sample

Claims	I completely disagree N %	I disagree N %	I am undecided N %	I agree N %	I highly agree N %	Total: N %
1. Quarrels dominate in our family.	1398 35,6	1556 39,6	507 12,9	329 8,4	136 3,5	3926 100,0
2. Quarrels and physical conflicts dominate in our family.	2927 74,6	749 19,1	135 3,4	69 1,8	46 1,2	3926 100,0
3. In our family, everyone lives for themselves, not taking much care of others.	2627 66,9	961 24,5	184 4,7	92 2,3	62 1,6	3926 100,0
4. In our family, relationships are emotionally cold.	2424 61,7	1007 25,6	279 7,1	131 3,3	85 2,2	3926 100,0
5. In our family, there is not much understanding or agreement.	2038 51,9	1114 28,4	359 9,1	273 7,0	142 3,6	3926 100,0
6. In our family, everything comes down to satisfying material needs, but we are mutually poorly connected and close.	2397 61,1	1032 26,3	249 6,3	159 4,0	89 2,3	3926 100,0
7. Misunderstandings and conflicts in our family are easily overcome, because there is trust and closeness among us.	297 7,6	303 7,7	376 9,6	1813 46,2	1137 29,0	3926 100,0
8. In my family there is harmony, closeness, trust and understanding.	102 2,6	221 5,6	420 10,7	1703 43,4	1480 37,7	3926 100,0
9. In my family, we take care of each other.	2917 74,3	704 17,9	230 5,9	50 1,3	25 0,6	3926 100,0
10. I enjoy with my family.	2491 63,4	852 21,7	395 10,1	132 3,4	56 1,4	3926 100,0
11. My family members agree.	2195 55,9	1158 29,5	371 9,4	159 4,0	43 1,1	3926 100,0
12. How do you assess overall family relationships?						
13. There is hatred in my family.	1039 26,5	1641 41,8	880 22,4	275 7,0	91 2,3	3926 100,0
14. I have confidence in my family.	2821 71,9	642 16,4	267 6,8	124 3,2	72 1,8	3926 100,0
15. Life with my family is stressful.	2178 55,5	7191 20,1	578 14,7	212 5,4	167 4,3	3926 100,0
16. I am proud of my family.	2968 75,6	519 13,2	267 6,8	109 2,8	63 1,6	3926 100,0
17. For me, my family comes first.	3250 82,8	377 9,6	178 4,5	70 1,8	51 1,3	3926 100,0

According to the distributions in Table 1, we can see that the adolescents' families are characterized by a relatively high level of cohesion because on average more than 4/5 of adolescents report good or very good relationships. It is about a non-clinical, healthy population, so these results are expected. If we can distinguish at all, we notice that the statements 7 and 1 have a slightly smaller positive sign than the other six, although this fact does not call into question the basic conclusion about the high degree of cohesion of family relations towards adolescents' perceptions. Perhaps the reasons for these differences should be sought in the relatively milder formulation of these claims compared to most other.

To see how items are structured on the dysfunction scale, we applied Varimax factor analysis, which is most acceptable when we do not know enough about the construct, which is the case because the Scale was subjected to factorization for the first time. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure is high (0.962) and indicates that the Scale is suitable for factorization.

Two factors stood out; the first bearing 55.640 variances and the second significantly weaker – 8.197 (see Table 2).

Table 2. Rotated matrix of the main components of the Scale of family dysfunction for the total sample

	Factors	
	1	2
I enjoy being with my family.	,829	,311
I have confidence in my family.	,809	,271
I am proud of my family.	,807	,267
In my family we take care of each other.	,769	,310
My family members get along well with each other.	,749	,368
For me, my family is the number one priority.	,744	,181
In my family there is harmony, closeness, trust and understanding.	,690	,429
How do you assess overall family relationships?	,661	,453
Living with my family is stressful.	,642	,446
My family members are arguing.	,527	,472
Misunderstandings and conflicts in our family are easily overcome, because there is trust and closeness among us.	,452	,156
Our family is dominated by quarrels and physical conflicts.	,108	,795
In our family, everyone lives for themselves, not taking much care of others.	,258	,753
In our family, relationships are emotionally cold.	,384	,743
In our family, everything comes down to satisfying material needs, but we are mutually poorly connected and close.	,373	,729
In our family there is not enough understanding and agreement.	,454	,718
In our family there is hatred.	,352	,715

On the first, many times stronger factor with saturations above 0.600, the following nine items were singled out:

- I enjoy being with my family 0.829;
- I have confidence in my family 0.809;
- I am proud of my family 0.807;
- In my family we take care of each other 0.769;
- My family members get along well with each other 0.749;
- For me, my family comes first 0.744;
- In my family there is harmony, closeness, trust and understanding 0.690;
- Assessment of overall family relations 0.661;
- Living with my family is stressful 0.642.

