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1. DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

One of the main project activities is to conduct qualitative and quantitative research in cooperation with ZNU on the language practices in higher education in Ukraine with a special focus being placed on ZNU internal language practices (usage of Ukrainian and foreign languages (incl. English) in teaching) and university community's background and opinions as to how multilingual, i.e. international, the university is and what might be done to support its performance in the international (European) higher education area. Therefore, the aim of the research is to map the current language practices in university management, teaching and learning, to discuss the legal framework which supports language practices at the university level and to develop the language strategy for ZNU as possible guidelines to follow the path of university’s internationalization.
1.1 Method

The analysis of the ZNU language strategy follows the following two stages:

First, analysis of relevant documents (background sources’ study) on state and university language polices and the role and place of languages in the higher education area is conducted (the Constitution, the Education Act, The University Act, The Curricula Statute, Language Requirements to curricula enrollment, internship, completion, etc.). The first stage also consists of collecting institutional data about what other universities in the region and in the rest of Ukraine are doing (preferably in comparable border regions with a multilingual background context). The first stage focuses on the information about the external and internal institutional context of ZNU. The external context involves other universities’ policies by means of a comparative study against European universities’ language policies. The internal context regards University’s previous and present language policies, curricula structures, language requirements for studies and research, mobility and management. The main focus is on teaching methods and teaching activities which support language policies to reveal the topicality of the CLIL proposal for training.

Second, an investigation is made into the characteristics, opinions and expectations of the ZNU community (student body, academic staff, and administration). The survey is based on four questionnaires in order to collect the opinions and expectations of the university community: two for students (undergraduate, graduate and post graduate), one for academic staff and one for administrative staff. To get the information from the whole university community might be problematic; with the aim of collecting descriptive information and comparing the information obtained from several groups (students, lectures, administrators) descriptive and analytical sampling shall be used. Regarding the procedure, e-mails explaining the research and containing questionnaire forms are to be sent to lecturers and administrative staff. All four questionnaires aim to reveal the necessity and preparedness of the university to implement strategies of content and language integrated learning and teaching (CLIL).
1.2 Objectives and Research Questions

The study puts forward the following objectives:

- To conduct analysis of documents on language policies in Ukraine and higher education of Ukraine to describe the background and language context of Zaporizhzhia National University (ZNU);

- To compare the legal basis which defines the language policies of ZPU with European criteria of multilingual universities to define the degree to which ZNU can be considered as multilingual European university;

- To conduct a survey among members of the ZNU community (management, academic staff, students) to define university’s language usage background and its needs in changes in the language policy of the University, its readiness to develop new approaches to management, teaching and learning.

- To devise a proposal on language policies at the level of the university to make ZPU multilingual university of the European level.

- The research questions to be considered during the study can be summarized as follows:

  - To which degree do University’s legal acts support the development and implementation of multilingual language policies?

  - To which degree is the University’s community prepared for new language policies?

  - How important and topical are changes in language policies and how topical is a proposal on new language policies?
2. BACKGROUND AND CONTEXT of ZAPORIZHZHIA NATIONAL UNIVERSITY (ZNU)
2.1 External Institutional Context

2.1.1. Linguistic Situation in Ukraine from Past to Present

The current linguistic situation in Ukraine is the consequence of a prolonged fight for and against the Ukrainian language, Ukrainian identity and Ukrainian statesmanship that can be divided into five main periods: 1654-1917, 1917-1933, 1933-1941, 1941-1989, 1989 – present day. The following is the summary of articles and facts on the historical situations in Ukraine as well as the current legal documents that regulate the general use of languages as well as their use in different spheres, with a special focus on education, higher education and media.

The Lost Ukrainian State (1654-1917)

In multiple battles (1648-1654) Hetman Bohdan Khmelnytsky tried to free the territories of Cossacks from the Crown of the Kingdom of Poland, abolish serfdom and make the country independent. His long-lasting dream partly came true for a short while, but, instantly after the Treaty of Perayaslav in January 1654, the Cossacks’ territories became the property of the Czar of Russia. The Treaty of Pereyaslav has been viewed differently by historians from “re-unification of Russia and Ukraine” to “the betrayal of Cossacks’ dreams” [Федорук, 2004]. Consequently, Zaporozka Sich was dissolutioned (1775) and serfdom was re-introduced (1783-1861), followed by multiple and systematic laws of imposed Russification.

In 1615 the School of Kyiv Bratstvo was opened, which was destined to become the first University in Eastern Europe. In 1632 it became Collegium and in 1658 it became “Kyiv-Mohyla Academy”, onwards, Ukrainian was the language of instruction, not only at schools, but also at university [Хижняк, 2000].

After the Treaty of Perayaslav the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy and multiple schools were Pussified, similar institutions in Western Ukraine were Polonized. Upper classes spoke Polish or Russian, depending on the territory, lower classes spoke Ukrainian. Over the following 150 years, Ukrainian was losing its stable position as a language of education, especially in Eastern regions. Its domain was being shrunk by a number of documents, regulating the language use.

The development of Ukrainian as a distinct Slav language had finished by the end of 18th century and Ivan Kotliarevsky’s Eneida (1798) is recognized as the first prominent literary work that was written in Modern Ukrainian (not Middle Ukrainian or Church Slavic). This
poem also manifested the formation of the literary standard from the people's parlance, even though it was threatened by Russian centralist policies [Luckyj, 1972].

The 19th century was rich in public figures, events and documents, some of them tried to free the language from the shackles of Russian, others tried to stabilize its grip. In 1811, the Kyiv-Mohyla Academy was ordered to be closed, the secret society "Brotherhood of Sts Cyril and Methodius", that tried to revive the Ukrainian nation, followed the Academy in 1847. Poets who wrote in Ukrainian were exiled, notably Taras Shevchenko and Pavlo Chubynsky. The serfdom was abolished in 1861. Both the former lords and serfs were unhappy with their current position and limited rights, respectively. Meanwhile the Russian Empire's government got the rumor that Ukraine cherished separatist ideas and the locals were thought to receive support from the Poles, the Austrians, and the Germans.

Despite immense oppression, the Ukrainian language continued living and developing. Dissatisfied with the situation, in 1863, Pyotr Valuyev, the Minster of Internal Affairs of the Russian Empire, issued a decree – "the Valuyev Edict (circular)" that banned the publishing of all books of religious and educational nature in "Little Russian dialect" (though belles-lettres literature could still be published in it). To further support his ideas, Pyotr Valuyev also announced that the Little Russians, as a distinct ethnic group, did not exist and they did not have their distinct language as well, what they used for communication was nothing more than a dialect of Russian spoiled by the Polish influence. The political aspect always went hand in hand with the linguistic one, when it concerned Ukraine [Saunders, 1995].

