

UDC 811.521'27-116(520)

WHAT LANGUAGES DO UKRAINIANS IN JAPAN PRIORITIZE IN DAILY LIFE?

Bogdan PAVLIY

*Faculty of Contemporary Society
Toyama University of International Studies, Japan
bopavliy@gmail.com*

Introduction

Background

The recent political situation in Ukraine along with the continued opposition of the Ukrainian army against Russian military and separatist forces in Donbas resulted in the political consensus on using Ukrainian as the only official language in Ukraine. The use of the Ukrainian language separates Ukrainians from Russians, Belarussians or other ethnicities of the former Soviet Union and indicates that Ukrainians - wherever they live or stay - have a special relationship with the Ukrainian nation through their language and culture. However, the stress on the priority of the Ukrainian language was not fully accepted in Ukrainian society, especially in the East and South of the country and provided a broad field for speculations (fueled by Russian propaganda) that can lead to the escalation of political or social tensions inside Ukraine. The language preferences of Ukrainians in their daily life are shaped by their identities. Thus, the language of use serves as one of the most important cultural markers for Ukrainians (Shulman, 2004; Kulyk, 2011). In her research on the politics of language, Schmid (2001) argues that there is a need for cultural nationalism for the formation of national identity. She defines cultural nationalism as “an ideology and form of behavior ...which includes a cultural doctrine and social movements aimed at maintaining identity on behalf of a population that believes itself to be a nation...” Schmid (2001:10). Cultural nationalism is vital for those Ukrainians who temporarily left their homeland to work, study, or raise their children in foreign countries. It becomes an important issue for the formation of Ukrainian communities abroad due to the differences in the self-identification of their members. Another factor which plays an important role in the self-identification of a person is his or her ethnic identity, or understanding and accepting the ethnicity an individual belongs to (See Joseph, 2004), which is also characterized by the linguistic choice of an individual. Thus, it can be said that the language choice is an important marker of identity of an individual or a group.

Many of the Ukrainian citizens living abroad face challenges related to their national identity. However, previous research shows that through all the years of Ukrainian independence the issue of language choice in Ukraine was politicized and the language has not been considered a key marker of national identity (Kuzio, 2000, 2001, 2002; Bilaniuk, 2005). The language issue was associated with the political preferences of Ukrainians but was not considered an issue of their ethnic identity. As Olszansky (2012) described it: “The role of language in the self-identification of Ukrainians is overstated and the language issue itself is strongly ideologised and politicized. The vast majority of the society does not see it as important and does not think they are being discriminated against on language grounds...” (Olszansky, 2012). If Ukrainian people had kept the very similar values of cultural nationalism and ethnic identity in all regions of the country and all segments of the Ukrainian society, such a nation would have been united in times of political turbulence (especially now, when Ukraine is involved in a long-term military conflict with Russia in Donbas). To strengthen this cultural

nationalism and complete the formation of the Ukrainian nation, Ukrainians should become more eager to change their language of daily use from Russian to Ukrainian.

The linguistic situation for Ukrainians in Japan

It is crucial for Ukrainian society to understand the recent trends in the linguistic preferences of Ukrainians who use Ukrainian, Russian and the languages of the countries they live in now. In Japan, where Ukrainians meet up and communicate not only with fellow Ukrainians but also with Russians and people from other republics of the former Soviet Union, the language of use not always becomes an indicator of their national identity or political preferences. The use of Russian with fellow Ukrainians may also have different reasons. While some Ukrainians – mostly those who were born in the Soviet Union – prefer to speak Russian because they lack this cultural nationalism and have a strong sense of cultural brotherhood among all Soviet people, others prefer to speak Ukrainian in their daily life, but switch to Russian to accommodate their language to interlocutors. Some Ukrainians prioritize Russian to resist the spread of Russian propaganda in Japan. If such people instead of offline communication spend more time in online communities where “domestic, diaspora, and foreign audiences interact with current events in real time... to some degree it is possible to presume how certain political groups will interpret the narrative and how they will describe it to their followers” (Jaitner, 2015). To expand their audience, they use Russian, and it becomes natural for them to describe their understanding of political realities to their followers or opponents mostly in Russian. Eventually, Russian becomes the dominant language in their daily life.

