УДК 378.147:811.111'243
DOI https://doi.org/10.31392/UDU-nc.series5.2026.110.27

Riabchuk M. O., Martynov I. V., Trush A. V.

TEACHING IS NOT A CALLING: WHY WE MUST DECONSTRUCT THE NOTION OF TEACHING AS VOCATION

The article critically reconsiders the concept of teaching as a calling within contemporary foreign language education. It examines how this notion influences pedagogical practices, teacher identity, and the quality of educational interaction in the process of foreign language teaching and learning. Particular attention is given to the role of communicative approaches in shaping effective language instruction.

The relevance of the study is determined by the need to rethink traditional perceptions of teaching in the context of increasing professional demands, emotional burnout, and systemic challenges in modern education. In foreign language teaching, where communicative interaction, empathy, flexibility, and adaptability are essential, the uncritical acceptance of teaching as a calling may negatively affect both teacher well-being and the effectiveness of developing communicative competence.

The article analyzes the theoretical foundations of the concept of teaching as a calling and its influence on the interpretation of key professional qualities, including motivation, empathy, resilience, and scholarly engagement. The works of John Dewey, bell hooks, and Jiddu Krishnamurti provide the methodological basis for understanding educational experience, classroom interaction, and teacher agency.

The results of the conceptual analysis demonstrate that the discourse of teaching as a calling can legitimize unfavorable working conditions, contribute to teacher burnout, and limit the development of meaningful pedagogical relationships. It is argued that abandoning this notion allows for a more balanced understanding of teaching as a professional activity and creates conditions for more authentic, student-centered, and reflective practices in foreign language education.

Key words: *teaching as a calling, teacher identity, foreign language education, communicative competence, teacher burnout, pedagogical interaction, professionalization of teaching, critical pedagogy.*

(статтю подано мовою оригіналу)

Recent years have placed educational systems under unprecedented pressure due to the combined impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and the full-scale war in Ukraine [6]. These overlapping crises have significantly disrupted the stability of schooling, reshaped institutional functioning, and intensified both the professional and emotional demands placed on teachers. In particular, efforts to maintain continuity of education during the pandemic, followed by the urgent need to adapt teaching and learning processes under wartime conditions, have resulted in sustained workload escalation, frequent shifts between learning formats, and increased psychological strain across the teaching profession.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, educational authorities attempted to ensure uninterrupted schooling despite severe health risks and limited institutional preparedness. This led to rapid and often unstructured transitions to online and hybrid modes of instruction, frequently implemented without sufficient technical infrastructure, training, or pedagogical support. As a result, teachers were required to continuously adapt their instructional practices, manage new digital environments, and maintain student engagement under conditions of uncertainty. Even within the early stages of academic cycles, clear indicators of exhaustion, stress, and professional burnout became increasingly visible [2].

The situation was further intensified by the full-scale war in Ukraine, which introduced additional layers of instability, displacement, and infrastructural disruption. Educational institutions have been forced to operate under conditions characterized by air raids, relocation of schools, interrupted learning processes, and widespread psychological trauma affecting both teachers and learners. In such circumstances, teaching has become closely intertwined with crisis response, resilience, and the constant reconfiguration of educational practices in response to external threats.

Within this context of overlapping crises, public and institutional discourse has increasingly relied on idealized narratives that frame teaching as a moral vocation rather than a profession. One of the most persistent formulations within this discourse is the statement "Teaching is a calling." This notion reflects the assumption that teaching is not merely acquired through education and professional preparation but is instead rooted in innate qualities that define who is "meant" to teach. According to this perspective, teachers are expected to demonstrate unwavering commitment regardless of working conditions, systemic limitations, or external pressures.

Such a framing has important consequences for how educational challenges are interpreted. Structural difficulties within schooling systems are frequently individualized and attributed to personal inadequacy or lack of vocation rather than being understood as outcomes of systemic underfunding, policy constraints, or institutional instability [2]. As a result, teacher dissatisfaction is often dismissed as evidence that individuals are not "cut out" for the profession, reinforcing a culture in which endurance is normalized and critique is discouraged.'

