

Bilinguals and multilinguals in a foreign language environment: A case study on the language use of Ukrainians in Japan

Bogdan Pavliy, Toyama University of International Studies, Japan

This research aims to investigate the language situation among Ukrainians (Ukrainian-Russian bilinguals) in Japan and discover the factors which may bring forth changes in their language use. The empirical research on the language use can be conducted with more accuracy in a foreign country, where individuals are faced with the necessity of using other languages and do not have recourse to their native languages. These exploratory research data collected from the interviews with Ukrainians in Japan have shown that in the current situation among those Ukrainian nationals who live or lived in Japan for one year or more Japanese is highly prioritized as a language for daily use compared to the other languages. The peculiarities in the use of each of four languages are described and considered.

Key words: *language choice, language use, multilingualism, sociolinguistics*

1. Introduction

Life in a foreign country with its diverse language environment brings new communicative challenges for bilinguals and multilinguals. Depending on different factors, their former language priorities either stay constant or evolve when their academic or working environments change. As the language of use serves as one of the most important cultural markers for Ukrainians (Shulman, 1999; Kulyk, 2011), understanding of the language preferences of Ukrainians who use Ukrainian, Russian and the languages of the countries they live in may bring us a new insight.

The previous research of Pavliy and Lewis on the language priorities of Ukrainians in Twitter and Facebook showed that the Russian language, in general, prevails in online communities (Pavliy and Lewis, 2015, 2016, 2017). Moreover, this research has found that female users tweet in Russian much more than male users. No explanation could be provided but to suggest that females tend to accommodate their language to that of their followers (Pavliy and Lewis, 2017:99).

To explore that phenomenon, independent empirical research was conducted. This research showed that among Ukrainian nationals in Japan there is no tendency for females to accommodate their language to interlocutors more than males. Findings suggested that concerning the language accommodation, out of the three variables “gender”, “length of stay in Japan” and “region of birth/ formative years in Ukraine”, the last factor makes the most impact on the phenomenon of accommodating the language (Pavliy, 2018). Current research is a continuation of the previous research on the language use of Ukrainians in Japan (Pavliy, 2018, 2019).

2. Bilingualism and language preferences of Ukrainians

According to the Constitution of Ukraine (1996), Ukrainian is the only official language. However, in many districts of Ukraine the citizens still prioritize Russian in their daily communication. The peculiarity of the situation in Ukraine was in that the official language for a long time needed more protection and support from the state than the “language of minority”

(Russian). Shevchenko (2015) describes that Ukrainians need the support of the authorities for imposing Ukrainian, their official language. At the same time, this official language needs protection as a “minority language” (Shevchenko, 2015:222).

Russia put efforts to undermine its relations with Ukraine with the use of the “Russian-speaking population” (Laitin 1998: 263-265). The existence of Russian-speaking citizens in Ukraine helps Russia to deal with political and financial elite of Ukraine, and uphold its right to consider Ukraine a part of the “Russian world”. The priority for the Ukrainian language in daily life is important for Ukrainians because it clearly discerns them from Russians and other ethnicities of the former Soviet Union and shows that they belong to the Ukrainian nation. The term “nation” means here, first of all, a political nation; however, the same can be said about a cultural nation. As Shulman (2004) describes it: “Language is one if not the most important cultural marker separating Ukrainians from Russians, so perhaps it is not surprising that, to the extent that the people of Ukraine believe that ethnic Ukrainians have a special relationship to the Ukrainian nation, they think it is their language specifically that should be given privileged consideration” (Shulman, 2004:53-54). The stress on the priority of the Ukrainian language was partially ignored in Ukrainian society, especially in the South-East region of the state, while the national identities of Ukrainians shaped their language preferences. According to the results of the public opinion polls of the population of Ukraine in 2006-2007, in general Ukrainian speakers tended to choose pro-European positions (47% for and 17% against) while Russian speakers did not welcome European integration (30% for and 59% against). The same attitude was observed among Ukrainians towards Ukraine joining NATO: (Ukrainian speakers: 61% for and 23% against, Russian speakers: 15% for and 52% against). By contrast, Russian speakers saw the future of Ukraine in union with Russia (Russian speakers: 55% for and 17% against, Ukrainian speakers: 20% for and 63% against) Zalizniak (2009:149-151). Controversial tendencies in the language policy in Ukraine before and after Euromaidan, the 2013 Ukrainian protest movement which led to the ouster of President Yanukovich in February 2014, stimulated the necessity of changes among the population of Ukraine in favor of the Ukrainian language. The realization of that finally resulted in the political consensus on using Ukrainian as the only official language in Ukraine, which may be beneficial for the future of the Ukrainian nation.