Another important factor for the linguistic choice of Ukrainians living abroad is the “communally shared” or “boundary-making” function of the language (Tabouret-Keller, 1997). In other words, language plays the role of an indicator for accepting or rejecting a person by a community, which is even more essential for those Ukrainians, who live in a country with a very small number of their fellow citizens.

After all, being unable to speak a particular language places immediate restrictions on one's ability to communicate and, by extension, identify with those who speak that language and any ethnic and/or national identities with which it is associated. This process of demarcation may be more salient for minority groups since such groups are likely to be more conscious of the need for clear linguistic boundaries in relation to a surrounding dominant language and culture (May, 2005).

Research Framework

This particular study is a part of an ongoing empirical research project on language preferences of Ukrainians living abroad. Fifty Ukrainians who live or lived in Japan for one year or longer (no limitation in length) were interviewed. The first stage of my study focused on the linguistic priorities of the interviewees. It was found that in general Ukrainian communities in Japan prioritize the Ukrainian language over Russian in communication with fellow Ukrainians. On the other hand, the results showed that among Ukrainians there is a tendency of language accommodating. Some of the interviewees prefer to adjust their language to the language of the interlocutors. How this language accommodating behavior of the respondents depends on their gender, length of stay in Japan, and region of birth/formative years in Ukraine was analyzed. The three possible impact factors were explored, and the results showed that the region of birth/formative years of respondents relates to this inclination to accommodate the language to the one of their interlocutors much more than two other factors: gender and length of stay in Japan (Pavliy, 2018).

Along with the analysis of the factors of language shift, there was a need to provide a general description of the respondents' use of languages in their daily life in Japan, which I

intend to cover in this stage of my research. The linguistic environment of my respondents will be compared in relation to such factors as their gender, the region of birth/formative years, length of stay in Japan, and the comparative analysis will be provided. While not all respondents were equally fluent in all four languages (Ukrainian, Russian, English, Japanese), the main purpose of this research is to describe and give a characteristic of the language of daily use of Ukrainians in Japan, rather than concentrate on their multilingual linguistic abilities or the level of fluency in each language.

Research questions

In the previous stage of this research, I have found out that the region of birth/formative years of respondents relate to the phenomenon of accommodating the language more than two other factors: gender and length of stay in Japan. In this paper, I will try to answer the following questions:

RQ1. What languages are used more often by Ukrainians living in Japan?

RQ2. What tendencies and particularities in language use are seen in relation to the respondents' gender, length of stay in Japan, and the region of birth/formative years?

If possible, I will also provide explanations on why these tendencies exist.

Hypothesis and Expectations

Before starting to proceed with the interviews which are the source of my data, I expected the following results:

1. Due to their job, male respondents would use more English and Japanese in their daily life than female respondents.
2. The respondents from Western regions use more Ukrainian than Russian in their daily activities, while the respondents from Kyiv, South-East, and Central regions use more Russian.
3. Those respondents who stayed in Japan for a longer time use more Japanese, those who stay shorter tend to use more English.
4. Those respondents who stayed in Japan for a longer time may prioritize Russian because they have a broader group of acquaintances in Japan including Russians, Belarussians and other Russian speaking population of the former Soviet Union.
5. Women may prioritize Russian more than men. This hypothesis is made based on the data of the joint research of Pavliy and Lewis, which showed that from the territory of Ukraine women send tweets on Russian almost twice more often than men (Pavliy and Lewis, 2015, 2016, 2017).

Objectives of Research

This research deals with those Ukrainians who have lived in Japan for more than one year. My main goal is to investigate their language preferences along with the actual use of languages in daily life and find which of three factors impacts the use of each language most. For this research, it is not essential if the respondents are balanced multilinguals (similar proficiency in all languages), dominant multilinguals (proficiency in one language is higher than in others (see Peal and Lambert, 1962)), because I do not intend to evaluate the level of their fluency. As this research aims on the willingness of respondents or the necessity for them to use one or another language in their daily activities, it does not make any difference even if they are less fluent in some language, but use it in their daily activities more than those they are more fluent in. I can still operate with the data and conclude that this language is prioritized.