The next turn against the Ukrainian language was presented in “the Ems Ukaz” in 1876 that banned the use of Ukrainian [Блохин, 2016], saying:

1) The importation into the Russian Empire, without special permission of the Central Censorship over Printing, of all books and pamphlets in the Little Russian dialect, published abroad, is forbidden; 2) The printing and publishing in the Empire of original works and translations in this dialect is forbidden with the exception of (a) historical documents and monuments; (b) works of belles-lettres but with the provison that in the documents the orthography of the originals be retained; in works of belles-lettres no deviations from the accepted Russian orthography are permitted and permission for their printing may be given only by the Central Censorship over Printing; 3) All theatrical performances and lectures in the Little Russian dialect, as well as printing of text to musical notes, are forbidden. In 1881, Aleksander II, the czar of the Russian Empire, amended the ukaz, thus, Ukrainian songs and dictionaries were allowed, as well as some theatre performances in Russian theatre companies. The theatre became the only place where words in Ukrainian could be publicly spoken and heard.

In the 19th century, in West Ukrainian territories the conditions were much easier, though the Austro-Hungarian Empire was not particularly developing the culture and the language, though, they were never banned and were allowed as a language of documents and schooling. The books were often published in Ukrainian and then smuggled to the Eastern part of Ukraine, thus, the Ukrainian language was being kept alive and developed relatively coherently across the territories, divided between the two empires [Михутина, 2003].

During the Revolution of 1905-1907, the people in Ukraine demanded general public education as well as Ukrainian as a language of instruction. Some universities founded departments of Ukrainian, but the Czar Nicholas II's manifesto on the allowed periodical press in Ukrainian (1905) did not change the situation [Михутина, 2003]. The Ems Ukaz was not officially abolished, people, particularly statesmen, were prosecuted for the use of Ukrainian and Ukrainian press, allowed by the manifesto.
In 1907 the publishing in Ukrainian was allowed, but in 1910 anti-Ukrainian campaign took a new disguise. The Ministry on Internal Affairs issued a new circular that banned the establishment of all Ukrainian and Jewish societies. They claimed that the main aim was not to allow the rebirth of the Ukrainians as a nation. Regional "Prosvitas" were closed, Ukrainian events cancelled, the anti-Ukrainian policy continued. WWI was not the reason to connive at Ukrainian.

Overall, from 1798 till 1916 the Russian Empire allowed only about 6000 titles, two thirds published after the Revolution of 1905. During WWI publishing in Ukrainian decreased considerably [Мураховський, 2014].

**Ukrainization (1917-1933)**

The establishment of the Ukrainian Central Council, followed by the People's Republic of Ukraine gave a new platform for the Ukrainian language to develop. Though it never received the title of the official language, the Council of Ministers issued a circular that required the officials to use Ukrainian, it was used officially and all the documents were issued in Ukrainian [Шульженко, 2008].

The Ukrainian Central Council was short lived and its successor, the Hetmanat of P.Skoropadsky, further cared for the language, thus, they radically changed the situation by popularizing Ukrainian as a language of law, press, books and schooling. Overall, in 1917-1918, 1831 titles were published (over 16 mln volumes) in Ukrainian [Мураховський, 2014], 70% of all materials printed in that period. Many people tried to convince the government that it was necessary to pass a bill saying that Ukrainian was the only state language in Ukraine. Even though the Ukrainian independent state failed, the language freed itself from the shackles and started flourishing. In 1921-23, 63% of school in Ukraine were Ukrainian, mostly in central and western territories. There were no Ukrainian schools in Donbass [Яворська, 2014].

The Bolsheviks could not turn a blind eye to Ukraine and its language and agreed to the formally independent Ukrainian Soviet Republic and the policy of Ukrainization (1923), that is derussification. Its main task was to bring up the new leaders who are originally Ukrainians and who could serve the USSR as well. All non-Russian nations of the USSR, including Ukrainians, were allowed to have schools, cultural establishments, newspapers, books etc. in their mother tongues. In the Ukrainian Republic there were two mainstreams: Ukrainization and the maximum development of all minorities, particularly in education [Шульженко, 2008]. Ukrainization was supported not only by the Bolsheviks, but also by the elite. They stimulated education, arts, theatre, literature, music, cinema, general literacy etc. In 1921 the Institute of the Ukrainian language was opened, different dictionaries were compiled. In 1927 the Kharkiv spelling rules (by M.Skrypnyk) were voted for at the all-Ukrainian spelling conference. By the 1929, there had been significant changes in the state of the general public and the authorities in Ukraine, all speaking Ukrainian. Stalin, in need of support from Ukraine's populous nation, demanded Ukrainization to proceed. It turned out to be more of a maneuver, not a dominant strategy.

Many people thought that it was possible to build the USSR, preserving regional languages. M.Skrypnyk was one of them and he achieved a lot in this sphere. Providing support to all Ukrainians who lived outside the Ukrainian Republic, he managed to open 500 schools and 2 universities in the Russian Republic. By 1932, the volume of publishing in Ukrainian increased to 77% compared with 47% in 1927 [Мураховський, 2014].
The situation started changing drastically in 1930 when the first accusations were given and the cleansing was unleashed. In August 1932 J. Stalin sent a letter to L. Kaganovich to introduce new measures: 1) to extract maximum grain from Ukraine (with the pretext to send grain to cities that were developing); 2) to carry out repressive cleansing of all social strata (to get void of the enemies of the nation). In 1932, J. Stalin required “correct” Ukrainization both in Ukraine and in places of their compact living [Борисенко, 2006]. This meant the end of Ukrainization. Controlled, Ukrainization still had a very positive influence on the language and the nation. Now, the Bolsheviks had to fight with the offshoots of the seeds they had planted themselves.

Counter-Ukrainization (1933-1941)

This was the period of dramatic changes: the Ukrainian language, dominant over a huge territory, and its speakers were starved, repressed, exiled. “The language front”, the term from the 1930s, and the so-called Russian-Ukrainian opposition started. A. Khvylia, deputy of Minister of Education, published an article “Deroot, destroy the nationalist roots in the language front” (1933). Consequently, the authorities ordered to stop publishing all the dictionaries, to check all dictionaries and terminology, to unify terminology of Ukraine and the USSR, to check and change Ukrainian spelling, etc. [Демська, 2014]. M. Skrypnyk, the Minister of education, realized the situation and the upcoming changes and committed suicide, which signified the end of Ukrainization. The repressions against the employees of Ministry of education and regional educational offices began; school teachers, university professors and writers followed, writers alone reaching 500. The language front turned into a real battle field, concerning spelling, language institutions, language and translation courses, etc. The policy towards moving Ukrainian closer to Russian began in the 1930s and lasted till the 1980s.