The first factor with saturations above 0.600 highlighted items that describe strong cohesion, closeness, trust and understanding among family members. That is why we called this first factor *the factor of predominantly cohesive, functional families*.

On the second, much weaker factor, which carries 8.197% of the variance, with saturations above 0.700, six items stood out:

- Our family is dominated by quarrels and physical conflicts 0.795;
- In our family, everyone lives for themselves, not taking much care of others 0.753;
- In our family, relationships are emotionally cold 0.743;
- In our family, everything comes down to satisfying material needs, but we are mutually poorly connected and close 0.729;
- There is not enough understanding and agreement in our family 0.718;
- There is hatred in our family 0.715.

The second factor is the factor of weakly cohesive, emotionally disturbed, alienated families.

Differences between Serbia and Montenegro on the items of the Scale of family dysfunction.

Statistically significant differences were found on 8 of 17 items using the t test between the samples of Serbia and Montenegro on the Scale of family dysfunction (see Table 3.).

These are:

- My family is dominated by quarrels and physical conflicts – 4.677; p=0.000;
- There is hatred in our family – 3.909; p=0.000;
- Living with my family is stressful. – 3.766; p=0.000;
- My family members argue – 2.985; p=0.000;
- In our family, everyone lives for themselves – 2.674; p=0.000;
- There is not enough understanding and agreement in our family – 2.387; p=0.718;
- My family members get along well with each other – 2.220; p=0.026;
- I enjoy being with my family – 2.054; p=0.040.

Table 3. T-test difference between the samples of Serbia and Montenegro according to the items of the Scale of family dysfunction

Items	T test	Df.	Sig.
1. There is hatred in our family.	-3.909	3826	0.000
2. Our family is dominated by quarrels and physical conflicts.	-4,667	3826	0,000
3. In our family, everyone lives for themselves.	-2,674	3826	0,000
4. In our family, relationships are emotionally cold.	-0,525	3826	0,600
5. There is not enough understanding and agreement in our family.	-2,387	3826	0,017
6. In our family, everything comes down to satisfying material needs.	-0,942	3826	0,346
7. Misunderstandings and conflicts in our family are easily overcome.	1,423	3826	0,155
8. In my family there is harmony, closeness, trust and understanding.	-1,021	3826	0,307
9. How do you assess overall family relationships?	-0,991	3826	0,322
10. In my family we take care of each other.	-1,467	3826	0,142
11. I enjoy being with my family.	-2,054	3826	0,040
12. My family members get along well with each other.	-2,220	3826	0,026
13. My family members argue.	-2,985	3826	0,003
14. I have confidence in my family.	-0,508	3826	0,611
15. Living with my family is stressful.	-3,766	3826	0,000
16. I am proud of my family.	0,425	3826	0,671
17. For me, my family comes first.	0,173	3826	0,863

In all eight items, the male/female adolescents from Montenegro have higher numerical values of average arithmetic means (see Table 4.).

Table 4. Group statistics of the differences between the samples of Serbia and Montenegro according to the items of the Scale of family disfunction

Group statistics					
Items	Country	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Quarrels dominate in our family.	SR	2705	1,9982	1,04785	,02015
	MN	1123	2,1451	1,08602	,03241
Our family is dominated by quarrels and physical conflicts.	SR	2705	1,3216	,70506	,01356
	MN	1123	1,4435	,80393	,02399
In our family everyone lives for themselves.	SR	2705	1,4466	,81828	,01573
	MN	1123	1,5245	,82630	,02466
In our family, relationships are emotionally cold.	SR	2705	1,5786	,93848	,01804
	MN	1123	1,5957	,87979	,02625
There is not enough understanding in our family.	SR	2705	1,7911	1,08189	,02080
	MN	1123	1,8833	1,10408	,03295
In our family, everything comes down to satisfying material needs	SR	2705	1,5919	,94670	,01820
	MN	1123	1,6233	,92580	,02763
Misunderstandings and conflicts in our family are easily overcome.	SR	2705	2,2074	1,18837	,02285
	MN	1123	2,1487	1,09535	,03269
In my family there is harmony, closeness, trust and understanding.	SR	2705	1,9105	,97155	,01868
	MN	1123	1,9457	,96539	,02881
How do you assess overall family relationships?	SR	2705	1,7187	,79869	,01536
	MN	1123	1,7471	,83173	,02482
In my family we take care of each other.	SR	2705	1,3453	,70120	,01348
	MN	1123	1,3820	,71470	,02133
I enjoy being with my family.	SR	2705	1,5564	,90684	,01744
	MN	1123	1,6224	,90351	,02696
My family members get along well with each other.	SR	2705	1,6281	,88208	,01696
	MN	1123	1,6981	,90388	,02697
There is hatred in our family.	SR	2705	2,1390	,96953	,01864
	MN	1123	2,2422	,98479	,02939
I have confidence in my family.	SR	2705	1,4647	,90259	,01735
	MN	1123	1,4809	,87871	,02622
Living with my family is stressful.	SR	2705	1,7834	1,09919	,02113
	MN	1123	1,9341	1,19309	,03560
I am proud of my family.	SR	2705	1,4200	,86835	,01670
	MN	1123	1,4069	,84705	,02528
For me, my family comes first.	SR	2705	1,2913	,75233	,01447
	MN	1123	1,2867	,72985	,02178