Concerning bilingualism, there is no consensus among scholars on the degree to which an individual should be able to operate in both languages to be regarded as bilingual. Historically, bilingualism was defined as the ability to have “native-like control of both languages” (Bloomfield, 1933:60), but many researchers think that bilingualism is not limited to the native-like fluency in a language, and define bilinguals as those who obtain enough language skills in order to effectively communicate with speakers of one or more languages in a given society (Macnamara, 1967, Mohanty and Perregaux, 1997, Butler and Hakuta, 2004). Bilinguals can be classified as *folk* or *elite* in the social domains where languages are associated with different social status (Fishman, 1977). Depending on their age of language acquisition bilinguals can be *early* or *late* (Genesee et al., 1978). Depending on their functional ability they can be classified as *incipient*, *receptive* or *productive*. Depending on the organization of linguistic codes and meaning units they can be classified as *compound*, *coordinate* or *subordinate* (Weinreich, 1953).

Although the level of fluency in Ukrainian and Russian in governmental organizations and institutions, education, cultural and sport facilities, business, and media along with the internet resources differs depending on the region, both languages are mutually comprehensible for most of the population of Ukraine. Regarding the bilingualism in Ukraine, it can be said

that “Ukraine is, at its heart, bilingual and bicultural” (Petro 2015:31).

3. Research goals

The goals of this research are:

- 1) To investigate the recent language situation among bilingual and multilingual Ukrainians in Japan, their language preferences, and their working languages in Japan.
- 2) To discuss how such factors as the gender of the respondents, their length of stay in Japan, region of birth/ formative years in Ukraine, their occupation/social role, and their willingness to accommodate the language to the interlocutor’s (in the case of a bilingual interlocutor, who understands both languages) relate to the language preferences of the respondents with regard to the four languages (Ukrainian, Russian, English and Japanese) which are the target of this study.

4. Research questions, methods, and limitations

4.1. Research questions

As noted in the introduction, the current research is a continuation of my previous research on the language use of Ukrainians in Japan. So, my first question is about their language priorities in general:

RQ1: Which of these four languages (Ukrainian, Russian, English, Japanese) is used most often by Ukrainians living in Japan?

I also want to explore which factors are most influential for the use of each language. Therefore, my second research question is:

RQ2: What particularities in the use of each language are seen in relation to the respondents’ gender, length of stay in Japan, the region of birth/formative years, occupation/social role, and willingness to accommodate their language to interlocutors?

4.2 Research methods

As this research is focused on sociological rather than linguistic components, the investigation was conducted through a field research, by the method of conducting interviews, which is widely used in sociology. Data have been collected and analyzed based on interviews with 50 participants. I used an integrated approach in dealing with the data: the qualitative approach was used for data collection; the quantitative approach was employed to analyze the numerical representation of elements under observation and in dealing with the variables. The interviews were conducted in person or through online media (Facebook Messenger). My respondents were Ukrainian citizens of both genders, from various regions of Ukraine, with various lengths of stay in Japan (the shortest constituted one year, while the longest was 30 years), and four different types of occupation/social roles. The research deals with the four possible impact factors: gender of the respondent, length of stay in Japan, the region of Ukraine where the respondent spent formative years, and the respondent’s occupation or social role.

4.3. Limitations

This research has several limitations. Due to the necessity of the self-evaluation by the objects of the research, it lacks the accuracy of data. Dealing with such delicate matter as the language choice, the data cannot be accurately proven or negated by the mere observation of the respondents. This research deals with how people self-evaluate their language situation, rather than what this situation really is. In many cases, the respondents were not confident about the percentage each language takes in their life but had to be trusted in the correct assessment of their own language.