Teaching as a calling functions not only as a cultural narrative but also as a mechanism that shapes professional expectations and institutional responsibility [4]. It contributes to the normalization of self-sacrifice, emotional

labour, and continuous adaptability as inherent components of teacher identity. This becomes especially visible in crisis contexts, where systemic fragility increases reliance on individual resilience rather than structural support.

The present analysis therefore critically examines the concept of teaching as a calling and its implications for teacher identity, institutional practices, and educational sustainability. It argues that while this discourse may appear to elevate the moral status of the teaching profession, it simultaneously obscures structural inequalities, reinforces unrealistic expectations, and limits the potential for meaningful educational reform. Furthermore, it contributes to working conditions that negatively affect teacher well-being and constrain the development of sustainable pedagogical relationships.

By situating the discussion within the dual context of the COVID-19 pandemic and the war in Ukraine, the study highlights the growing tension between idealized expectations of teaching and the material realities of contemporary education. This tension forms the basis for a critical re-evaluation of dominant narratives in the field and opens space for reconsidering teaching as a professionally supported and institutionally accountable practice rather than an innate calling.

The conceptualization of teaching as a calling is closely connected to broader philosophical and pedagogical debates concerning the nature of educational experience, teacher agency, and the social function of schooling. Critical examination of this notion requires engagement with theoretical perspectives that challenge idealized and essentialist understandings of education, particularly those articulated in the works of John Dewey, Bell Hooks, and Jiddu Krishnamurti. These perspectives collectively emphasize the importance of lived experience, relationality, and critical awareness in educational practice, offering an alternative to narratives that frame teaching as an innate vocation.

From a Deweyan perspective, education is fundamentally grounded in experience rather than abstract ideals imposed upon it. In *Experience and Education* (1938), Dewey critiques dichotomous thinking that separates theory from practice or ideal from reality, arguing that such separations hinder meaningful educational development [1]. Within this framework, teaching cannot be reduced to a fixed moral identity or vocational destiny, as doing so risks detaching educational practice from the concrete conditions in which it occurs. Instead, teaching is understood as an evolving, situational, and reflective practice shaped by continuous interaction between educators, learners, and institutional environments. The discourse of teaching as a calling, by contrast, tends to elevate fixed moral expectations over contextual realities, thereby limiting the capacity for adaptive and reflective pedagogical practice.

Similarly, bell hooks emphasizes the importance of education as a practice of freedom grounded in engagement, care, and mutual recognition within the classroom. In *Teaching to Transgress* (1994), hooks highlights the transformative potential of education when it is based on authentic interaction and shared intellectual growth rather than hierarchical or sacrificial models of teaching [3]. Within this perspective, the expectation that teachers must endlessly endure structural deficiencies in the name of vocation risks undermining the relational quality of education itself. When teaching is framed as a calling, emotional labour and self-sacrifice are often normalized to the extent that they obscure the need for institutional accountability and sustainable pedagogical conditions. hooks’ emphasis on well-being and mutuality in educational spaces provides a critical counterpoint to ideologies that valorize suffering as a necessary component of teaching identity.

Krishnamurti’s philosophical reflections further reinforce the critique of idealized thinking in education. In *Education and the Significance of Life* (1953), Krishnamurti argues that adherence to ideals often functions as a psychological escape from present realities, preventing individuals from fully engaging with the actual conditions of their lives and institutions [5]. Applied to the discourse of teaching as a calling, this perspective suggests that the idealization of teaching may obscure the material and structural challenges faced within educational systems. Rather than addressing present difficulties such as underfunding, workload imbalance, or institutional instability, the narrative of vocation may redirect attention toward abstract notions of duty and sacrifice.

Taken together, these theoretical perspectives challenge the assumption that teaching can be understood as a predetermined vocation detached from institutional and social contexts. Instead, they position teaching as a situated, relational, and critically engaged practice that must be analyzed within the material conditions in which it operates. Within this framework, the discourse of teaching as a calling appears less as a neutral description of professional identity and more as a culturally embedded ideology that shapes expectations, legitimizes certain institutional arrangements, and influences how educational challenges are interpreted.’

Importantly, these theoretical positions also allow for a rethinking of teacher identity beyond the binary opposition between vocation and profession. Rather than conceptualizing teaching as either a moral calling or a purely technical occupation, these perspectives support a more integrated understanding of teaching as a socially embedded professional practice requiring both ethical engagement and institutional support. This approach enables a shift away from narratives that individualize responsibility for systemic shortcomings and toward a more balanced recognition of the interplay between personal agency and structural conditions.