It is noted that the significance of the differences is highest in the first five items (significance at 0.000) that describe quarrels and physical conflicts in the family, stressful situations, alienation and lack of understanding among family members (see Table 3). Although the male/female adolescents in Montenegro try to minimize and cover up conflicts, the data still indicate their latent presence. The mere fact that Montenegrin male/female adolescents show a pronounced tendency to withdraw from conflict may suggest that these conflicts may be intense and that withdrawal is seen as the least undesirable outcome if the chances of emerging victorious are low or non-existent. On the other hand, adolescents in early and middle adolescence, such as most in our sample, are prone to frequent and intense conflicts (Laursen *et al.*, 1998; Jensen, Dost-Gözkán 2015; Laursen & Collins 2009) because they are most vulnerable and most persistent in gaining autonomy in that period, so withdrawal from the conflict is neither a typical nor a common outcome.

It is possible that the increased acceptance of the withdrawal of adolescents from Montenegro is influenced by specific cultural and collective – psychological patterns, but so far this remains only in the realm of assumptions. We believe that only one targeted study on this topic could provide more reliable answers, although it would require a long-term longitudinal study.

The adolescents from Montenegro value family interactions more positively when they are not directly involved. Their ambivalent, contradictory, and even negative assessment is stronger when they evaluate themselves in the context of family interactions. We notice similar tendencies among the adolescents from Serbia, but less pronounced. We are often inclined to view these phenomena as pathological patterns, which is wrong. In adolescence, there is a split between cognition and feelings, which is embodied in oscillations between excessive intellectualization and the search for universal solutions to a particular problem, and on the other hand, strong emotional engagement in finding solutions. Both times they prove to be ineffective. However, these processes should be viewed as transient in the process of gaining autonomy and social maturation of adolescents. Providing emotional and social support with mild control and direction indicates desirable directions for the male/female adolescents to emerge from the maze of conflicting attitudes, feelings, and behaviours in these turbulent situations.

CONCLUDING CONSIDERATIONS

The results of our research showed that in the total samples, in more than 4/5 cases, it is about functional, cohesive families. Based on the descriptive analysis of the Scale of family dysfunction, it is difficult to single out some more pronounced problems that lead to family dysfunction. If it is at all possible to single out some, then they are occasional quarrels between family members due to insufficient mutual understanding. It seems that by doing so, the male/female adolescents emphasize the dominant adolescent problem, which is contained in their perception of insufficient parental understanding. It is the basic constant in all adolescent families and the catalyst of all conflicts in adolescence. However, judging by almost all other items of the Scale, these conflicts at the level of the entire sample are neither too frequent nor too intense. Families at the level of the total sample, owing to their cohesiveness, manage to resolve or alleviate them, which is why they do not call into question the satisfactory level of family integration.

A more complete analytical picture was provided by the Varimax factor analysis of the Scale of family dysfunction. It should be noted that the Scale, which is being used for the first time in research, has shown very good metric properties. By applying the Varimax factor analysis, two factors were distinguished; on the first, much stronger factor, which carries 55.640 variance with high saturations above 0.600, nine items were singled out that indicate great closeness and cohesiveness of family members, with the exception of the ninth one with the relatively lowest saturation, which is the opposite of all the other eight and says that for adolescents, life is in their families stressful. If it were an adult population, it would be difficult to integrate this result into a picture of close, emotionally warm and cohesive relationships. However, in the pursuit of building autonomy and identity, adolescents often oscillate between idealizing family relationships and seeing everything in black and white tones, between acceptance and rejection, closeness and hostility, etc. In this context, these opposite emotional tones are quite expected.

On the second, significantly weaker factor, which carries only 8.197% of the variance, six items with very high saturations above 0.700 stood out. These items describe poorly cohesive, emotionally disconnected, and alienated families. Although in quantitative terms they do not represent a significant percentage, it is about a narrower, well-structured dysfunctional segment of the total sample of families.