On the other hand, the volatility of the data may turn out to be the strong point of this research, because the respondent's self-assessment in itself provides important data and gives an opportunity to explore current dynamic "through a framework which is value-laden, flexible, descriptive, holistic, and context sensitive" (Yilmaz, 2013:312).

5. Data

To get the data on the language use of Ukrainian citizens in Japan, I conducted interviews which included twenty-five questions related to the respondent's language background. Questions to the interviewees were about:

- Language environment in the family.
- Language in school, with friends.
- Language situation in the days of their youth and how it changed now
- Language preferences in social networks, news, comments on internet sites and music favorites.
- Their opinions on the necessity of Ukrainian for raising children in Japan.
- Their opinions on the necessity of Ukrainian for the Ukrainian community in Japan.
- Their opinions on the necessity of Ukrainian in the Embassy of Ukraine in Japan.
- Language in the church (if visited).
- Changing the language of daily use from Russian to Ukrainian or from Ukrainian to Russian.
- The current percentage of each of four languages (Ukrainian, Russian, English, Japanese) in their daily life.
- The tendency to accommodate their language to the language of interlocutors.

Due to the large amount of information, this research analyzes the data on only two questions: the proportion of use of Ukrainian, Russian, English, and Japanese in the daily life of interviewees and their accommodation of the language to the one of an interlocutor.

Concerning the percentage of each language in the daily life in Japan, when interviewees were asked about what percentage each of four languages takes in their daily life, it was made clear for them that by the percentage of each language all their language activities: speaking, reading, writing, internet browsing, listening and comprehending, and even thinking are meant. Some interviewees thought at first that they are asked only about the spoken language for daily communication but later realized the task after my explanation.

The proportion of use of each language was divided into five categories:

- 1) less than 20% - "used very rarely"
- 2) 20% ~ 39% - "used rarely"
- 3) 40% ~ 59% - "used often"

- 4) 60% ~ 79 % - “used very often”
- 5) more than 80% - “dominant”

The borderline was made between “rare” and “often” on the level of 40% of the language in daily use, and however low it may seem, due to the fact that we deal with four languages, which are used to some extent by almost all of the respondents, considering that a share of each language constitutes 25% (in case of three languages 33,3%), 40% is high enough to state that the language is prioritized at least over two languages, if not over all three.

Although there is a misbalance due to an unequal number of female (33) and male (17) respondents, the length of stay ((1) 1~5 years: a period from the time of the Euromaidan and the Revolution of Dignity – 24 respondents; (2) 6~14 years: a period from the Orange Revolution until Euromaidan – 16 respondents; (3) 15~and more years: before the Orange Revolution – 10 respondents), region of birth/formative years ((1) Central Ukraine: Poltava, Sumy, Zhytomyr, Chernihiv, Cherkasy, Zaporizhzhya, Kirovohrad, Dnipropetrovsk oblasts – 9 respondents; (2) Kyiv City and Kyiv oblast – 23 respondents; (3) South and East of Ukraine: Kharkiv, Donetsk, Luhansk, Odesa, Mykolayiv, Kherson oblasts and Crimea – 9 respondents; (4) West of Ukraine: Volyn, Rivne, Lviv, Ivano-Frankivsk, Zakarpattya, Khmelnytskyi, Ternopil, Vinnytsya and Chernivtsi oblasts – 9 respondents), and occupation/ social role ((1) Company worker – 16 respondents; (2)Homemaker – 9 respondents; (3) Researcher/ educator – 15 respondents, (4) Student – 10 respondents) observe the general tendencies for each impact factor.

As for the change in the choice of language of daily use, given that most of the Ukrainians are bilingual (Arel, 1995, Janmaat, 1999; Bilaniuk, 2005; Zhurzhenko, 2010; Polese, 2010, 2011; Kulyk, 2011; Olszanski, 2012) the crucial thing for speakers which may prevent the complete change from one main language of daily use to another can be their desire to accommodate their language to the language of interlocutors (Pavliy, 2018). It is rather this “boundary-making” function of the language (Tabouret-Keller, 1997) which makes it so important for the daily life of Ukrainians abroad. The proportion of use of each language will be compared from the perspective of gender, length of stay in Japan, the region of birth/formative years of respondents, and their willingness to accommodate the language to the one of an interlocutor.