As the result of counter-Ukrainization, by mid-1930s the young generation did not have enough school and university books in Ukrainian. The number of books in Ukrainian published in the 1930s was plummeting. In 1938, a decree made Russian compulsory at schools. The starvation of 1932-1933 and repressions of 1933-1937 decimated the Ukrainian speaking population, mostly in Eastern, Southern and central territories [Борисенко, 2006]. The emptied villages and towns sheltered newcomers from the Russian Republic, bringing their language with them.

War and peace (1941-1989)

Unexpectedly, but WWII brought some relief in the language policy. Ukraine being a huge battle field, J. Stalin had to rely on the people’s support to confront the enemy. After his death in 1953, the movement to defend Ukrainian started spurring in Ukraine. Books were published, people insisted on broadening the rights of Ukrainian and introducing it into all spheres of life. In late 1950-s, in the republics of the USSR both Russian and local languages were the languages of instruction. Ukrainian returned to classrooms, still lacking popularity [Парахина, 2014].

In the 1960s a new body in the Academy of Science was established, whose duty was to monitor the linguistic situation in the USSR. Conversely, the Council acted to spread Russian and limit the use of other minority languages, the language issue remained the political one. In 1962 journal “Linguistic problems” (Voprosi Yazikoznanija) published the Council’s program on the linguistic situation in the USSR, claiming equality for all languages. The article, however, ran that not all the languages are equal and divided them into prospective (Russian,
Armenian, Georgian, Lithuanian, Latvian, and Estonian) and non-prospective (all the others, Ukrainian included). It also said that closely related languages like Ukrainian and Belorussian had to gradually merge with Russian (or be absorbed by it). In the mid-60s, the situation only intensified, 75% of all titles published in the USSR were in Russian, and all the other languages shared 25% of publications [XXII СЪЕЗД КПСС, 1962]. People became their own publishers for what they were tracked by the police with multiple pogroms [Стасюк, 2013]. The largest number of books published in Ukrainian during the USSR period falls for 1961, with 4041 titles [Іванко, 2010].

In 1963 there was an all-Ukrainian conference held on the situation of Ukrainian, where it was suggested to announce Ukrainian as a state language. The authorities refused [Від «Культури мови»]. The next attack on the language was in 1972, when V.Scherbutsky came to power; he ignored the adjective “Ukrainian” as well as collocations the “Ukrainian people” and the “Ukrainian language” [Якубець, 2014]. In 1979 the new approach in language policy was chosen. The teachers who taught in Russian or switched to Russian were fully supported by the state and given bonuses. Over the next two decades of Khrushov’s administration, the number of Ukrainian schools in Ukraine decreased radically, with no schools in Donetsk area and Crimea. Books and the press were mostly in Russian, though published in Ukraine. Secondary and tertiary education in Ukrainian, in different areas, was decreasing, 50-80% in Russian [Шевченко, 2014].

In 1985, perestroika allowed to switch the focus to the Ukrainian language, the linguistic issue was reintroduced into the political discourse. In 1989, Kyiv held a conference and Oles Honchar gave a speech there saying that the state of the Ukrainian language can be described as “linguistic Chornobyl” [Мовна ситуація в Україні]. The conference highly criticized the policy of denationalization and demanded the Ukrainian language to be given the status of state language as well as constitutional protection. In late 1989, the Parliament of the Ukrainian Republic supported the law “On Languages in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic”, which gave the Ukrainian language an official status [Закон «Про мови»]. The same law identified Russian as a language of international communication in the Ukrainian SSR. In 1991, the USSR collapsed and Ukraine acquired independence as well as the linguistic burden of the 17-20th century Russification.

**Independence (1991-present)**

Ukraine became independent in 1991 and continued to use the law “On Languages in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic”, Ukrainian was official [Закон «ПРО МОВИ»]. The linguistic situation remained problematic, particularly in Eastern areas and Crimea, but the dire economic situation for some time switched the focus off languages. Over the years of independence, bills on language can outnumber bills in any other sphere. These bills came and left, planting confusion in the citizens.

In 1992, Ukraine signed and, in 2003, ratified the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages, identifying Belarusian, Bulgarian, Crimean Tatar, Gagauz, Greek, German, Hungarian, Jewish/Yiddish, Moldavian, Polish, Romanian, Russian, and Slovak as minority languages in Ukraine and granting them full support.

In 1996 the Constitution of Ukraine was accepted. Article 10 of the Constitution of Ukraine says:
The state language of Ukraine is the Ukrainian language. The State ensures the comprehensive development and functioning of the Ukrainian language in all spheres of social life throughout the entire territory of Ukraine. In Ukraine, the free development, use and protection of Russian, and other languages of national minorities of Ukraine, is guaranteed. The State promotes the learning of languages of international communication. The use of languages in Ukraine is guaranteed by the Constitution of Ukraine and is determined by law. [Constitution of Ukraine].

Notably, though the Constitution of Ukraine was changed in 2004, then in 2010, and in 2014 the Parliament returned the version of 2004, Article 10 did not incur even a minor change.

In 1996, the bill “On education” was passed, Article 7 of this law says that in Ukraine the language of instruction is identified by the Constitution of Ukraine and the law “On Languages in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic”, thus, recognizing Ukrainian as the main language of education and providing an opportunity for the use of any other language within the school walls [«Про освіту» 1996]. This law “On education” is still valid, but in October 2016 the Parliament supported the new bill “On education” in the first reading and it was voted for in September 2017 [«Про освіту» 2017.]. It says: 1) the language of schooling in educational establishments is the state language, minorities can study in mother tongues or learn their mother tongues at primary schools; 2) the state language is compulsory; minorities are provided with special conditions to learn the state language; 3) the state supports the acquisition of languages of international communication; 4) educational establishments can teach in two or more languages (state and minority or other languages) or teach in English or other languages; 5) if requested, colleges and universities provide the conditions for students to learn the languages of minorities as a separate course; 6) the use of languages in some areas is regulated by special laws.

