UDC 37.016:811.111
DOI https://doi.org/10.32782/apv/2026.1.33

Maryna KIRILLOVA
PhD in Philology, Associate Professor, Associate Professor at the Department of Theory and Practice of Translation, Odesa I. I. Mechnikov National University, Vsevoloda Zmiienka str., 2, Odesa, Ukraine, 65082
ORCID: *0000-0002-7603-4958*

To cite this article: Kirillova, M. (2026). Zastosuvannia modeli 5E u vykladanni anhliiskoi movy: strukturno-funktsionalnyi analiz etapiv [Implementation of the 5E model in English language teaching: a structural-functional analysis of the stages]. *Acta Paedagogica Volynienses,* 1, 241–247, doi: https://doi.org/10.32782/apv/2026.1.33

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE 5E MODEL IN ENGLISH LANGUAGE TEACHING: A STRUCTURAL-FUNCTIONAL ANALYSIS OF THE STAGES

The purpose *of this article is to justify a more classroom-realistic interpretation of the 5E instructional model (Engage–Explore–Explain–Elaborate–Evaluate) for English language teaching (ELT) and to explain how the model can convert learners' experience into conceptual clarity and, subsequently, transferable communicative competence. The paper foregrounds Engage as an inductive entry point, Explore as an inquiry-based phase, and the Explain–Elaborate pair as the core instructional "engine" that stabilizes understanding and promotes transfer. The study is based on a* ***theoretical review and structured analysis*** *of scholarly and methodological sources on inductive learning, inquiry-based teaching, and the 5E model. The methods include analysis, synthesis, generalization, and structural-logical modeling to map stage functions to ELT practice. A practice-oriented lesson framework and a sample 5E lesson plan are used to illustrate operationalization of the proposed interpretation.* ***Results.*** *The article specifies functional roles for each 5E phase in ELT: Engage supports hypothesis formation from contextualized language input; Explore organizes scaffolded investigation of linguistic patterns; Explain formalizes learners' discoveries into shared form–meaning–use knowledge through interactive guidance (e.g., think-aloud modeling and concept checking questions); Elaborate strengthens transfer through tasks that shift context, audience, and pragmatic constraints; Evaluate is reconceptualized as evidence gathering across the cycle, combining formative checks with end-of-lesson performance tasks that inform subsequent instruction.* ***Conclusions.*** *A function-oriented implementation of the 5E model prevents checklist-based teaching and increases the likelihood that classroom activity results in genuine competence. The Explain–Elaborate sequence has the greatest leverage for moving learners from noticing to flexible use, while Evaluate should be treated as an ongoing evidence-and-feedback mechanism rather than a final test only. The proposed framework can guide ELT lesson design that is meaning-driven, inquiry-supported, and explicitly oriented toward transfer.*

Key words: *5E model, inductive learning, inquiry-based teaching, ELT methodology, Explain, Elaborate, transfer tasks, scaffolding.*

Марина КИРИЛЛОВА
кандидат філологічних наук, доцент, доцент кафедри теорії та практики перекладу, Одеський національний університет імені І. І. Мечникова, вул. Змієнка Всеволода, 2, м. Одеса, Україна, 65082
ORCID: *0000-0002-7603-4958*

Бібліографічний опис статті: Кириллова, М. (2026). Застосування моделі 5E у викладанні англійської мови: структурно-функціональний аналіз етапів. *Acta Paedagogica Volynienses,* 1, 241–247, doi: https://doi.org/10.32782/apv/2026.1.33

ЗАСТОСУВАННЯ МОДЕЛІ 5E У ВИКЛАДАННІ АНГЛІЙСЬКОЇ МОВИ: СТРУКТУРНО-ФУНКЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ АНАЛІЗ ЕТАПІВ

Метою статті *є обґрунтування більш практичного й «класно-реалістичного» тлумачення моделі 5E у викладанні англійської мови, з акцентом на те, як навчальний досвід учнів перетворюється на чітке розуміння й переносні мовленнєві вміння. Особливу увагу приділено трактуванню етапів Engage як індуктивного входження в тему, Explore як дослідницько-орієнтованого вивчення, а також ролі пари Explain–Elaborate як «інструкційного двигуна» уроку. Дослідження ґрунтується на* ***теоретичному аналізі наукових і методичних джерел*** *щодо індуктивного навчання, inquiry-based teaching та моделі 5E; застосовано методи аналізу, синтезу, узагальнення*