6. Results

As we can see from Table 1, in general among those Ukrainians who live or lived in Japan for one year or more, Japanese language is prioritized. In total thirty respondents (60% of all) use Japanese often, very often, or as a dominant language. Often – seventeen respondents (34%), very often – nine respondents (18%), as a dominant language – four respondents (8%). All the other three languages take approximately equal proportions as a priority language for daily use (in the range of 10% ~ 18%). To investigate deeper on what relation the use of each language has to the gender, length of stay, the region of birth/formative years, and willingness of the respondents to accommodate their language to interlocutors, I will describe the situation with each of four languages below.

6.1 Ukrainian language

Concerning the use of Ukrainian in their daily life in Japan, Table 2 shows that both

female and male respondents use Ukrainian very rarely or rarely. No substantial difference between genders in their priorities of Ukrainian was found. Eight respondents – five females and three males – use Ukrainian often, and one female respondent uses it very often. The proportion of those who use Ukrainian often or very often is the same (18%) for both females and males in relation to their genders in total.

Concerning the relation between the respondents' length of stay in Japan and their use, it can be said that the respondents with "Medium stay" (6~14 years) in Japan prioritize Ukrainian more than two other groups. Almost one-third of "Medium stay" respondents – 31% from all members of this group – use Ukrainian often or very often, while in "Short stay" only 13% of the group, and in "Long stay" – 10%.

As for the region of birth/formative years, the respondents from the Central region of Ukraine have a much higher percentage of use of Ukrainian often or very often (44%). In the West region it constitutes 22%, while in the South-East region – 11%. The lowest percentage is of respondents from Kyiv and Kyiv oblast (8%). The highest percentage of those who very rarely use Ukrainian in daily life comes from respondents from Kyiv/ Kyiv oblast (57%) also.

Concerning interviewee's occupation/ social role, three categories – homemaker, company worker and researcher/educator – use Ukrainian in their daily life in Japan relatively often. Homemaker – 33%, researcher/educator – 20%, company worker – 19%. No student reported daily use of Ukrainian in Japan higher than 30%. As one of the main purposes for a student in Japan is to learn Japanese or improve their English while studying, students may deliberately restrict themselves from using their first language.

Those who tend to accommodate their language to the language of an interlocutor use Ukrainian less often than those who stick to their language 16% and 21% respectively. There is no large difference, so language accommodation is not a substantial factor for the use of Ukrainian.

6.2. Russian language

The data in Table 3 shows that among Ukrainians in Japan, Russian is used in daily life even less than Ukrainian. The percentage of those who use Russian often, very often, or as a dominant language varies depending on gender, but the difference is not big. In Table 3 we can see that three females (9% of all females) use Russian often or very often, one male respondent (6% of all males) uses it often, and for another male (6% of all males) Russian was a dominant language in his daily life in Japan. It should be admitted that at the time of the interview this man was working with Russian colleagues and constantly used Russian at work.

Concerning the relation between the use of Russian and length of stay in Japan, in comparison Russian is slightly prioritized among the "Short stay", while the "Medium stay" group uses Russian much less than the other two groups – the respondents who use Russian often and use Russian very often constitute 16% of "Short stay", 0% of "Medium stay" and 10% "Long stay" groups.

Concerning the region of birth/formative years, the respondents who use Russian in Japan "often", "very often" or even as a "dominant language" in daily use all belong to Kyiv/Kyiv oblast (12% in total). There were no respondents from any other region who would prioritize the use of Russian in their daily life in Japan.

As for the occupation/ social role of the respondents, although Russian is not prioritized among all of the categories, homemakers use Russian slightly more often than others: homemakers – 22%, researchers/educators – 7%, company workers – 6%, students – 10%.

Concerning language accommodation, we can see that it appears to be a substantial factor in the use of Russian. Those who tend to accommodate their language to the interlocutor's language prioritize Russian compared to those who do not accommodate their language, 12% and 5% respectively. The difference would be even more serious if we take into account that those who use Russian "very rarely" constitute 58% of the first group and 74% of the second.