Using the t-test, significant differences between Serbia and Montenegro on the items of the Scale of family dysfunction were determined. Namely, the male/female adolescents from Montenegro rate family relationships significantly worse; they emphasize arguments, misunderstanding, hatred, physical conflicts and estrangement between family members significantly more often than the male/female adolescents from Serbia.

The reasons for these differences should be sought in several directions. The results of a recent survey of daily life in Montenegro showed that various aspects of conflict in Montenegrin families are significantly more pronounced than we found in this one (Đukanović, 2018), especially due to serious financial problems. The roots should be sought in the general socio-economic crisis of the 90s, which affected the countries of the Western Balkans, and especially Montenegro. The only positive aspect of that chronic cumulative crisis in Montenegro was the fact that women from the lower and part of the middle classes did particularly well and ensured the economic survival of their families. This resulted in the

dethroning of men in family decision-making and, as a result, the strengthening of marital and family conflicts. Atypical historical and cultural patterns in emotional relations between mothers and sons, as a consequence of inadequate socialization and identification of sons, were only supplementary factors of intra-family conflicts. None of these directions have been sufficiently or systematically examined, so we cannot talk about either their individual contribution or their structural contributions. However, we anticipated them as possible landmarks in some future research.

REFERENCES

- [1] Beane, L. A. (2008). *Protect your child from bullying – Expert advice to help you recognize, prevent, and stop bullying before your child gets hurt*. Jossey-Bass, A Wiley Imprint.
- [2] Benbenishty, R. & Avi Astor, R. (2005). *School violence in context: Culture, neighbourhood, family, school, and gender*. Oxford University Press.
- [3] Howells, L. N. & Rosenbaum, A. (2008). Effects of perpetrator and victim gender on negative outcomes of family violence. *Journal of family violence*, 23(3), 203-209.
- [4] Ljubičić, M. (2014). Functionality of single-parent families. U: S. Tomanović, M. Ljubičić, D. Stanojević (ed.). *Single-parent families in Serbia – a sociological study*; pp. 155-174. Belgrade: Čigoja press, Institute for Sociological Research of the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade.
- [5] Jugović, A. (2011). Socio-cultural context of juvenile delinquency in Serbia. *Topics*, 35(2), pp. 385-402.
- [6] Macanović, N. (2013). Criminogenic behaviour of parents and criminogenic infection of children. *Papers*. No. 17. pp. 151-165. Banja Luka: Faculty of Philosophy.
- [7] Macanović, N. (2015). *Pedagogical current events*. Banja Luka: EDC and the Association of Teachers and Associates of the University of Banja Luka.
- [8] Macanović, N. (2020a). *Socially maladjusted behaviour of children and adolescents*. Banja Luka: The Centre of Modern Knowledge.
- [9] Macanovic, N. (2020b). The influence of the family on the school achievement of juvenile delinquents. *Knowledge International Journal*, 43(5), pp. 951-956.
- [10] Macanović, N., & Dujaković, D. (2019). The state of juvenile delinquency in the territory of the municipality of Derвента. *Belgrade Special Education School*, 25(1), pp. 47-69.
- [11] Vasiljević-Prodanović, D. (2016). Family and delinquent behaviour of young people. U: V. Nikolić-Ristanović (ed.) *Delinquency and victimization of minors in Serbia. Results of the International Delinquency Self-Report Survey (77-150)*, Belgrade: IGP Prometej.
- [12] Zloković, J., Čekalj, N. (2018). *Strengthening the family*. Rijeka: Faculty of Philosophy.
- [13] Laursen, B., Coy, K. C. and Collins, W. A. (1998) Reconsidering changes in parent-child conflict across adolescence: A metaanalysis, *Child Development*, 69, pp. 817-832.
- [14] Jensen, L. A. and Dost-Gözkan, A. (2015) Adolescent-parent relations in Asian Indian and Salvadoran immigrant families: a cultural-developmental analysis of autonomy, authority, conflict, and cohesion, *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 25, pp. 340-351.
- [15] Laursen, B. and Collins, W. A. (2009) Parent-child relationships during adolescence, in *Handbook of Adolescent Psychology*, (eds.) Lerner, R. M. and Steinberg, L., Hoboken, NJ: Wiley
- [16] Đukanović, B. (2018) Svakodnevní život [Everyday life], in Vukčević, D. (ed), *Sociološki presjek crnogorskog društva [Sociological cross-section of Montenegrin society]*, Podgorica: Montenegrin Academy of Sciences and Arts, pp. 107-337.

Article history:

Received 25 Jun 2022

Accepted 21 July 2022