Article 48 was cut of the bill and it regulated the linguistic aspect. It says that the language of instruction in all higher educational establishments is the state language. To provide the grounds for international academic mobility, the higher educational establishment can make a decision to teach one or some disciplines in English or other foreign languages, higher educational establishments organized by foreign countries on the territory of Ukraine as well as private higher educational establishments can choose the language of instruction, with the state language as a separate discipline. If required or wanted, the higher educational establishments can create special conditions for the learning of minority languages, so that students can work professionally in this language. This article further supported the use of foreign languages in the educational establishments.

In 1993 the Parliament of Ukraine passed the bill “On printed press in Ukraine” [Закон «Про друковані засоби»]. Article 4 of the law said that the press in Ukraine is published in the state language and other languages, the style and the vocabulary should be within the identified moral frames. In 1994 the Parliament approved of the law “On television and radio broadcast” [Закон «Про телебачення»]. Article 4 of the law said that the state runs the protective policy, concerning the locally produced programmes; the state provides conditions to satisfy the cultural need of the citizens and Ukrainians living abroad; the state does not forbid TV and radio broadcasting from other countries in languages of minorities or other languages. Not a single article of this law protected or specified the use of the Ukrainian language.

The law “On cinema” was voted for in 1998 [Закон «Про кінематографію»]. Its Article 6 ran that the use of languages is regulated by the law on languages. In 2008 an amendment was passed that at the initial state spurred a lot of discontentment [Блохтур, 2017]. The
Parliament approved of an amendment that required all the cinemas in the country to show the films with the Ukrainian voiceover. On the whole, this amendment gave rise to the Ukrainian audiovisual translation which was of such high quality that in some years’ time people realized that the Ukrainian voiceover product was a way ahead of the Russian analogues.

In June 2016, the law was amended; currently Article 9 says that home audiovisual product should make no less than 50% of every TV or radio channel’s volume of information. The amount of songs in the state language should be no less than 25% in the first year, 30% in the second year, 35% in the third year of the law in power, the songs distributed evenly throughout the air time.

In March 2017, the bill “On the language of audiovisual (electronic) media” was supported in the first reading by the Ukrainian Parliament [Закон «Про внесення змін…»]. The bill is being changed and amended now. Article 10 of the bill runs that the TV and radio stations can broadcast in the state language, regional languages or languages of minorities, languages of international communication, there is still the minimum volume of broadcasting in the state language for some categories; no less than 75% of all-national and regional broadcasters’ time should be in the state language; no less than 50% of films broadcast in Ukrainian, films broadcast not in Ukrainian should be subtitled, no less than 75% of news programmes broadcast in the state language, etc.

In 2010 there was a bill “On languages in Ukraine” registered in the Parliament (by pro-Russia Yefremov, Symonenko, Grynevetskyi), supposing harmonious development of Russian-Ukrainian bilingualism [Проект Закону про мови]. The bill was taken to expertise and all the expert institutions identified the bill as confronting the Constitution of Ukraine.

From 1989 till 2012, Ukraine followed the law “On Languages in the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic” [Закон «Про мови»] and was substituted by the law “On the principles of the state language policy” [Закон «Про засади». Both the bill and the law caused the revolt, enraged, dissociated and disintegrated the country and the population. Its abolishment in 2014 brought a new turn to the already complicated situation and became a powerful reason for using the language as a political tool to heat up the dissatisfaction between the citizens. The law was suggested by Vadym Kolesnichenko and Sergiy Kivalov, for this reason it was dubbed “Kelesnichenko-Kivalov’s law”.

The bill was registered on February 7, 2012. On June 5, 2012 the law was voted for in the first reading with multiple violations, then, it was voted for in the second reading on July 3, 2012, with multiple violations again. The speaker of the Parliament understood that the law did not compile with the Constitution and tried to resign, unsuccessfully. The law came into force only August 10, 2012. There is ample evidence that the bill was supported by less than 225 people (the minimum required), as many deputies whose cards voted were abroad on the days of both votings. According to the press covering and video shortage, only 172 deputies, physically present in the Parliament, supported the law, which is 54 votes below the required minimum. Moreover, the bill in both readings was imperfect and for the second reading over 2000 amendments were suggested, none of them heard in the Parliament. The procedure of the voting was also violated. All these procedural shortcomings and the abuse of the Constitution of Ukraine in conceptual aspects caused the revolt in the society. In 2017 the law was taken to the Constitutional law of Ukraine [17 листопада Конституційний Суд України].

Between the days when the law was supported by the Parliament and signed by the President there were several campaigns to support or confront the law. The supporters included Sergii Tygypko, Minister of Social Policy, Kharkiv city council, Lugansk city council, Sevastopol city
The law caused protests in Zhytomyr, Kherson, Chrnigiv, Poltava, Zaporizhzhia, Kharkiv, Donetsk, Lviv, Rivne, Ivano-Frankivsk, Khmenlytsky, etc. The confronters included Chernivtsi regional state administration, Ternopil regional state administration, the head of Khmelnytsky regional state administration, the head of Ivano-Frankivsk regional state administration, Khmelnytsky regional council, Vinnytsa regional council, Rivne regional council, Ternopil city council, Sumy city council, Cherkasy city council, Sokalsk local and town councils, Mukachevo town council, non-governmental organizations from Crimea, other regions of Ukraine and abroad, Union of Ukrainians in Great Britain, Association of Ukrainian lawyers of America, fans of football club “Dinamo”, numerous statespeople and public figures [Tepec, 2014]. Knut Vollebaek, OSCE High Commissioner, expressed his concernment with both the bill and the law as “deeply divisive” [OSCE High Commissioner, 2012].

Then current authorities said that the passed bill was not a problem for the proper functioning of different establishments and institutions in multiple languages, with satisfactory sums of money allocated to ensure the law, book publishing, media licensing alike. The law was presented as the one introducing polylingualism in Ukraine.

**The Gist of the Law**

The law [Закон «Про засади державної мовної політики»] identified Ukrainian as the state language, but it significantly increases the rights of other languages. Every community of any size was entitled to identify a local language for themselves. The law also vaguely defined the terms such as “state language”, “language group”, “language minority”, “regional language group”, “region”, “regional language / minority language”, “territory of a regional language”, “mother tongue”, “languages of national minorities”, which contradicted each other.