6.3. English language

Concerning the use of English, it is clear that English is not prioritized by either gender. However, as Table 4 shows, there is a substantial difference between genders. Four male respondents use English often or very often (30% of all males), while three female respondents use English often (only 9% of all females).

As we can see, in general, the "Medium stay" group uses English less than the other two groups – more than half of the respondents who belong to that group use English very rarely (56%). "Long stay" respondents (20% of their group) use English often and very often, and the percentage is slightly higher in comparison to the "Short stay" group (17%), and much higher in comparison to the "Medium stay" group (13%).

Concerning the region of birth/formative years, the percentage of respondents who use English in Japan often is the same in Central (22%) and West (22%) regions. For Kyiv/Kyiv oblast it drops down to 9%, but because of the only respondent who uses English very often (4%), in total it constitutes 13%. The lowest percent is South-East (11%).

Concerning the occupation/ social role of the respondents, surprisingly, English is used in daily life more intensively by company workers (25%) and students (20%) than by researchers/ educators (13%). No homemakers acknowledged that they use more than 40% of English in their daily activities.

Concerning the use of the English language, no serious difference is found between those who tend to accommodate their language to interlocutors and those who do not.

6.4. Japanese language

Table 5 shows that Japanese prevails as a language of use of Ukrainians in Japan. It is used often, very often, or as a dominant language in daily activities by two-third of respondents. There is almost no difference between genders concerning the frequency of Japanese use. Twenty of thirty-three female respondents (60%) use Japanese often or very often. Japanese is prioritized by ten of seventeen male respondents including four (24%) for whom the Japanese language has become dominant. In total, the percentage of male respondents is the same (60%) as females.

Concerning the relation of length of stay to the language used, we can see that the Japanese language is prioritized almost equally among all three groups – the respondents who use Japanese often, very often, and as a dominant language constitute 54%, 70% and 60% of "Short stay", "Medium stay" and "Long stay" groups respectively. On the other hand, we can see the slight priority in the use of Japanese among the representatives of the "Medium stay" group, and a comparatively big percentage of those who use Japanese very rarely in the "Short stay" group (25%). It may relate to the proficiency in Japanese which will naturally increase with the length of stay of the respondents.

As for the occupation/ social role of the respondents, there is no surprise, that Japanese

is used in daily life by all categories. However, in general, Japanese is prioritized more by company workers (69%) and homemakers (67%), than by researchers/ educators (53%) or students (50%).

Language accommodation is a serious factor for the use of Japanese. Japanese is prioritized more by those Ukrainians who do not accommodate their language to the interlocutor's language (74%) than by those who accommodate (51%).

7. Conclusions and topics for future research

This exploratory research has shown that in the current situation among Ukrainians who live or lived in Japan for one year or more, Japanese is highly prioritized as a language for daily use compared to the other languages.

Concerning the peculiarities of each language use, it can be concluded that Ukrainian is used in Japan more by the representatives of the Central region, who stay in Japan from 6 to 14 years and do not tend to accommodate their language to the interlocutors. Homemakers, company workers and researchers/ educators use Ukrainian more than students.

Russian is used in Japan more by male representatives of Kyiv/Kyiv oblast, who stay in Japan from 1 to 5 years and accommodate their language to the interlocutors. While no serious difference in relation to occupation/ social role of the respondents was found, homemakers tend to use Russian slightly more than other categories.

English is prioritized by male representatives from West or Central regions of Ukraine who either live in Japan longer than 15 years or come for a "Short stay" (1-5 years). Company workers and students use English more than researchers/ educators and homemakers.

A typical representative of Ukrainians who prioritize English use in daily activities in Japan is a person from Kyiv/Kyiv oblast, staying in Japan for 6-15 years and not accommodating his or her language to the interlocutors. While Japanese is often used in daily life by all categories of occupation/ social role, it is prioritized more by company workers and homemakers.