Methodology and Limitations

Methodology

This research employed fieldwork as the main method. Data has been collected through interviews with the Ukrainian citizens living in Japan, in which I asked them to describe the percentage that each of the four languages (Ukrainian, Russian, English, and Japanese) takes in their daily life.

As well as in my previous research, grounded on methodological considerations and aiming on consistency, I decided to deal with the three variables: gender of the respondent, length of stay in Japan, and the region of Ukraine where the respondent spent formative years.

The interviews with the respondents were taken in person or through Facebook Messenger between November 4, 2018 and March 11, 2019. My respondents were fifty Ukrainian citizens living in Japan for one year or more. The shortest length of stay constituted one year, the longest being thirty years.

Limitations

As I mentioned in my previous research paper on the tendencies in language use of Ukrainians in Japan, qualitative research on the linguistic choices through the interview with the respondents lacks the accuracy of data, because the objects of the research have to evaluate themselves and their opinions are subjective. In addition, the data cannot be proven or negated by observation of the respondents' language behavior before, after, or during the interview (Pavliy, 2018). Moreover, in this research the respondents themselves are not confident about the percentage each language takes in their life. In many cases they are doubtful and feel uneasy when it comes to the evaluation of the share of their English or Japanese language activities, because they are not sure if they really do understand what they hear or read due to their unsatisfactory command of these languages. Several of my interviewees changed their mind about the percentage of languages they use, because at first, they assumed that they are being asked only about the spoken language for daily communication. I had to make it clear to all respondents that by percentage of each language in their daily life I mean all their language activities: speaking, reading, listening and comprehension, writing and, even thinking, when they are considering something. Some of the respondents after this clarification acknowledged that their previous evaluation was not correct, because they did not take into account internet browsing, reading articles or watching movies as a part of their language activities. So, if I was more precise, I should have called this research paper "What languages do Ukrainians in Japan *think they* prioritize in their daily life".

Another limitation is that the language use is interrelated to the personal matters of the individuals. Although the interviews were taken in 2018-2019 and so I am dealing with recent data, the language choice is never static or rigid. Language priorities may quickly change depending on the situation in the families of the respondents, their living environment, changes in job duties or personal life, communities they belong to, or even their impressions from their last visit to Ukraine. For example, if the respondents moved to another department, changed their job, environment or living conditions, became engaged in social activities, the percentage of languages they use in daily life changes, and sometimes quite substantially.

On the other hand, this volatility of the data along with the dynamics of language change can bolster our understanding of the processes and factors that lead to the change in language preferences, which the Ukrainians living abroad often experience. And even if it is difficult to categorize respondents by their level of fluency in each language, the minimalist approach in assessing their multilingual abilities enables me to investigate the language

situation among Ukrainians in Japan at satisfactory level and present an ample picture of the linguistic variations in the daily life of Ukrainians in Japan.

Findings

To get the data on the Ukrainian nationals' language use in Japan I conducted interviews which included twenty-five questions related to the respondent's language background, language environment in school and with friends, language of news sources, music favorites, and actual language use in social networks. There was a set of questions regarding the respondent's outlooks on the necessity of Ukrainian for raising children (even if the spouse cannot speak it), for the Ukrainian community in Japan and the Embassy of Ukraine in Japan, the relation between the Ukrainian language and national identity, and language used in church.

The question about the proportion of use of Ukrainian, Russian, English, and Japanese in the daily life of interviewees was one of the final questions and the interviewees often admitted that this question is a most difficult one. To ensure that interviewees understand that the share of each language involves not only speaking or listening, but the use of the language in all daily activities an appropriate explanation was provided.

For this research I decided to divide the proportion of use of each language 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"

At first, the priority of each language will be compared from the perspective of gender. The tables below show what proportion each of the languages takes in daily use of female and male respondents in relation to the total number of respondents of their gender and the total number of all respondents. Although there is a misbalance due to an unequal number of female (33) and male (17) respondents, it does not affect the whole picture, and the tendencies of daily use of each language can be clearly seen.