In this sense, the theoretical framework provides a foundation for critically examining how the ideology of teaching as a calling operates within contemporary educational discourse. It highlights the need to move beyond idealized constructions of teacher identity and toward a more nuanced understanding of teaching as a dynamic practice shaped by experience, relationality, and socio-political context. This foundation is essential for further

analysis of how such ideological constructs influence teacher well-being, institutional practices, and the development of sustainable educational environments.

Beyond its rhetorical function, the discourse of teaching as a calling (TAC) operates as a powerful ideological mechanism that shapes professional identity formation, regulates expectations within teacher education, and contributes to the normalization of structural inequalities in schooling systems. Rather than functioning as a neutral metaphor, TAC structures how teachers are selected, trained, evaluated, and socially positioned, thereby influencing both institutional practices and individual self-understanding.

One of the key mechanisms through which TAC operates is the early identification and validation of so-called "innate" teacher qualities during the admission process into teacher education programs. Candidates are often assessed not only on academic achievement but also on perceived dispositional traits such as passion, empathy, resilience, and scholarship. While these characteristics may appear pedagogically desirable, their framing as pre-existing and essential attributes reinforces the assumption that effective teaching is primarily a matter of personal disposition rather than professional formation. This contributes to a selective logic in which teaching ability is partially naturalized, thereby obscuring the role of structured training, mentorship, and institutional support in teacher development.

Once admitted into teacher education programs, student-teachers frequently encounter a system in which these same traits are continuously reinforced and monitored. Field experiences and internships often function as sites where idealized expectations of teacher identity are enacted under conditions that may be inconsistent, under-resourced, or pedagogically unsupportive. In such contexts, student-teachers are frequently expected to demonstrate emotional endurance and compliance with institutional demands in order to be perceived as "suitable" for the profession. This dynamic produces a form of professional socialization in which endurance and self-sacrifice become normalized indicators of competence.

Within this process, the traits initially presented as strengths – passion, empathy, resilience, and scholarship – are progressively transformed into mechanisms of regulation. Passion becomes a justification for accepting excessive workloads and unfavorable working conditions, reinforcing the idea that genuine teachers must remain committed regardless of systemic constraints. Empathy, while pedagogically essential, is often expanded into an unrealistic expectation of emotional labor that requires teachers to manage not only instructional tasks but also complex psychological and social needs of large groups of learners without adequate institutional support. Resilience, rather than functioning as a situational coping strategy, becomes a continuous requirement, effectively shifting responsibility for systemic dysfunction onto individuals. Scholarship, similarly, can be reconfigured into a hierarchical relationship with knowledge, positioning teachers as gatekeepers rather than facilitators of learning.

Through these mechanisms, TAC contributes to the gradual internalization of professional norms that align teacher identity with self-sacrifice and moral obligation. This internalization is further reinforced by institutional narratives that frame teaching as a socially noble but inherently demanding vocation. As a result, structural issues such as large class sizes, inadequate funding, limited resources, and administrative overload are often reframed as unavoidable aspects of a meaningful profession rather than as problems requiring systemic intervention.

Another important dimension of TAC is its role in shaping responses to teacher dissatisfaction and burnout. Within this discourse, expressions of professional discomfort are frequently interpreted not as indicators of structural imbalance but as signs of insufficient vocation. Teachers who experience stress, exhaustion, or disengagement may therefore be positioned as lacking the necessary intrinsic qualities associated with teaching. This contributes to a culture in which seeking support or questioning institutional conditions can be perceived as a failure of commitment, further discouraging critical reflection on systemic issues.

Over time, these mechanisms contribute to the normalization of burnout as an expected dimension of professional life in education. Rather than being recognized as a signal of institutional dysfunction, burnout is often reframed as evidence of insufficient resilience or misplaced career choice. This normalization has significant implications for teacher retention, professional satisfaction, and the overall sustainability of educational systems, particularly in contexts already affected by crisis conditions such as the COVID-19 pandemic and the war in Ukraine.