As we can see from above, such variables as the region of birth/ formative years and occupation/ social role impact the language use of respondents more than their gender or length of stay in Japan. Language accommodation is a serious factor for the use of such languages as Japanese and Russian, but it has almost no effect on the use of Ukrainian or English.

References

- Arel, Dominique. 1995. Language politics in independent Ukraine: Towards one or two state languages. *Nationalities Papers* 23 (3), 597–621.
- Bilaniuk, Laada. 2005. *Contested Tongues: Language Politics and Cultural Correction in Ukraine*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Bloomfield, Leonard. 1933. *Language*. London: Allen and Unwin.
- Butler, Yuko & Hakuta, Kenji. 2004. Bilingualism and second language acquisition. In Bhatia, Tej & Ritchie, William (eds.), *The Handbook of Bilingualism*, 114–144. Malden, MA: Blackwell.
- Fishman, Joshua. 1977. Language and ethnicity. In Giles, Howard (ed.), *Language, Ethnicity and Intergroup Relations*, 15–57. London: Academic Press.
- Genesee, Fred & Hamers, Josiane & Lambert, Wallace & Mononen, Larry & Seitz, Michael & Starck, Richard. 1978. Language processing in bilinguals. *Brain and Language* 5, 1–12.

- Janmaat, Jan. 1999. Language politics in education and the response of the Russians in Ukraine. *Nationalities Papers* 27 (3), 475–501.
- Kulyk, Volodymyr. 2011. Language identity, linguistic diversity, and political cleavages: Evidence from Ukraine. *Nations and Nationalism* 17 (3), 627–648.
- Laitin, David. 1998. *Identity in Formation: Russian-Speaking Populations in the Near Abroad*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Macnamara, John. 1967. The bilinguals' linguistic performance: a psychological overview. *Journal of Social Issues* 23, 59–77.
- Mohanty, Ajit & Perregaux, Christiane. 1997. Language acquisition and bilingualism. In Berry, John W. & Dasen, Pierre R. & Saraswathi, T.S. (eds.), *Handbook of Cross-Cultural Psychology. Vol.2: Basic Processes and Human Development*, 217–253. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Olszański, Tadeusz. 2012. *The Language Issue in Ukraine: An Attempt at a New Perspective*. Warsaw: Centre for Eastern Studies.
- Pavliy, Bogdan. 2018. Language switch and tendencies in linguistic choices of Ukrainian bilinguals living abroad: language use of Ukrainians in Japan. *Language and Society* 9, 45–54.
- Pavliy, Bogdan. 2019. What languages do Ukrainians in Japan prioritize in daily life? *Language and Society* 10, 91–108.
- Pavliy, Bogdan & Lewis, Jonathan. 2015. Borders of identity and actual language use in Ukraine: an analysis of geotagged tweets. *Japanese Slavic and East European Studies* 36, 77–97.
- Pavliy, Bogdan & Lewis, Jonathan. 2016. The use of Ukrainian and Russian on Facebook pages of governmental organizations in Ukraine. *Journal of Linguistic and Cultural Studies* 46, 47–61.
- Pavliy, Bogdan & Lewis, Jonathan. 2017. Analyzing actual language use in Ukraine using social media data: Gender, location and language. *Eurasia Cultura* 3, 89–102.
- Petro, Nicolai N. 2015. Understanding the other Ukraine: Identity and allegiance in Russophone Ukraine. In Pikulicka-Wilczewska, Agnieszka & Sakwa, Richard (eds.), *Ukraine and Russia: People, Politics, Propaganda and Perspectives*, 18–34. Bristol: E-International Relations.
- Polese, Abel. 2010. The formal and the informal: Exploring Ukrainian education in Ukraine: Scenes from Odessa. *Comparative Education* 46 (1), 47–62.
- Polese, Abel. 2011. Language and identity in Ukraine: was it really nation building? *Studies of Transition States and Societies* 3 (3), 36–50.
- Shevchenko, Natalya. 2015. The history of bilingualism in Ukraine and its role in the present day political crisis. (L'histoire du bilinguisme en Ukraine et son rôle dans la crise politique d'aujourd'hui) , *Cahiers Sens public*, 17–18 (1), 203–225. Available at: https://www.cairn-int.info/load_pdf_do_not_index.php?ID_ARTICLE=E_CSP_017_0203 [Accessed: 21 June 2019].
- Shulman, Stephen. 1999. The cultural foundations of Ukrainian national identity. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 22 (6), 1011–1036.
- Shulman, Stephen. 2004. The contours of civic and ethnic national identification in Ukraine. *Europe-Asia Studies* 56 (1), 35–56.
- Tabouret-Keller, Andrée. 1997. Language and identity. In Coulmas, Florian (ed.), *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*, 315–326. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Weinreich, Uriel. 1953. *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.
- Yilmaz, Kaya. 2013. Comparison of quantitative and qualitative research traditions: Epistemological, theoretical, and methodological differences. *European Journal of Education* 48, 311–325. Available at: <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/f45f/993702833849749b3ddd83e1673728d569eb.pdf> [Accessed: 22 June 2019]
- Zalizniak, Hanna. 2009. Language orientations and the civilisation choice for Ukrainians. In Besters-Dilger, Juliane (ed.), *Language Policy and Language Situation in Ukraine. Analysis and Recommendations*, 287–326. Frankfurt am Main: Peter Lang.
- Zhurzhenko, Tatiana. 2010. *Borderlands into Bordered Lands: Geopolitics of Identity in Post-Soviet Ukraine*. Stuttgart: ibidem-Verlag.