та структурно-логічного моделювання. Здійснено педагогічну інтерпретацію функцій етапів 5E для контексту ELT і запропоновано приклад уроку, побудований на принципах «індукція → дослідження → формалізація → перенесення → доказ». ***Результати.*** *Уточнено функціональну роль кожного етапу 5E в ELT: Engage забезпечує індуктивне висування гіпотез на основі мовного матеріалу в контексті; Explore організує кероване дослідження мовних закономірностей із педагогічним скелетуванням; Explain систематизує учнівські спостереження у спільні поняття (form–meaning–use) з використанням think-aloud та концептуальних перевірочних запитань; Elaborate забезпечує перенос через завдання зі зміною контексту, адресата й комунікативних обмежень; Evaluate розглядається як збирання доказів навчальних досягнень (формувальне й підсумкове), що створює зворотний зв'язок для наступного планування.* ***Висновки.*** *Функціонально орієнтоване впровадження 5E запобігає перетворенню моделі на формальну «послідовність етапів» і підвищує якість навчальних результатів у ELT. Найбільший вплив на формування компетентності має узгоджена робота Explain–Elaborate, тоді як Evaluate має виконувати роль системного доказового контролю й корекції навчання, а не лише фінального тестування. Запропонована інтерпретація та дидактичні прийоми можуть бути використані для проєктування уроків, орієнтованих на знання, контекст і перенос мовних умінь.*

Ключові слова: *модель 5E, індуктивне навчання, дослідницьке навчання, викладання англійської мови, етап «Залучення», етап «Дослідження», етап «Пояснення», етап «Розширення», формувальне оцінювання, перенесення навчання.*

Introduction. The 5E instructional model (Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, Evaluate) is widely used as a lesson structure, yet in many classrooms it functions as a predictable sequence rather than a learning mechanism. From a structural-functional perspective, the model should not be reduced to five consecutive activities. Each stage has a distinct pedagogical function that supports how learners construct knowledge and develop communicative competence. When teachers treat the stages as interchangeable "parts of a lesson," students may complete tasks successfully while still lacking conceptual clarity or the ability to transfer language to new contexts.

In ELT, this risk is especially visible in grammar and functional language teaching. Learners can repeat forms accurately in controlled exercises without understanding the meaning boundaries that govern real usage. Theoretical work on inductive learning supports the idea that learners can build stronger conceptual understanding when they begin with examples and patterns and move toward generalizations, rather than receiving rules first. In this sense, Engage can be interpreted as an inductive entry point, where learners encounter contextualized language and begin forming hypotheses. Explore then aligns with inquiry-based teaching because learners investigate evidence, test emerging ideas, and refine their conclusions through guided interaction. Research on inquiry and problem-based approaches emphasizes that complex learning improves when students work with structured tasks and teacher scaffolding rather than being expected to discover principles independently. This supports the view that Explore should be inquiry-oriented but not minimally guided. Within the 5E cycle, the Explain and Elaborate stages operate as the instructional engine. Explain consolidates learners' observations into shared form–meaning–use understandings, while Elaborate builds transfer by requiring learners to apply language in new contexts and under new communicative constraints. Finally, Evaluate should be understood as evidence gathering across the cycle, combining formative checks with performance-based tasks that reveal whether learners can use language appropriately. Thus, the theoretical problem addressed in this article is the gap between using 5E as a procedural template and implementing it as a functional system that converts experience into understanding and understanding into flexible language use.

Methodology and Methods. This study adopts a qualitative, theoretical design based on structured analysis of scholarly and methodological literature related to the 5E model, inductive learning, and inquiry-based teaching. The methodological approach combines analysis, synthesis, generalization, and structural-functional modeling. Structural-functional analysis is used to interpret each stage of the 5E model in terms of its instructional purpose, teacher moves, learner actions, and expected learning outputs in an ELT context. To operationalize the analysis, the article proposes an implementation framework that maps each stage to specific pedagogical functions: induction in Engage, guided inquiry in Explore, interactive formalization in Explain, transfer-oriented task design in Elaborate, and evidence-based assessment in Evaluate. The framework is illustrated through a sample lesson scenario focused on a common grammar contrast, demonstrating how

the same 5E sequence produces different outcomes depending on whether stages are treated as activities or as functions. The analysis focuses on internal coherence of lesson design, alignment between stage purposes and task types, and the assessment logic that connects Evaluate to instructional decision-making.