Gender and language priorities

Proportion of Ukrainian in daily use of female and male respondents

Table 1.

Proportion of Ukrainian in the daily use of female respondents

Percentage of language in daily use	Number of female respondents	Percentage of female respondents	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	16	48%	32%
20-39%	11	33%	22%
40-59%	5	15%	10%
60-79%	1	3%	2%
80%~	0	0%	0%

Table 2.

Proportion of Ukrainian in the daily use of male respondents

Percentage of language in daily use	Number of male respondents	Percentage of male respondents	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	7	41%	14%
20-39%	7	41%	14%
40-59%	3	18%	6%
60-79%	0	0%	0%
80%~	0	0%	0%

As seen from Table 1 and Table 2, most female and male respondents use Ukrainian in their daily life in Japan very rarely or rarely. We cannot find serious differences between genders in prioritizing Ukrainian. Eight respondents (16%) – five females (10%) and three males (6%) use Ukrainian often, and one female respondent uses it more than 60%.

Proportion of Ukrainian in daily use of female and male respondents

Table 3.

Proportion of Russian in the daily use of female respondents

Percentage of language in daily use	Number of female respondents	Percentage of female respondents	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	19	58%	38%
20-39%	11	33%	22%
40-59%	2	6%	4%
60-79%	1	3%	2%
80%~	0	0%	0%

Table 4.

Proportion of Russian in the daily use of male respondents

Percentage of language in daily use	Number of male respondents	Percentage of male respondents	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	13	76%	26%
20-39%	2	12%	4%
40-59%	1	6%	2%
60-79%	0	0%	0%
80%~	1	6%	2%

Table 3 and Table 4 show that among both female and male respondents Russian is not prioritized as a language for daily use. Most of the respondents use Russian in Japan very rarely or rarely. Three respondents (6%) – two females (4%) and one male (2%) use Russian often, and one female respondent uses it more than 60%. Russian is even less prioritized than Ukrainian, especially among males. There is one exception, though, a male respondent in whose daily life Russian language is dominant. Partially it can be explained with the fact that this man is a researcher and in his research, he works and communicates with Russian colleagues in Japan.

Proportion of English in daily use of female and male respondents

Table 5.

Proportion of English in the daily use of female respondents

Percentage of language in daily use	Number of female respondents	Percentage of female respondents	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	14	42%	28%
20-39%	16	48%	32%
40-59%	3	9%	6%
60-79%	0	0%	0%
80%~	0	0%	0%

Table 6.

Proportion of English in the daily use of male respondents

Percentage of language in daily use	Number of male respondents	Percentage of male respondents	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	9	53%	18%
20-39%	3	18%	6%
40-59%	4	24%	8%
60-79%	1	6%	2%
80%~	0	0%	0%

In Table 5 and Table 6 we can see that in general English is not prioritized, however, male respondents use more English in their daily activities than female respondents. Here we can observe a substantial difference between genders. Among males the percentage of those who use English often or very often raises to 30% in relation to the total number of the respondents of their gender, while among females those who use English often or very often constitute only 9% of all female respondents.

Proportion of Japanese in daily use of female and male respondents

Table 7.

Proportion of Japanese in the daily use of female respondents

Percentage of language in daily use	Number of female respondents	Percentage of female respondents	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	5	15%	10%
20-39%	8	24%	16%
40-59%	14	42%	28%
60-79%	6	18%	12%
80%~	0	0%	0%

Table 8.

Proportion of Japanese in the daily use of male respondents

Percentage of language in daily use	Number of male respondents	Percentage of male respondents	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	3	18%	6%
20-39%	4	24%	8%
40-59%	3	18%	6%
60-79%	3	18%	6%
80%~	4	24%	8%

As Table 7 and Table 8 show, Japanese prevails in daily activities of about two third of respondents. Twenty of thirty three female respondents (60%) admit that they use Japanese often or very often in their daily life. As for the male respondents, ten of seventeen respondents prioritize Japanese in their daily activities, so the percentage would be the same as with females (60%), including four persons (24%) for whom Japanese language has become dominant.