Bogdan Pavliy
 Toyama University of International Studies
 65-1 Higashikuromaki,
 Toyama 930-1292, Japan
 e-mail: pavliy@tuins.ac.jp

Appendix

Table 1. Percentage of languages in the daily use of Ukrainians in Japan

Language	Percentage of use of the language by Ukrainians in daily life in Japan				
	Very rare 0-19%	Rare 20-39%	Often 40-59%	Very often 60-79%	Dominant 80% ~
Ukrainian	23 (46%)	18 (36%)	8 (16%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Russian	32 (64%)	13 (26%)	3 (6%)	1 (2%)	1 (2%)
English	23 (46%)	19 (38%)	7 (14%)	1 (2%)	0 (0%)
Japanese	8 (16%)	12 (24%)	17 (34%)	9 (18%)	4 (8%)

Table 2. Proportion of Ukrainian in the daily use of Ukrainians in Japan

Categories	Percentage of use of Ukrainian language by Ukrainians in daily life in Japan				
	Very rare 0-19%	Rare 20-39%	Often 40-59%	Very often 60-79%	Dominant 80% ~
<i>Gender</i>					
Female	16 (48%)	11 (33%)	5 (15%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
Male	7 (41%)	7 (41%)	3 (18%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Length of Stay</i>					

1-5 years	14 (58%)	7 (29%)	3 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
6-14 years	5 (31%)	6 (38%)	4 (25%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
15 years and longer	4 (40%)	5 (50%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Region</i>					
Central	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	4 (44%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Kyiv/Kyiv oblast	13 (57%)	8 (35%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)
South-East	7 (78%)	1 (11%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
West	0 (0%)	7 (78%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Occupation/social role</i>					
Company worker	9 (56%)	4 (25%)	3 (19%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Homemaker	3 (33%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)
Researcher/educator	4 (27%)	8 (53%)	3 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Student	7 (70%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Accommodating language to interlocutor</i>					
Yes	19 (61%)	7 (23%)	4 (13%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
No	4 (21%)	11 (58%)	4 (21%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 3. Proportion of Russian in the daily use of Ukrainians in Japan

Categories	Percentage of use of Russian language by Ukrainians in daily life in Japan				
	Very rare 0-19%	Rare 20-39%	Often 40-59%	Very often 60-79%	Dominant 80% ~
<i>Gender</i>					
Female	19 (58%)	11 (33%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	0 (0%)
Male	13 (76%)	2 (12%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	1 (6%)
<i>Length of Stay</i>					
1-5 years	11 (46%)	9 (38%)	2 (8%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)
6-14 years	13 (81%)	3 (19%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
15 years and longer	8 (80%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Region</i>					
Central	7 (78%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Kyiv/Kyiv oblast	16 (70%)	4 (17%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)	1 (4%)
South-East	6 (67%)	3 (33%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
West	7 (78%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Occupation/social role</i>					
Company worker	11 (69%)	4 (25%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Homemaker	4 (44%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Researcher/ educator	13 (87%)	1 (7%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	1 (7%)