Article 2 of this law says that the state language and regional languages can be used in state, economic, political and community spheres, interpersonal and international communication, at the same time contradicting the main purpose of the language – to satisfy communication. Article 7 identifies 18 languages as regional languages in Ukraine (Russian, Belorussian, Armenian, Gagaus, Yiddish, Crimean Tatar, Moldavian, German, Modern Greek, Polish, Romany (Gypsy), Romanian, Slovak, Hungarian, Rusyn, Karaim, Krymchak), thus, all these languages can be used for communication at all levels, if 10% of the community signed a request for a regional language. This not at all facilitates cross-ethnic communication in Ukraine. This not at all facilitates cross-ethnic communication in Ukraine. Article 10 says that all the acts of national and local authorities have to be published in the state language and all regional languages, thus, only increasing the number of legal documents. Articles 9-19 state that Ukrainian and any of the regional languages, if requested, must be used by state and local authorities, courts, for economic and social activity, as well as for IDs issued. Article 20 dwells on the languages of education. Every person is entitled to choose the language freely, mentioned in this law, but must learn the state language in the satisfactory amount to be integrated into the Ukrainian society. Everyone is guaranteed the right to study in the state language, regional or minority languages. All secondary schools ensure the learning of the state language, regional or minority languages. The amount of regional or minority languages is identified locally, in accordance with the law “On education”. In secondary schools classes are taught in regional or minority languages, except the classes of Ukrainian and Ukrainian Literature, which are taught in Ukrainian. Students do tests and exams in the state language, or regional or minority languages of their choice. The state ensures the training of teacher students for schools with regional or minority languages.
Educational establishments can form classes or groups with foreign languages as languages of education. Thus, article 20 almost totally ousted Ukrainian from education. Articles 21-23 identify the use of languages in science, IT, culture. Ukrainian, Russian and English become the languages of IT. For digital texts, any other languages can be used freely. The state stresses the importance of cross-cultural communication and polylingualism, cares for the development of Ukrainian forms of the cultural life, ensures the free use of regional or minority languages. Books, concerts, films can be translated into the state language, regional or minority languages. Articles 24-26 dwell on the use of languages in the sphere of information. Everyone is guaranteed the right to consume the media in any language. The state supports the publishing of audiovisual information in the state language, regional or minority languages. The bill “On the language of audiovisual (electronic) media” (voted for in the first reading in March 2017) will outlaw Articles 23-24 when supported by the Parliament in the second reading and signed by President. Articles 27-28 on the language of toponyms and names of citizens identify the format of the names in the state language as main. Transliterated into English, personal names can be changed according to the spelling rules of regional languages or languages of minorities. Article 29 identifies the state languages as the language of the armed forces. Article 30 says that the state supports the development of the Ukrainian language and culture across the borders of Ukraine. The law enlarges the use of all other regional or minority languages, limiting the role of Ukrainian as a state language.

**The Impact of the Law**

Peter Stano, spokesperson of Stefan Fule, EU commissioner for Enlargement and European Neighborhood Policy, said that such reforms as the language law should be adopted on the basis of a proper inclusive domestic debate and with a broad consensus.

The approval of the document by the Parliament triggered a number of protests across the country. In particular, a hunger strike and a mass protest were stages near the Ukrainian House (in Kyiv), following the voting. The country got divided into people and areas, supporting the law and refusing to accept it as anti-constitutional.

The head of Lviv regional administration started preparing a lawsuit to the Constitutional Court to acknowledge the law as anti-constitutional. Deputies of town councils of the Lviv region had a meeting and signed an agreement where they declared that they recognized Ukrainian as the only state language of the country. Ivano-Frankivsk regional council accepted a programme of the Ukrainian language protection in the face of separatist intentions, Ivano-Frankivsk town council flatly refused to realize the law. Lutsk city council (Volyn region) approved of a decision that the law would not be efficient in Lutsk as anti-Ukrainian. The head of Vinnystia regional council and Ternopil regional council found the law non-applicable in their territories. Busk local council and Sokalsk local council found the decision non-constitutional.

Zhytomyr regional council, Chernigiv regional council refused to analyze the law. Simferopol city council (Crimea) did not approve of the decision to give Russian the status of a regional language. Ternopil city council appealed to other councils in Ukraine not to support the law.

The opposition urged citizens not to execute the law. Different statesmen and public figures gave official speeches or sent official letters to confront the law. Even, Ganna German, President Yanukovych’s counselor, said that the law is raw and contradicts multiple laws and acts.
Some heads of regions, Zhytomyr and Poltava in particular, said that this law will realize the dreams of some ethnic minorities, but the state language will remain Ukrainian, or that there are no places of minorities’ compact living and it is easy for minorities to assimilate in their regions as Ukrainian is widely spoken.

Non-governmental organizations in Crimea addressed the speaker and prime-minister of Crimean Council to announce Ukrainian, Russian, and Crimean Tatar languages as regional. Pro-Ukrainian organizations, surprisingly, joined the movement and said that as there were 24% of Ukrainian speakers in Crimea they requested 24% of budget money to be allocated for Ukrainian schools, kindergartens etc. as at that time they received less than 1%. The Ukrainian language was underfinanced while the Russian language had everything.

When the law was signed, some communities started to introduce regional or minority languages [Мовний закон Колесніченка-Ківалова]. The following days, the law was verbally supported by the head of Zhytomyr regional administration, by the head of Zakarpattia regional administration, Kharkiv city council. Krasnolutsk town council (Lugansk region) approved of the documentation to be both in Ukrainian and Russian. The village of Bila Tserkva (Zakarpattia region) gave the Romanian language the status of regional. In Odesa, the mayor said that 89% of Odesa citizens feel more comfortable speaking, reading or communicating in Russian and that he was sure that this decision would be supported by the majority. Odesa regional council, Zaporizhzhia regional council, Donetsk regional council, Kherson regional council, Mykolaiv regional council, Sevastopol city council, Kherson city council, Pervomaysk town council (Kharkiv region), gave Russian the status of a regional language. Lugansk regional council decided to inform the population that according to the law Russian was a regional language or a language of minorities in the region. Dnipropetrovsk regional council approved of measures to protect Russian in the area. Yalta town council made a decision to launch the law in the town.

Beregovo town council (Zakarpattia region) approved of Hungarian as a regional language. Tarasovets village council (Chernivtsi region) gave the Romanian (Moldavian) language the status of a regional language.