Results and Discussion. Many teachers like the 5E model because it offers a clear lesson rhythm: learners get interested, try things out, make sense of what happened, extend it, and check their progress. The issue is not the model itself. The issue is how easily it becomes a checklist: "We engaged, we explored, we explained…" while student understanding remains fragile. This article treats 5E less as a script and more as a learning logic. Two stage interpretations are made explicit because they help teachers design lessons that feel natural and still produce strong learning outcomes: **Engage** is most powerful when it works *inductively*: students first see language in action and start guessing how it works, rather than being told a rule upfront (Prince & Felder, 2006). **Explore** is most productive when it works like *inquiry*: students investigate examples, notice patterns, and test hypotheses with guidance, not with "sink-or-swim" independence (National Research Council, 2000; Hmelo-Silver et al., 2007). Once those two stages are doing their jobs, the later stages become much easier to execute well. In particular, **Explain** and **Elaborate** become the "engine" that turns discovery into stable understanding and then into transferable communicative ability (Bybee et al., 2006).

Inductive learning typically starts with examples, cases, or problems and gradually moves toward principles and rules (Prince & Felder, 2006). In ELT terms, this means Engage should do more than "catch attention." It should place learners in front of meaningful language evidence such as short dialogues, a mini-story, a meme, a voice note, contrasting sentences so they begin asking questions like:

- "Why did the speaker choose *have done* here?
- "What changes when we use passive voice in this paragraph?
- "Why does *Could you…* sound softer than *Can you…*?

A strong Engage phase sparks curiosity while also giving learners clear, concrete material to explore in the next stage, which is what makes it inductive in nature. Inquiry-based teaching emphasizes investigation: learners examine data, ask questions, try explanations, and revise them (National Research Council, 2000). The 5E model places this work in **Explore** (Bybee et al., 2006). In ELT, Explore might look like:

- sorting sentence examples into groups and explaining the grouping rule,
- noticing what changes when context changes (time, speaker intention, social distance),
- reconstructing meaning from a text and identifying the language that signals it.

A critical point is that inquiry works best when it is **scaffolded**. Students do not need less teaching; they need the right teaching at the right time like prompts, task constraints, and feedback that keep reasoning productive (Hmelo-Silver et al., 2007).

Explain is where many lessons either become strong or fall apart. If teachers treat Explain as a traditional lecture, they risk disconnecting from what students actually noticed. If they skip Explain, students may keep "doing activities" without knowing what matters.

In the 5E logic, Explain is the moment when the class makes sense of what happened in Explore and names it in a way learners can reuse (Bybee et al., 2006). A practical way to keep Explain interactive and grounded is the following four-step routine:

1. **Ask**: Return to the evidence. "What did you notice?" "What changed between A and B?"
2. **Clarify**: Let learners propose explanations (even partial ones).
3. **Formalize**: The teacher organizes and labels the idea (rule, timeline, function, pragmatic meaning).
4. **Check**: Confirm meaning and limits before moving on. This approach works particularly well after inductive and inquiry-based stages because students already have "raw material" to explain: examples they have analyzed, patterns they have noticed, and hypotheses they have proposed. Two techniques make the Explain phase more effective. The first is **think-aloud modeling**, when the teacher briefly verbalizes their reasoning (for example, "I'm choosing this tense because the result matters now…"). This makes expert thinking visible and therefore easier for learners to adopt in their own decision-making. The second technique is **concept checking questions (CCQs)**. They are short, focused questions that verify learners' understanding of the *meaning and use* of a language point, not only its form. Rather than

asking "Do you understand?", the teacher asks specific questions about essential features such as time reference, completion, who performs the action (agent), or the level of politeness. CCQs make the Explain stage more dependable because they reveal misunderstandings early, when they can still be corrected quickly and efficiently.