Student	4 (40%)	5 (50%)	0 (0%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
<i>Accommodating language to interlocutor</i>					
Yes	18 (58%)	9 (29%)	2 (6%)	1 (3%)	1 (3%)
No	14 (74%)	4 (21%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)

Table 4. Proportion of English in the daily use of Ukrainians in Japan

Categories	Percentage of use of English language in daily life of Ukrainians in Japan				
	Very rare 0-19%	Rare 20-39%	Often 40-59%	Very often 60-79%	Dominant 80% ~
<i>Gender</i>					
Female	14 (42%)	16 (48%)	3 (9%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Male	9 (53%)	3 (18%)	4 (24%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
<i>Length of Stay</i>					
1-5 years	10 (42%)	10 (42%)	4 (17%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
6-14 years	9 (56%)	5 (31%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
15 years and longer	4 (40%)	4 (40%)	1 (10%)	1 (10%)	0 (0%)
<i>Region</i>					
Central	4 (44%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Kyiv/Kyiv oblast	11 (48%)	9 (39%)	2 (9%)	1 (4%)	0 (0%)

South-East	4 (44%)	4 (44%)	1 (11%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
West	4 (44%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Occupation/ social role</i>					
Company worker	7 (44%)	5 (31%)	3 (19%)	1 (6%)	0 (0%)
Homemaker	7 (78%)	2 (22%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Researcher/ educator	6 (40%)	7 (47%)	2 (13%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Student	3 (30%)	5 (50%)	2 (20%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Accommodating language to interlocutor</i>					
Yes	14 (45%)	12 (39%)	5 (16%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
No	9 (47%)	7 (37%)	2 (11%)	1 (5%)	0 (0%)

Table 5. Proportion of Japanese in the daily use of Ukrainians in Japan

Categories	Percentage of use of Japanese language by Ukrainians in daily life in Japan				
	Very rare 0-19%	Rare 20-39%	Often 40-59%	Very often 60-79%	Dominant 80% ~
<i>Gender</i>					
Female	5 (15%)	8 (24%)	14 (42%)	6 (18%)	0 (0%)
Male	3 (18%)	4 (24%)	3 (18%)	3 (18%)	4 (24%)
<i>Length of Stay</i>					

1-5 years	6 (25%)	5 (21%)	8 (33%)	4 (17%)	1 (4%)
6-14 years	1 (6%)	4 (25%)	6 (38%)	3 (19%)	2 (13%)
15 years and longer	1 (10%)	3 (30%)	3 (30%)	2 (20%)	1 (10%)
<i>Region</i>					
Central	1 (11%)	3 (33%)	2 (22%)	2 (22%)	1 (11%)
Kyiv/Kyiv oblast	3 (13%)	5 (22%)	6 (26%)	7 (30%)	2 (9%)
South-East	2 (22%)	2 (22%)	4 (44%)	0 (0%)	1 (11%)
West	2 (22%)	2 (22%)	5 (56%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
<i>Occupation/ social role</i>					
Company worker	1 (6%)	4 (25%)	7 (44%)	1 (6%)	3 (19%)
Homemaker	2 (22%)	1 (11%)	6 (67%)	0 (0%)	0 (0%)
Researcher/ educator	4 (27%)	3 (20%)	2 (13%)	5 (33%)	1 (7%)
Student	1 (10%)	4 (40%)	2 (20%)	3 (30%)	0 (0%)
<i>Accommodating language to interlocutor</i>					
Yes	6 (19%)	9 (29%)	8 (26%)	6 (19%)	2 (6%)
No	2 (11%)	3 (16%)	9 (47%)	3 (16%)	2 (11%)

In SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics [online]. 2020, vol. 17, no. 3 [cit. 2020-10-14]. Available on web page http://www.skase.sk/Volumes/JTL45/pdf_doc/06.pdf. ISSN 1336-782X