As we can see, compared to the three other languages, Japanese is highly prioritized among both males and females. Concerning the gender difference in language, almost no difference is found, except the situation with the use of English, where the proportion of males who use English often or very often (30% of all males) is much greater than the proportion among females (9% of all females).

Length of stay in Japan and language priorities

To investigate the relation between the language priorities and the length of stay in Japan, I have divided the length of stay into three categories: 1) "Short stay" 1~5 years: those who moved to or stayed in Japan in a time period from the Euromaidan and the Revolution of Dignity – this group consists of 24 persons. 2) "Medium stay" 6~14 years: those who moved to Japan in a time period (approximately) from the Orange Revolution until the Euromaidan – 16 persons. 3) "Long stay" 15 years and longer: those who moved to Japan before the Orange Revolution – 10 persons.

Proportion of Ukrainian in daily use of respondents depending on their length of stay in Japan

Table 9.

Ukrainian and length of stay (1~5 years)			
Percentage of language in daily use	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents with the same length of stay in Japan	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	14	58%	28%
20-39%	7	29%	14%
40-59%	3	13%	6%
60-79%	0	0%	0%
80%~	0	0%	0%

Table 10.

Ukrainian and length of stay (6~14 years)			
Percentage of language in daily use	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents with the same length of stay in Japan	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	5	31%	10%
20-39%	6	38%	12%
40-59%	4	25%	8%
60-79%	1	6%	2%
80%~	0	0%	0%

Table 11.

Ukrainian and length of stay (15 years and longer)			
Percentage of language in daily use	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents with the same length of stay in Japan	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	4	40%	8%
20-39%	5	50%	10%
40-59%	1	10%	2%
60-79%	0	0%	0%
80%~	0	0%	0%

Tables 9, 10 and 11 show that the respondents with “medium stay” (6~14 years) in Japan use Ukrainian more than two other groups. Almost one third of respondents (31%) from of this group use Ukrainian often or very often.

Proportion of Russian in daily use of respondents depending on their length of stay in Japan

Table 12.

Russian and length of stay (1~5 years)			
Percentage of language in daily use	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents with the same length of stay in Japan	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	11	46%	22%
20-39%	9	38%	18%
40-59%	2	8%	4%
60-79%	1	4%	2%
80%~	1	4%	2%

Table 13.

Russian and length of stay (6~14 years)			
Percentage of language in daily use	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents with the same length of stay in Japan	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	13	81%	26%
20-39%	3	19%	6%
40-59%	0	0%	0%
60-79%	0	0%	0%
80%~	0	0%	0%

Table 14.

Russian and length of stay (15 years and longer)			
Percentage of language in daily use	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents with the same length of stay in Japan	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	8	80%	16%
20-39%	1	10%	2%
40-59%	1	10%	2%
60-79%	0	0%	0%
80%~	0	0%	0%

In Tables 12, 13 and 14 we can see that in comparison, there is a slight priority concerning the use of Russian among the “Short stay” respondents. On the other hand the “Medium

stay” group uses Russian less than the other two other groups – the respondents who use Russian often and use Russian very often constitute 16%, 0% and 10% of their groups respectfully.

Proportion of English in daily use of respondents depending on their length of stay in Japan

Table 15.

English and length of stay (1~5 years)			
Percentage of language in daily use	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents with the same length of stay in Japan	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	10	42%	20%
20-39%	10	42%	20%
40-59%	4	17%	8%
60-79%	0	0%	0%
80%~	0	0%	0%

Table 16.

English and length of stay (6~14 years)			
Percentage of language in daily use	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents with the same length of stay in Japan	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	9	56%	18%
20-39%	5	31%	10%
40-59%	2	13%	4%
60-79%	0	0%	0%
80%~	0	0%	0%

Table 17.

English and length of stay (15 years and longer)			
Percentage of language in daily use	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents with the same length of stay in Japan	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	4	40%	8%
20-39%	4	40%	8%
40-59%	1	10%	2%
60-79%	1	10%	2%
80%~	0	0%	0%

In Tables 15, 16 and 17 we can see that in comparison, there is a slight priority concerning the use of English among the “Long stay” respondents. On the other hand the respondents

who use English often and very often constitute 17%, 13% and 20% of their groups respectfully. In general the “Medium stay” group uses English less than the other two groups – more than a half of the respondents who belong to that group use English very rarely (56%).