Importantly, TAC also shapes public perceptions of teaching, reinforcing the belief that teachers should be motivated primarily by moral rather than material considerations. This perception contributes to the justification of comparatively low remuneration and limited institutional investment in education, under the assumption that teachers are driven by intrinsic vocation rather than external reward structures. In this way, TAC operates not only at the level of individual identity but also at the level of policy discourse and societal expectation.

Taken together, these mechanisms demonstrate that TAC is not merely a descriptive metaphor but a structuring ideology that influences multiple dimensions of the educational system. It shapes how teachers are selected and trained, how professional expectations are constructed, how institutional deficiencies are interpreted, and how teacher well-being is understood. In doing so, it reinforces a model of education in which systemic problems are individualized and normalized, thereby limiting the potential for structural reform and sustainable pedagogical development.

The discourse of teaching as a calling has particularly significant implications for foreign language education, where communicative interaction, affective engagement, and adaptive pedagogical strategies are central to the development of learners' communicative competence. In such contexts, the teacher's role extends beyond knowledge

transmission to include facilitation of interaction, emotional support, and the creation of an environment conducive to authentic language use. However, when teaching is framed primarily as a calling, these professional demands are often reinterpreted through the lens of moral obligation and self-sacrifice, which can distort both pedagogical priorities and educational outcomes.

Foreign language teaching is inherently relational and dialogic, requiring sustained attention to learner participation, feedback, and interactional dynamics. The development of communicative competence depends not only on linguistic input but also on the quality of classroom interaction, opportunities for meaningful communication, and the teacher’s ability to scaffold language use in contextually appropriate ways. Within this framework, teacher well-being and professional sustainability become essential preconditions for effective instruction. However, TAC discourse risks obscuring these conditions by positioning teacher endurance as an assumed norm rather than a variable dependent on institutional support.

In practice, the expectation that language teachers should demonstrate constant empathy, enthusiasm, and emotional availability may lead to the overextension of professional responsibilities. While empathy is a crucial component of effective language instruction – particularly in creating supportive environments for language production – it becomes problematic when it is transformed into an unlimited emotional obligation. Large class sizes, limited instructional time, and administrative pressures further exacerbate this imbalance, making it difficult for teachers to maintain the level of individualized attention required for effective communicative language teaching.

Similarly, passion is frequently framed as a defining characteristic of effective language teachers. In foreign language education, this often translates into expectations of constant enthusiasm, creativity, and motivational energy. However, when passion is treated as an essential identity marker rather than a professional disposition that fluctuates over time, it becomes a mechanism of pressure rather than support. Teachers may feel compelled to perform enthusiasm even in conditions of fatigue or institutional constraint, which can undermine authenticity in classroom interaction and contribute to emotional exhaustion.

Resilience, within foreign language teaching contexts, is often associated with the ability to manage classroom unpredictability, linguistic diversity, and varying levels of learner proficiency. However, when resilience is continuously invoked as a requirement rather than a response to specific challenges, it risks masking structural deficiencies in educational systems. In contexts affected by crisis – such as pandemic-related disruptions or wartime instability – this becomes particularly pronounced, as teachers are expected to sustain instructional continuity despite limited resources, psychological stress, and frequent interruptions to learning environments.

The implications of TAC are also evident in the development of foreign language communicative competence itself. Effective language acquisition requires consistent exposure, interaction, and opportunities for meaningful use of the target language. However, when teacher workload and institutional pressures reduce the quality or quantity of classroom interaction, the development of communicative competence may be indirectly affected. In this sense, teacher well-being is not external to language learning outcomes but directly connected to them. Overburdened teachers are less able to design interactive tasks, provide individualized feedback, and maintain the communicative orientation of instruction that is central to modern language pedagogy.

Furthermore, the ideological framing of teaching as a calling can limit innovation in foreign language pedagogy. The adoption of digital tools, communicative methodologies, and learner-centered approaches often requires institutional support, time, and professional development. However, in contexts where teachers are expected to rely primarily on personal dedication rather than systemic support, such innovation may be constrained. This is particularly relevant in contemporary foreign language education, where digital platforms, online applications, and blended learning environments have become increasingly important for developing communicative competence.