If Explain is where understanding becomes clear, **Elaborate** is where it becomes durable. The 5E model explicitly expects learners to apply ideas in new contexts during Elaborate (Bybee et al., 2006). In ELT, this is where language starts behaving like a tool rather than a rule.

You can usually tell Elaborate is working when learners show at least one of these:

• **Transfer:** they use the target language in a context you did not script.

• **Self-correction:** they revise because meaning or tone is wrong, not only because form is wrong.

• **Nuance questions:** they ask about subtle differences ("Is this rude?" "Does this sound too formal?").

These are strong signs that learning is moving beyond rehearsal toward competence. Here are four elaboration moves that teachers can use repeatedly across grammar and communication topics:

1. Audience shift: same message, different audience (friend, teacher, manager). 2. **Perspective shift:** same event, different speaker role (witness, journalist, participant). 3. **Concept stretching:** use the structure where it is less obvious, so learners must justify choice. 4. **Cross-system integration:** combine the target item with previously learned language (tense + modality + stance; grammar + discourse markers).

These moves align with the general finding that complex learning improves when learners work with structure and guidance rather than being left to "discover everything alone" (Hmelo-Silver et al., 2007).

In practical ELT terms, this principle can be operationalized through a carefully scaffolded 5E lesson in which inductive noticing is followed by guided inquiry, clear conceptual formalization, and transfer oriented practice. Accordingly, the following lesson is designed for a B1/B2 English class and runs for approximately 60 minutes. Its language focus is the contrast between the Present Perfect and the Past Simple, taught through meaning and use rather than rule-first instruction. The overall goal is to help learners understand when each tense is chosen in real communication (life experience, recent events with present relevance, and finished past events with a specified time), and then to use both forms confidently in speaking and short writing. By the end of the lesson, students should be able to (1) distinguish the two tenses based on time reference and connection to the present, (2) produce them accurately in guided and semi-free tasks, and (3) self-correct when the tense does not match the intended meaning.

The lesson begins with an **Engage** phase that works as an inductive entry point. Instead of presenting rules, the teacher shows four short "social update" style sentences on the board or screen, such as: "I've lost my keys. I can't get in," "I lost my keys yesterday, but I found them," "Have you ever tried sushi?" and "I tried sushi last weekend." Students work in pairs to sort these examples into two groups and, importantly, justify their decisions in simple language: which sentences feel like a "now-problem / now-relevance" message and which feel like a "finished story." The teacher does not confirm rules at this stage; the teacher's role is to capture a few learner hypotheses on the board (even if incomplete), for example, "This group has time words," or "This group feels connected to now."

The class then moves into **Explore**, which is structured as inquiry-based investigation. Learners receive a larger set of examples (eight to ten short sentences or mini-dialogues) and work in small groups to test their early hypotheses. To keep the inquiry focused, the teacher gives the groups two analytic questions: first, whether a specific finished time is mentioned (for example, "yesterday," "last week," "in 2019"); second, whether the sentence creates a clear connection to the present (a present result, a current situation, or a life-experience frame). Students sort, classify, and debate, using the examples as "data." Throughout Explore, the teacher avoids explanation but actively scaffolds with prompts such as: "Where is the time marker?" "Does the speaker care about the result now?" and "Is the question asking about experience or about one finished event?" At the end of this phase, each group writes a one-sentence "rule guess" (e.g., "We use Present Perfect when…") and the teacher posts two or three of these statements for the class to see.

The **Explain** phase is handled as interactive formalization rather than a lecture. The teacher returns directly to the learners' evidence from

Explore and uses it to build a shared concept model on the board: Past Simple as a tense for finished past events with a specified or understood finished time, and Present Perfect as a tense for past events connected to the present (results, recent changes) or for life experience without specifying when. The teacher follows a simple routine: first asking students to point to examples that support their ideas, then clarifying learner language and correcting misconceptions, then formalizing the rule in concise terms (including a minimal form reminder: have/has + past participle), and finally checking understanding with precise concept-checking questions. For instance, with "I've lost my keys," students confirm that the keys are still missing now and the situation is still relevant; with "I lost my keys yesterday," students confirm that the time is finished and specified; and with "Have you ever been to London?" students confirm that no specific time is required because the meaning is "life experience." This stage ends only when the teacher is confident that learners understand the meaning boundary between "finished time" and "present relevance/experience," not merely the verb form.