The Expertise

The main expertise apparatus of the Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine stated that the bill had multiple faults and had to be largely amended. It was not in line with the Constitution [17 листопада Конституційний Суд, 2016], the language was viewed not as an ethnic or national attributes, but as territorial, that confronts the theory of ethnogenesis. It also stated that the law did not follow the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages as the document did not identify the percentage of the speakers to be given the status of regional or minority languages, it did not give regional and minority language the status to be used by officials [Лопушинський, 2012]. The Charter only protects regional or minority languages. The Venetian Commission [Висновок Венеціанської комісії] found that the law could not provide the required balance between the state language as the unifying power and the protection of minority laws, etc.
The Law Abolishment

23 February 2014, the next day after Viktor Yanukovych, ex-president of Ukraine, ran away, one of the deputies of the Parliament gave a bill to vote the law as the one that lost its power. The bill was supported. The abolishment of the law caused a negative reaction in Crimea and in some areas in Eastern and Southern regions. Oleksandr Turchynov, a.i. President of Ukraine, did not sign the bill on the law abolishment, though, it did not save the situation. Russia kept on using this situation in the propaganda to stir the situation in the East and South, to occupy Crimea and start the war. The law is still valid, though, the case is being heard in the Constitutional Court.

The Legal Case

The first legal case connected with the law was in September 2012 against the speaker of the Parliament, who signed the anti-constitutional law.

In 2014, 57 deputies signed a petition to take the law on languages to the Constitutional Court. The Constitutional Court of Ukraine started the listening of the case on 13 February 2015.

Main arguments: the law has norms that contradict the Constitution of Ukraine, as it considerably degrades the status of Ukrainian as the state language. Russian was mentioned 9 times while other minority languages were mentioned only once what considerably degrades other minority languages. It contradicts the European Charter for Regional or Minority Languages as it protects endangered languages and Russian definitely does not belong to them and was added to the law purposefully. The plaintiffs claim that the name of the law itself contradicts the Constitution of Ukraine as the laws should identify only the use of the languages, not re-identify the Constitutional bases of the country. Moreover, the law was voted for with multiple violations (mentioned above). The case is still in the Constitutional Court [17 листопада Конституційний Суд].

Conclusion

The analysis of the historical background allows to state that though the key issue of language state policies in education has always been focused on the use of Ukrainian in educational institutions and on measures to support its development and wide use as the language of instruction, a particular attention has always been given to other languages as means of international/ intercommunal communication. The Constitution of Ukraine (2004, 2010), Law on Education (VRU, 1996), Law on Higher Education (VRU, 2002a), The Law on Language Policy (2014), The National Doctrine on the Development of Education (President of Ukraine, 2002), etc are based on the principle that “the system of education should continue to ensure knowledge of both native and foreign languages. Education should address the right of national minorities to be educated in their native language and safeguard their culture with state support and protection” (Higher Education in Ukraine, 2006:23).

To realize the principle, higher education institutions in Ukraine develop their university language policies which shape studying and teaching processes, curricula development, research activities, management, international relations and student and academic staff mobility.
2.1.2 Language Policies Documents in Ukrainian Universities

The analysis of the external institutional context suggests the consideration of major official documentation of higher educational establishment with reference to their language policy. All these normative documents include the Statute of an educational establishment and its Development Strategy presented online in the Ukrainian language. The documents are composed by educational establishments in compliance to current laws and regulations on higher education in Ukraine.

It should be noted, that Ukraine consists of 25 oblasts including the Autonomous Republic of Crimea. The following analysis includes The Statutes and Development Strategies of national institutes or universities from each oblast giving the priority to the top institutions from the consolidated rating of Ukrainian higher educational institutions 2016 [http://osvita.ua/vnz/rating/51741/] complementing our analysis by geographical parameters taking into account the necessity to manifest geographical context.

The analysis of the current documentation of Ukrainian higher educational institutions enables us to group them into four main classes according to the character of their major official documentation presented online and the ideas articulated referring to language policy, we also intend to consider the peculiar features of language aspects in different higher educational institutions.

The first group with “State Language Priority in Teaching Plus Foreign Languages Option Approved by the University Council” is represented by the top national universities: Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv [SNUK], National Technical University “Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute” [KNTU, ], Kharkiv National University of Radioelectronic [KNUR], Ivan Franko National University of Lviv [FNUL], Lviv Polytechnic National University [LPNU], National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine [NULESU], National University of Kyiv-Mohyla Academy [NUKMA], Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University [SPNU], State University «Uzhhorod National University», Donets National Technical University, Kyiv National University of Technologies and Design, Vinnytsia National Technical University, Ternopil Ivan Puluj National Technical University, Ternopil National Economic University, State Institution “Luhansk Taras Shevchenko National University”.

The Statutes of the above-mentioned universities provide similar ideas, articulated in a slightly different form and can be presented in the following way:

The language of instruction at the University is Ukrainian. In order to create conditions for international academic mobility scientific councils of faculties (institutes), providing the applicants of higher education with teaching the discipline in official language, have the right to decide on the teaching of subjects in English and / or other foreign languages. It is allowed to implement into teaching curriculum educational and professional, educational and research programs in foreign languages approved by the Department (Institute) Council in compliance to current legislation and The University Statute. To perform teaching courses in foreign languages university forms a separate group for foreign citizens and people without citizenship (in case they express their wish to get a degree at the expense of entities or persons) or develops individual programmes. However, these individuals learn Ukrainian language as a separate discipline. The list of foreign languages the subjects are taught in is determined by the University.
The Development Strategies of universities emphasize the necessity of the Internationalization of educational process, focusing on the development of professional training in foreign languages, creating conditions for admission of foreign students, academic exchange of students and teachers, harmonization of training programs of the Universities with their partner universities overseas, new courses introduction, effective teaching methods application, increasing the number of foreign students, activation of academic mobility, development of innovative techniques and educational software. One of the major issues of the strategies is to provide university teachers with the opportunity to learn foreign languages enabling their participation in international mobility programs and delivering lectures in foreign languages for the Ukrainian and foreign students. One of the university objectives is defined as increasing the number of consultations, publication of texts of lectures and instructional materials in English and Ukrainian languages [KNTU, 2015].

National Technical University "Kharkiv Polytechnic Institute", Ivan Franko National University of Lviv and Lviv Polytechnic National University belonging to the first group, present similar ideas concerning languages in a different formulation and thus a slightly different emphasis. Their official documents state that training, paperwork, meetings, and other activities in the University are conducted in Ukrainian. Foreign languages can be used for the events of an international character, where the decision on working language is taken by the committee; in teaching students from other countries in case they are grouped appropriately; teaching people invited from other countries; teaching certain disciplines in foreign languages, during the defense of qualifying works aimed at professional efficiency; for the cover documentation of the work performed for customers from other countries.