Proportion of Japanese in daily use of respondents depending on their length of stay in Japan

Table 18.

Japanese and length of stay (1~5 years)			
Percentage of llanguage in daily use	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents with the same length of stay in Japan	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	6	25%	12%
20-39%	5	21%	10%
40-59%	8	33%	16%
60-79%	4	17%	8%
80%~	1	4%	2%

Table 19.

Japanese and length of stay (6~14 years)			
Percentage of llanguage in daily use	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents with the same length of stay in Japan	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	1	6%	2%
20-39%	4	25%	8%
40-59%	6	38%	12%
60-79%	3	19%	6%
80%~	2	13%	4%

Table 20.

Japanese and length of stay (15 years and longer)			
Percentage of llanguage in daily use	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents with the same length of stay in Japan	Percentage of all respondents
0-19%	1	10%	2%
20-39%	3	30%	6%
40-59%	3	30%	6%
60-79%	2	20%	4%
80%~	1	10%	2%

Tables 18, 19 and 20 show almost the same pattern for all three groups, all of them prioritize Japanese in daily activities – the respondents who use Japanese often, very often and as a dominant language constitute 54%, 70% and 60% of their groups respectively. We can see the slight priority for the use of Japanese among the representatives of “Medium stay” group, and 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.

Place of birth/formative years and language priorities

By the place of birth/ formative years of the respondents, I have categorized the respondents by four regions:

- 1) Central Ukraine, which includes Poltava, Sumy, Zhytomyr, Chernihiv, Cherkasy, Kirovohrad, Dnipro, Zaporizhzhya oblasts of Ukraine.
- 2) Kyiv City and Kyiv oblast
- 3) South and East of Ukraine, which includes Kharkiv, Donetsk, Luhansk, Odesa, Mykolayiv, Kherson oblasts and Crimea.
- 4) Western Ukraine, which includes Volyn, Rivne, Lviv, Ivano-Frankivsk, Zakarpattya, Khmelnytskyi, Ternopil, Vinnytsya and Chernivtsi oblasts of Ukraine

Table 21.

Use of Ukrainian by the region of birth/formative years

Region of birth/ formative years	Percentage of Ukrainian in daily use	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents with the same region of birth/formative years in Ukraine
Central	0-19%	3	33%
	20-39%	2	22%
	40-59%	4	44%
	60-79%	0	0%
	80%~	0	0%
Kyiv/ Kyiv oblast	0-19%	13	57%
	20-39%	8	35%
	40-59%	1	4%
	60-79%	1	4%
	80%~	0	0%
South-East	0-19%	4	40%
	20-39%	5	50%
	40-59%	1	10%
	60-79%	0	0%
	80%~	0	0%

West	0-19%	3	33%
	20-39%	2	22%
	40-59%	4	44%
	60-79%	0	0%
	80%~	0	0%

Table 21 shows that the respondents from Central and West regions have higher percentage of use of Ukrainian (44% both) in their daily life in Japan compared to the respondents from Kyiv and Kyiv oblast (8%) or South-East (10%). Moreover, the respondents from Kyiv/Kyiv oblast have the highest percentage of those, who very rarely uses Ukrainian in daily life in Japan (57%).

Table 22.

Use of Russian by the region of birth/formative years

Region of birth/ formative years	Percentage of Russian in daily use	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents with the same region of birth/formative years in Ukraine
Central	0-19%	7	78%
	20-39%	2	22%
	40-59%	0	0%
	60-79%	0	0%
	80%~	0	0%
Kyiv/ Kyiv oblast	0-19%	16	70%
	20-39%	4	17%
	40-59%	1	4%
	60-79%	1	4%
	80%~	1	4%
South-East	0-19%	8	80%
	20-39%	1	10%
	40-59%	1	10%
	60-79%	0	0%
	80%~	0	0%
West	0-19%	7	78%
	20-39%	2	22%
	40-59%	0	0%
	60-79%	0	0%
	80%~	0	0%

In Table 22 we can see that the highest percentage of Russian as the language used often, very often or even dominant in daily use, show the respondents from Kyiv/Kyiv oblast (12% in total). There were no respondents from Central and West regions who would prioritize use of Russian in their daily life in Japan.