In addition, TAC may influence how success in foreign language education is evaluated. When teaching is perceived as a vocation, educational outcomes may be implicitly linked to teacher dedication rather than pedagogical conditions or institutional resources. This can lead to an oversimplified understanding of language learning success, where student achievement is attributed primarily to teacher effort rather than to the interaction of multiple structural and pedagogical factors. Such a perspective risks reinforcing unrealistic expectations placed on teachers while overlooking the systemic dimensions of language education.

Overall, the implications of TAC for foreign language education highlight a critical tension between idealized expectations of teacher identity and the practical requirements of communicative language teaching. While foreign language education depends heavily on relational engagement, creativity, and emotional support, these qualities cannot be sustained through ideological pressure alone. They require stable working conditions, institutional recognition, and professional balance. Without these conditions, the quality of communicative competence development may be indirectly compromised, despite high levels of individual teacher commitment.

The critical examination of teaching as a calling (TAC) has demonstrated that this discourse functions as more than a cultural metaphor; it operates as a structuring ideology that shapes teacher identity, institutional expectations, and broader educational practices. While TAC may appear to affirm the moral significance of teaching, its practical implications reveal a more complex and problematic dynamic in which structural inequalities are individualized and normalized, and professional challenges are reframed as matters of personal disposition rather than systemic conditions.

The analysis has shown that in contemporary educational contexts shaped by overlapping crises, including the COVID-19 pandemic and the full-scale war in Ukraine, the pressures placed on teachers have intensified significantly. These conditions have exposed and amplified existing structural vulnerabilities within educational systems, including underfunding, excessive workload, and psychological strain. In such contexts, TAC becomes particularly influential, as it reinforces expectations of endurance and self-sacrifice while limiting critical engagement with institutional responsibility.

From a theoretical perspective, the works of Dewey, hooks, and Krishnamurti provide a coherent foundation for challenging idealized conceptions of teaching. Dewey's emphasis on experience highlights the importance of contextual and reflective practice, rejecting fixed and abstract notions of professional identity. hooks foregrounds the relational and affective dimensions of education, emphasizing care, engagement, and well-being as essential components of meaningful learning environments. Krishnamurti's critique of idealism further underscores the risks associated with displacing attention from present realities toward abstract moral narratives. Together, these perspectives support a reorientation of educational discourse away from vocation-based idealization and toward a more grounded understanding of teaching as a situated and socially embedded practice.

Teacher education and selection processes to classroom expectations and public discourse, TAC shapes how teaching is understood, evaluated, and experienced. Traits such as passion, empathy, resilience, and scholarship, while pedagogically valuable, become problematic when transformed into rigid identity markers that justify excessive emotional labor and normalize structural inadequacies. In this way, TAC contributes to the reproduction of conditions that undermine teacher well-being and limit the potential for sustainable professional practice.

Within the context of foreign language education, these dynamics acquire additional significance. Communicative language teaching relies heavily on interaction, engagement, and sustained pedagogical responsiveness. However, when teacher well-being is compromised, the quality of communicative practice is also affected. The development of communicative competence depends not only on methodological approaches but also on institutional conditions that enable teachers to facilitate meaningful interaction, provide feedback, and maintain supportive learning environments. TAC, by obscuring these dependencies, risks reinforcing unrealistic expectations regarding teacher performance and educational outcomes.

Importantly, the critique of TAC does not imply a rejection of teaching as a meaningful or socially significant profession. Rather, it calls for a reconfiguration of how teaching is conceptualized within educational discourse. Moving beyond the binary opposition between vocation and profession allows for a more balanced understanding of teaching as a complex practice that requires both ethical engagement and institutional support. Such a perspective recognizes that teacher dedication alone is insufficient to sustain educational quality in the absence of structural investment and systemic responsibility.

Reconsidering teaching outside the framework of calling also opens space for more sustainable approaches to teacher well-being and professional development. It enables a shift from individualized narratives of endurance toward collective and institutional approaches to addressing educational challenges. In doing so, it becomes possible to reimagine educational environments in which teachers are supported not through moral expectation alone, but through concrete conditions that enable effective, reflective, and humane pedagogical practice.

Ultimately, the rejection of TAC as a dominant explanatory framework allows for a more critical and realistic engagement with contemporary educational realities. It creates the conditions for rethinking teacher identity, re-evaluating institutional responsibility, and reasserting the importance of well-being and sustainability in education. In this sense, the present analysis contributes to ongoing discussions on pedagogical innovation by challenging reductive narratives and advocating for a more contextually grounded understanding of teaching in the twenty-first century.