Language policy is mentioned in the Statute of Lviv Polytechnic National University in reference to editing activity formulating the purpose of publishing activities as promoting education and science in Ukraine by increasing the total number of circulation, volume expansion and thematic focus on scientific and educational literature in Ukrainian language; providing access to universal values by issuing the best achievements of world science and literature translated into Ukrainian, cooperation with foreign publishers, Ukrainian Diaspora, international cooperation; publishing in minority languages in Ukraine; increasing the number of publications in foreign languages, which would popularize Ukraine in the world. [LPNU, 2013]

The National Aviation University Statute besides the ideas presented above provides the information about the additional corresponding certification of the university graduates in case they choose to be trained in foreign languages [NAU, 2017].

The only university from the abovementioned group specifying other teaching languages (English, German, French or Russian approved by the University Council) is National University of Life and Environmental Sciences of Ukraine [NULES, 2015].

The second group with “State Language Priority in Teaching Plus Foreign Languages Option Plus Minority Languages Approved by the University Council” is represented by V. N. Karazin Kharkiv National University, National Technical University of Ukraine «Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute», Odessa I. I. Mechnikov National University, Yuriy Fedkovych Chernivtsi National University, Oles Honchar Dnipropetrovsk National University, National Aerospace University “Kharkiv Aviation Institute”, National Mining University, Volodymyr Dahl East Ukrainian National University.

The teaching language in these institutions is stated as Ukrainian. Though the University Council can come to a decision to teach certain subjects in English or other foreign languages.
to facilitate academic mobility, on condition the relevant subject knowledge is provided for the students in the state language. To applicants’ wish a University creates possibilities to learn the minority languages to enable their functioning in the chosen field using the required language. Among the priorities of the universities are the following: to create favorable conditions to enable students and university staff to learn foreign languages, to work out and start the implementation of bilingual education project.

The Development Strategies of these educational establishments emphasize the importance of strengthening cooperation between university-partners, focusing on academic mobility programs. The Strategies of their Development provide the following: “Our priority is to increase the number of students enrolled in double degree programs with the universities in developed countries... We are to enhance the effectiveness of our university participation in foreign grants, including – the EU programmes “Tempus” and “Erasmus Mundus”. We need to improve the quality of training significantly, to be able to organize and carry out international projects. We have to overcome the language barrier in contact with the outside world, improving language training of our students, researchers and teachers to involve every department of the university and especially students to international activities. It is necessary to automate all information and technology education, university management to ensure successful implementation and further development of electronic information services, departments, institutes and faculties sites, including their English language resources.

The third group with “State Regulation Priority Policy in Teaching” is represented by Sumy State University, Bogomolets National Medical University, Donetsk National Medical University, Odessa National Polytechnic University, Higher State Educational Establishment of Ukraine «Bukovinian State Medical. The Statutes of the universities tend to use hedging techniques, avoiding direct mentioning of the teaching language, though there is a clear reference to plenty of laws and regulations, namely “The Constitution of Ukraine” – “The Law on Higher Education, “The Law on Language Policy”. The Development Strategies focus on the need to encourage students of all specialties to improve their foreign language communicative competences, to develop Bachelor’s and Master’s Degree programmes in foreign languages, to activate academic mobility.

The Statutes of these universities claim to provide training for foreigners in English, Russian and other languages; create the system of lifelong language learning for citizens of Ukraine mastering their national language and its improvement and the conditions for successful and practical application of at least one foreign language; promoting high linguistic culture of citizens, respect for the state language and languages of national minorities of Ukraine, tolerance with respect to carriers of different languages and cultures, implementation of training programs for foreign students in English, Russian and Ukrainian languages [BNMU, 2016].

The Development Strategy of Sumy State University emphases the importance of their graduates’ fluency in several languages of international communication; implementing into curriculum English academic writing and English as a language of international scientific communication [SSU, 2015].

Odessa National Polytechnic University with no reference to teaching language in its Statute, highlights in its Development Strategy [ONPU, 2015] the necessity of implementing innovative approaches to language training, delivering lectures and conducting classes in foreign languages; introduction of bachelor’s and master programmes in foreign languages, invitation of qualified scientific and pedagogical staff from foreign universities to conduct lectures, workshops, seminars in English and other foreign languages.
Higher State Educational Establishment of Ukraine «Bukovinian State Medical University»
Statute insists on the need of instilling students with a democratic outlook, in compliance with civil liberties and respect for the traditions, culture, religion and world languages, creating a system of lifelong language learning, providing the obligatory mastering of the official language by the citizens of Ukraine and opportunity to learn the native (national) language and know at least one foreign language; promotion of high linguistic culture of citizens, respect for the state language and languages of national minorities of Ukraine, tolerance to different languages and cultures [BSMU, 2015].

The fourth group “Teaching Language is not mentioned” is represented by Vasyl Stus Donetsk National University, National University of Food Technologies, Lviv National Medical University, Ivan Franko National Technical University of Oil and Gas, National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. These universities avoid mentioning language policies in their Statutes, omitting the paragraphs, presented in the official documents of the higher educational establishments of the above analyzed groups.

The analysis of major official documentation, i.e. the Statute and the Development Strategy of higher educational establishments enables us to come to the conclusion that 85 % of universities under consideration treat the language policy as an official strategic priority. According to their reference to language policy, the higher educational establishments can be divided into 4 groups: 1) State Language Priority in Teaching Plus Foreign Languages Option Approved by the University Council; 2) State Language Priority in Teaching Plus Foreign Languages Option Plus Minority Languages Approved by the University Council; 3) State Regulation Priority Policy in Teaching; 4) Teaching Language is not mentioned.

The first group ”State Language Priority in Teaching Plus Foreign Languages Option Approved by the University Council” is the most numerous, presented by the top Ukrainian Universities and accounts for almost 46 %. Ukrainian is stated as the language of instruction, while in order to create conditions for international academic mobility scientific councils of faculties (institutes), providing the applicants of higher education with teaching in official language, universities have the right to introduce courses in English and / or other foreign languages on condition of being approved by the University Council.

The second group “State Language Priority in Teaching Plus Foreign Languages Option Plus Minority Languages Approved by the University Council” accounts for 24%. The teaching language in these institutions is stated as Ukrainian, while the University Council can approve of teaching certain courses in English or other foreign languages to facilitate academic mobility, on condition the relevant subject knowledge are provided for the students in the state language; and besides to applicants’ wish universities can create possibilities to learn the minority languages to enable their functioning in the chosen field using the required language.