Table 23.

Use of English by the region of birth/formative years

Region of birth/ formative years	Percentage of English in daily use	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents with the same region of birth/formative years in Ukraine
Central	0-19%	4	44%
	20-39%	3	33%
	40-59%	2	22%
	60-79%	0	0%
	80%~	0	0%
Kyiv/ Kyiv oblast	0-19%	11	48%
	20-39%	9	39%
	40-59%	2	9%
	60-79%	1	4%
	80%~	0	0%
South-East	0-19%	4	40%
	20-39%	4	40%
	40-59%	1	10%
	60-79%	1	10%
	80%~	0	0%
West	0-19%	4	44%
	20-39%	3	33%
	40-59%	2	22%
	60-79%	0	0%
	80%~	0	0%

As we can see in Table 23, the percentage of the respondents who use English in Japan often is similar in the South-East (20%), and West (22%). For Kyiv/Kyiv oblast it drops down to 9%, but because of the only respondent who uses English very often (4%), in total in constitutes 13%. So we cannot find any substantial difference between the regions concerning the use of English.

Table 23.

Use of Japanese by the region of birth/formative years

Region of birth/ formative years	Percentage of Japanese in daily use	Number of respondents	Percentage of respondents with the same region of birth/formative years in Ukraine
Central	0-19%	1	11%
	20-39%	3	33%
	40-59%	2	22%
	60-79%	2	22%
	80%~	1	11%
Kyiv/ Kyiv oblast	0-19%	3	13%
	20-39%	5	22%
	40-59%	6	26%
	60-79%	7	30%
	80%~	2	9%
South-East	0-19%	1	10%
	20-39%	3	30%
	40-59%	3	30%
	60-79%	2	20%
	80%~	1	10%
West	0-19%	1	11%
	20-39%	3	33%
	40-59%	2	22%
	60-79%	2	22%
	80%~	1	11%

In Table 24 we see that the use of Japanese by the region of birth/formative years does not differ significantly. The highest percentage shows Kyiv/Kyiv oblast (65%), including two respondents who have Japanese as dominant, and seven respondents who use Japanese very often). Second result has South-East region (60%), and two other regions have the same percentage: Central (55%), West (55%).

Conclusion

So, what conclusion can we make out of these findings concerning the research questions and the hypothesis of the research? First of all, going back to the research questions, the answers are clear: in general, the dominant language for daily activities of Ukrainian in Japan is Japanese, with English and Ukrainian prioritized slightly over Russian. As for the respondents' gender, length of stay in Japan, and the region of birth/formative years, there is no substantial difference except for the slight impact of the length of stay on the use of English and Japanese.

Concerning my hypothesis, no serious difference between male and female users concerning the use of English or Japanese in their daily life in Japan was found. Although the

percentage of the respondents from Western regions who use more Ukrainian in their daily activities (44%) seriously exceeds the percentage of those from Kyiv/Kyiv oblast and South-East region, the percentage of the respondents from Central Ukraine is the same as in West region (44%). So it cannot be said that the phenomenon of prioritizing Ukrainian exists only among the respondents from the western part of Ukraine.

The hypothesis that those respondents who stayed in Japan for a longer time use more Japanese and those who stay shorter tend to use more English is not supported by our data, as the respondents who use English often and very often constitute 17% of “Short stay” group, 13% for “Medium stay” group, and 20% of “Long stay” group, while the respondents who prioritize Japanese constitute 54%, 70% and 60% of the above groups respectfully. Thus, we cannot see the substantial difference in priorities among the representatives of any group. The hypothesis that those respondents who stayed in Japan for a longer time may prioritize Russian also proved to be wrong. Also, no data has been found, which can prove that female respondents tend to prioritize Russian over Ukrainian.