Bibliography:

1. Dewey J. Experience and Education. New York : Macmillan, 1938. 96 p.
2. Hargreaves A., Fullan M. Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School. New York : Teachers College Press, 2012. 176 p.
3. Hooks B. Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom. New York, USA : Routledge, 1994. 216 p.
4. Ingersoll R. M., Strong M. The Impact of Induction and Mentoring Programs for Beginning Teachers. Review of Educational Research. 2011. Vol. 81, no. 2. P. 201–233. URL: https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311403323 (дата звернення: 13.04.2026).
5. Krishnamurti J. Education and the Significance of Life. New Delhi : Krishnamurti Foundation Trust, 1953. 128 p.
6. UNESCO. Education in a Post-COVID World: Nine Ideas for Public Action. Paris : UNESCO, 2020. 24 p. URL: https://www.unesco.org/sites/default/files/education_in_a_post-covid_world-nine_ideas_for_public_action.pdf (дата звернення: 15.04.2026).

References:

1. Dewey J. (1938). Experience and Education. New York : Macmillan, 96 p.
2. Hargreaves A., Fullan M. (2012). Professional Capital: Transforming Teaching in Every School. New York : Teachers College Press, 176 p.
3. Hooks B. (1994). Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom. New York, USA : Routledge, 216 p.
4. Ingersoll R. M., Strong M. (2011). The Impact of Induction and Mentoring Programs for Beginning Teachers. Review of Educational Research. Vol. 81, no. 2. P. 201–233. URL: https://doi.org/10.3102/0034654311403323 (last accessed: 13.04.2026).

5. Krishnamurti J. (1953). Education and the Significance of Life. New Delhi : Krishnamurti Foundation Trust, 128 p.
6. UNESCO. (2020). Education in a Post-COVID World: Nine Ideas for Public Action. Paris : UNESCO, 24 p. URL: https://www.unesco.org/sites/default/files/education_in_a_post-covid_world-nine_ideas_for_public_action.pdf (last accessed: 15.04.2026).

М. О. Рябчук, І. В. Мартинов, А. В. Труш. Викладання – не покликання: чому необхідно переосмислити концепцію викладання як професійне покликання

У статті здійснено критичне переосмислення концепції викладання як покликання в контексті сучасної іншомовної освіти. Досліджено вплив цього уявлення на педагогічні практики, професійну ідентичність викладача та якість освітньої взаємодії у процесі навчання іноземних мов. Особливу увагу приділено ролі комунікативних підходів у забезпеченні ефективного навчання та викладання мов.

Актуальність дослідження зумовлена необхідністю перегляду традиційних уявлень про викладання в умовах зростання професійних вимог, емоційного вигорання та системних викликів сучасної освіти. У сфері навчання іноземних мов, де визначальними є комунікативна взаємодія, емпатія, гнучкість і адаптивність, некритичне сприйняття викладання як покликання може негативно впливати як на благополуччя викладача, так і на ефективність формування іншомовної комунікативної компетентності.

У статті проаналізовано теоретичні засади концепції викладання як покликання та її вплив на інтерпретацію ключових професійних якостей, зокрема мотивації, емпатії, стійкості та наукової залученості. Методологічною основою дослідження слугують праці Джона Дьюї, Белли Гукс та Джидда Крішнамурті, які дають змогу осмислити освітній досвід, взаємодію в класі та агентність викладача.

Результати концептуального аналізу засвідчують, що дискурс викладання як покликання може легітимізувати несприятливі умови праці, сприяти професійному вигоранню та обмежувати розвиток змістовних педагогічних взаємин. Обґрунтовано, що відмова від цієї ідеї сприяє більш збалансованому розумінню викладання як професійної діяльності та створює умови для впровадження автентичних, студентоцентрованих і рефлексивних практик у іншомовній освіті.

Ключові слова: *викладання як покликання, професійна ідентичність викладача, іншомовна освіта, комунікативна компетентність, професійне вигорання, педагогічна взаємодія, професіоналізація викладання, критична педагогіка.*

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 27.04.2026
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 21.05.2026
Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 29.05.2026



Стаття поширюється на умовах ліцензії відкритого доступу CC BY 4.0