Once meaning is clear, the lesson shifts to **Elaborate**, where the objective is transfer rather than repetition. Students complete a "newsroom update" roleplay in which each group receives a scenario card such as a school club update, a sports match recap, or a personal problem and its solution and they must produce a short spoken update using at least two Present Perfect and two Past Simple sentences. The task is designed so that both tenses are naturally needed, which pushes learners to make choices rather than follow a template. To deepen transfer, the teacher adds an audience shift: learners deliver the same update first to a friend and then as if speaking to a teacher, encouraging attention to tone and clarity while keeping the tense choices meaning-driven. After the roleplay, students do a second elaboration activity that forces explicit reasoning: the teacher provides short prompts ("I ___ that movie," "She ___ her homework, so she's free," "I __ him in 2022"), and students choose the tense and defend the choice in one sentence ("I used Past Simple because the time is specified," or "I used Present Perfect because the result matters now"). This "choose and justify" move is the heart of Elaborate because it requires learners to connect grammar to communicative intent.

The lesson ends with **Evaluate**, using a short exit ticket to generate clear evidence of understanding. Individually, students complete three items: they choose the correct tense and add a brief reason, they correct a typical error (for example, "I've visited Paris last year"), and they write one sentence about life experience plus one sentence about a finished event with a time marker. If time permits, learners add a quick self-check reflection: one situation where Present Perfect is better, and one time word that usually triggers Past Simple. This final step matters because it measures conceptual control, not only accuracy.

Differentiation is embedded without changing the overall structure. Learners who need support receive a small bank of time markers and two model sentences per tense to reduce cognitive load. More advanced learners can be stretched by adding one optional contrast prompt that invites Present Perfect Continuous (for example, "I've been studying for…"), but only after the core distinction is stable. Mixed-ability groups can also be given roles – such as "time-marker spotter," "meaning checker," and "grammar editor" – to distribute responsibility and keep everyone engaged.

For homework, learners complete either a short written weekly update (approximately 120-150 words) that includes a set number of Present Perfect and Past Simple examples, or a brief audio recording (60–90 seconds) describing three things they have done recently and one finished story from last week. Both homework options reinforce the same principle as the lesson: tense choice follows meaning, context, and communicative purpose, not memorized rules alone.

Evaluate is not just the "test at the end." In a strong 5E lesson it functions as **evidence gathering and feedback**, and it happens in two ways:

1. Formative evaluation (throughout the cycle). During Engage and Explore the teacher evaluates *diagnostically*: What do learners already know? What patterns are they noticing? What misconceptions are appearing? In Explain the teacher evaluates *conceptually* with quick checks (e.g., CCQs, short decision questions, mini whiteboard responses) to confirm that learners understand meaning and use, not only the form. This aligns with inquiry-oriented teaching, where assessment is embedded in the learning process rather than separated from it (National Research Council, 2000; Hmelo-Silver et al., 2007).

2. Summative evaluation (end-of-lesson performance). At the end, Evaluate should capture whether learners can *use* the target language appropriately. In ELT this is best done through short performance tasks: a brief spoken exchange, a micro-writing task, or an "apply-and-justify" item where learners choose a form and explain why. This checks transfer from Elaborate and provides data for the next lesson (Bybee et al., 2006).

In practical terms, Evaluate answers three questions:

• **What did learners understand?** (concept accuracy: meaning/use boundaries)

• **What can they do with it?** (performance: communication in context)

• **What needs reteaching or extension?** (feedback loop for planning)

If Engage is inductive and Explore is inquiry-based, Evaluate closes the cycle by making learning visible and actionable so the teacher can adjust input, scaffolding, and task difficulty rather than simply "moving on."

Conclusion. This article argues for a more practical, teacher-friendly interpretation of the 5E model in ELT. **Engage** works best as an inductive entry that gives students meaningful language evidence and sparks hypothesis-building (Prince & Felder, 2006). **Explore** works best as inquiry-based learning with scaffolding, where learners investigate patterns and test ideas productively (National Research Council, 2000; Hmelo-Silver et al., 2007). When those stages are designed well, **Explain** can cleanly formalize what learners discovered, and **Elaborate** can push learning into transfer where language becomes flexible, contextual, and genuinely usable (Bybee et al., 2006).