In general, it can be said, that Ukrainians in Japan, though, facing the realities that Japanese language would inevitably be prioritized in their lives as long as they stay in Japan, are on their way to comprehension and acceptance of this cultural nationalism and ethnic identity, which will contribute to the process of the complete formation and strengthening of the Ukrainian nation.

References

1. Bilaniuk, L. 2005. *Contested Tongues: Language Politics and Cultural Correction in Ukraine*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
2. Jaitner, M. 2015. Russian Information Warfare: Lessons from Ukraine Language Politics in Education and the Response of the Russians in Ukraine. In K. Geers (Ed.) *Cyber War in Perspective: Russian Aggression against Ukraine*, NATO CCD COE Publications, Tallinn, pp. 87–94.
3. Joseph, J. 2004. *Language and Identity: National, Ethnic, Religious*. New York: Palgrave MacMillan.
4. Kulyk, V. 2011. Language Identity, Linguistic Diversity, and Political Cleavages: Evidence from Ukraine. *Nations and Nationalism*, 17 (3), pp. 627–648.
5. Kuzio, T. 2000. Nationalism in Ukraine: Towards a New Framework. *Politics*, 20 (2), pp. 133-162.
6. Kuzio, T. 2001. Identity and nation-building in Ukraine: Defining the ‘Other’. *Ethnicities*, 1, pp. 343-365.
7. Kuzio, T. 2002. *Ukraine: State and Nation Building*. Routledge Studies of Societies in Transition, 2nd edition. New York: Routledge.
8. May, S. 2005. Language rights: Moving the debate forward. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 9 (13), pp. 471-486.
9. Olszanski, T. 2012. *The Language Issue in Ukraine: An Attempt at a New Perspective*, Warsaw: Centre for Eastern Studies.
10. Pavliy, B., Lewis, J. (2015). Borders of Identity and Actual Language Use in Ukraine: An Analysis of Geotagged Tweets *Japanese Slavic and East European Studies*, Vol.36, pp.77-97.
11. Pavliy, B. and Lewis, J. 2016. The Use of Ukrainian and Russian on Facebook Pages of Governmental Organizations in Ukraine. *Journal of Linguistic and Cultural Studies*, 46, pp.47-61.
12. Pavliy, B. 2018. Language switch and tendencies in linguistic choices of Ukrainian bilinguals living abroad: language use of Ukrainians in Japan. *Language and Society*, 9, pp.45-54. Peal, E., Lambert, W. 1962. The relation of bilingualism to intelligence. *Psychological Monographs*, 76, pp. 1-23.
13. Shulman, S. 2004. The contours of civic and ethnic national identification in Ukraine, *Europe-Asia Studies*, 56 (1), pp. 35-56
14. Schmid, C. 2001. *The Politics of Language: Conflict, Identity, and Cultural Pluralism in Comparative Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press..
15. Tabouret-Keller, A. 1997. Language and identity. In F. Coulmas (Ed.) *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 315-326.

WHAT LANGUAGES DO UKRAINIANS IN JAPAN PRIORITIZE IN DAILY LIFE?

Bogdan PAVLIY

*Faculty of Contemporary Society
Toyama University of International Studies, Japan
bopavliy@gmail.com*

Background. This empirical research investigates which of four languages (Ukrainian, Russian, English, Japanese) is prioritized or used more often in the daily activities of multilingual Ukrainians living in Japan.

Purpose. In this paper, I analyse factors that can affect the linguistic priorities of the respondents and actual use of languages in their daily life, and discuss the relationship between the language use and such factors.

Results. The hypothesis that those respondents who stayed in Japan for a longer time use more Japanese and those who stay shorter tend to use more English is not supported by our data. It cannot be said that the phenomenon of prioritizing Ukrainian exists only among the respondents from the western part of Ukraine. My findings show that Japanese language is used more often than the three other languages, and in general, Ukrainian is prioritized over Russian. The use of English depends on the length of stay of respondents more than other languages.

Key words: language choice, multilingual, sociolinguistics, Ukrainian, Russian, English, Japanese.

Стаття надійшла до редколегії 10 вересня 2019 року
Прийнята до друку 6 листопада 2019 року