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Baker J. D. Instructor immediacy increases student enjoyment, perception of learning. Online Classroom. 2010. Vol. 10, No 1. P. 1–3.

2. Bybee R. W., Taylor J. A., Gardner A. та ін. The BSCS 5E instructional model: origins, effectiveness, and applications. Colorado Springs, CO : Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS), 2006. 49 p.

3. Freeman S., Eddy S. L., McDonough M. та ін. Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2014. Vol. 111, No 23. P. 8410–8415. DOI: 10.1073/pnas.1319030111.

4. Fredricks J. A., Filsecker M., Lawson M. A. Student engagement, context, and adjustment: Addressing definitional, measurement, and methodological issues. Learning and Instruction. 2016. Vol. 43. P. 1–4. DOI: 10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.02.002.

5. Hattie J., Timperley H. The power of feedback. Review of Educational Research. 2007. Vol. 77, No 1. P. 81–112. DOI: 10.3102/003465430298487.

6. Hmelo-Silver C. E., Duncan R. G., Chinn C. A. Scaffolding and achievement in problem-based and inquiry learning: A response to Kirschner, Sweller, and Clark (2006). Educational Psychologist. 2007. Vol. 42, No 2. P. 99–107.

7. Laal M., Ghodsi S. M. Benefits of collaborative learning. Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences. 2012. Vol. 31. P. 486–490. DOI: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.091.

8. National Research Council. Inquiry and the national science education standards: A guide for teaching and learning. Washington, DC : National Academy Press, 2000. DOI: 10.17226/9596.

9. Prince M. J., Felder R. M. Inductive teaching and learning methods: Definitions, comparisons, and research bases. Journal of Engineering Education. 2006. Vol. 95, No 2. P. 123–138.

10. Schlechty P. C. Working on the work: An action plan for teachers, principals, and superintendents. San Francisco, CA : Jossey-Bass, 2002. 128 c.

REFERENCES:

1. Baker, J. D. (2010). Instructor immediacy increases student enjoyment, perception of learning. *Online Classroom, 10*(1), 1–3.

2. Bybee R. W., Taylor J. A., Gardner A., Van Scotter P., Powell J. C., Westbrook A., Landes N. The BSCS 5E instructional model: origins, effectiveness, and applications. Colorado Springs, CO : Biological Sciences Curriculum Study (BSCS), 2006. 49 p.

3. Freeman, S., Eddy, S. L., McDonough, M., Smith, M. K., Okoroafor, N., Jordt, H., & Wenderoth, M. P. (2014). Active learning increases student performance in science, engineering, and mathematics. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111*(23), 8410–8415. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1319030111

4. Fredricks, J. A., Filsecker, M., & Lawson, M. A. (2016). Student engagement, context, and adjustment: Addressing definitional, measurement, and methodological issues. *Learning and Instruction, 43*, 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.learninstruc.2016.02.002

5. Hattie, J., & Timperley, H. (2007). The power of feedback. *Review of Educational Research, 77*(1), 81–112. https://doi.org/10.3102/003465430298487

6. Hmelo-Silver, C. E., Duncan, R. G., & Chinn, C. A. (2007). Scaffolding and achievement in problem-based and inquiry learning: A response to Kirschner, Sweller, and Clark (2006). *Educational Psychologist, 42*(2), 99–107.

7. Laal, M., & Ghodsi, S. M. (2012). Benefits of collaborative learning. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences, 31*, 486–490. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.12.091

8. National Research Council. (2000). *Inquiry and the national science education standards: A guide for teaching and learning*. National Academies Press.

9. Prince, M. J., & Felder, R. M. (2006). Inductive teaching and learning methods: Definitions, comparisons, and research bases. *Journal of Engineering Education, 95*(2), 123–138.

10. Schlechty, P. C. (2002). *Working on the work: An action plan for teachers, principals, and superintendents*. Jossey-Bass. 128 p.

Дата першого надходження статті до видання: 19.01.2026
Дата прийняття статті до друку після рецензування: 23.02.2026
Дата публікації (оприлюднення) статті: 23.04.2026