The third group of higher educational establishments with “State Regulation Priority Policy in Teaching” accounts for 15 %. These universities tend to avoid direct mentioning of the teaching language in their official documents, though there is a clear reference to plenty of laws and regulations, namely “The Constitution of Ukraine” – “The Law on Higher Education, “The Law on Language Policy”. Overall they focus on the need to stimulate students of all specialties to improve their foreign language communicative competency, to develop programmes in foreign languages, to activate academic mobility.

The fourth group “Teaching Language is not mentioned” accounts for 15 %. These universities avoid mentioning language policies in their Statutes, omitting the paragraphs, presented
in the official documents of the higher educational establishments of the above analyzed groups.

Therefore, the above given analysis manifests the importance of language policy in the tertiary system of education, showing general regularities which can be partly explained by the historical division of Ukraine into western and eastern parts, current military tension environment though there is a tendency to merge. The western part of Ukraine tends to be more cosmopolitan, the eastern one – more flexible and ambiguous concerning the language policy in higher educational institutions. Some other language policy features which draw our attention are of scattered character, though seem to present certain important tendencies such as the desire of Ukraine to get engaged in the Euro-integration process, to enhance the participation in international mobility programmes, to popularize Ukrainian achievements and potential wiliness to cooperate with the developed world.
2.2 The Internal Factors: Zaporizhzhia National University Language Policies Documents

Our research focuses on the analyses of the survey results in Zaporizhzhia National University, therefore certain relevant documents require a more detailed consideration. As it was mentioned above, Zaporizhzhia National University belongs to the first group with “State Language Priority in Teaching Plus Foreign Languages Option Approved by the University Council”, represented by the top national universities.

The Statutes of the above-mentioned universities provide similar ideas, articulated in a slightly different form with the emphasis on certain features. Zaporizhzhia National University defines its academic aim, principles and target programmes within the conceptual framework of the development of National Education, Laws of Ukraine on Education, Higher Education, State National Program “Education” ("Ukraine in the 21st century"), National Ukrainian Educational Strategy up to 2021 and Zaporizhzhia National University Conceptual Framework. It supports the National idea contributing to the development of national identity, culture and universal cultural awareness and as a result stimulates the necessity and develops the skills of the youths enabling their efficient living in the civil society in the environment of spiritual and physical excellence, moral, esthetic, labour and ecological culture.

The language of instruction in Zaporizhzhia National University is Ukrainian and it focuses on the creation of lifelong language learning providing mandatory mastering of the Ukrainian language and the possibility to learn native (national) and foreign languages. Zaporizhzhia National University promotes the development of language culture, respect to national language and national minority languages, tolerance to the representatives of different cultures speaking different languages [ZNU, Statute, 2015].

Zaporizhzhia National University Study Regulations posit the priority of the creation of the conditions for international academic mobility, creation of scientific councils of faculties (institutes), providing the applicants of higher education with teaching the discipline in the official language, the right to decide on the teaching of subjects in English and / or other foreign languages. According to University Study Regulations it is allowed to implement into teaching curriculum educational and professional, educational and research programmes in foreign languages approved by the Department (Institute) Council in compliance with the current legislation and The University Statute. To perform teaching courses in foreign
languages university forms a separate group for foreign citizens and people without citizenship (in case they express their wish to get a degree at the expense of entities or persons) or develops individual programmes. However, these individuals learn Ukrainian language as a separate discipline. The list of foreign languages the subjects are taught is determined by the University [ZNU, Study Regulations, 2016].

The Strategic Plan of Zaporizhzhia National University promotes the ideas of European integration, emphasizes the necessity of providing the structure and content compatibility of educational process with the university programmes of the advanced European higher institutions and the possibility of the implementation and adjustment of their experience. Zaporizhzhia National University intensifies its efforts to reach the European standards and practices in education; it keeps on engaging leading foreign scientists and scholars into the teaching process of certain subjects and conducting workshops. It also focuses on the development of professional training in foreign languages, academic exchange of students and teachers, creating students’ groups of advanced study enabling their participation in academic exchange programmes, activation of academic mobility and professional advancement. European Integration, stimulation of global network usage and academic mobility are considered to be university internal objectives [ZNU, Strategic Plan, 2016].

The Admission Rules of Zaporizhzhia National University specify the Ukrainian language and literature as obligatory option certificate in the application form required by higher educational establishments in Ukraine. In case a person has no certificate in Ukrainian language and literature he or she can apply with any language certificate of Ukrainian Assessment Centre of Education Quality or pass an examination. When applied for a Master’s Degree Programme a competitive score is calculated as a sum of professional test score foreign language examination score and additional indexes of competitive selection in compliance with the Admission Rules of Zaporizhzhia National University. Candidates for Ph.D. Programmes should pass corresponding professional examination and examination in a foreign language (B 2 level) or get a corresponding TOEFL (Test of English as a Foreign Language), IELTS (International English Language Testing System) or CELA (Cambridge English Language Assessment) certificates in compliance with the Admission Rules of Zaporizhzhia National University [ZNU, Admission Rules, 2016].

It should be mentioned that ZNU has conducted an approbation process of a wide scale educational project “Conception of Foreign Language Study” for the last four years. Its aim is to enhance language competencies of both teachers and students. As a result of complicated and challenging activity on the realization of the idea, the developers of Conception of Foreign Language Study created its renewed framework. It will allow the university staff to improve their knowledge of foreign languages and meet the needs of the modern professional environment. The strategic plan of the realization of the conception covers four academic years (up to 2020/2021), it embraces all “non-foreign language” departments and targets at students and research and academic staff of ZNU. The practical aim of “Conception of Foreign Language Study” is forming general and professionally-oriented communicative skills and abilities for providing effective communication in academic and professional environment mastering a foreign language (English, German, and French) on B2 level. Exams in a foreign language should be taken at the end of the course with a score in a certificate that gives the right to work majoring in certain speciality using a foreign language. Master’s Degree Programmes offer a special course “Practically-oriented Foreign Language” and professionally-oriented subjects in foreign languages. Students getting their Master’s Degree should defend their thesis in foreign languages. Another important aspect of the realization of the renewed Conception is close cooperation between different departments. As a result of such effective
collaboration methodical and educational manuals on the study of professional disciplines in foreign languages will be published [ZNU, Renewed Conception, 2016].

It is important that since 2016 ZNU has been engaged in joint Estonia-Ukraine Project between Narva College Tartu University and ZNU “Introduction of the Multilingual System of Education and Methodology of Content and Language Integrated Learning” which contributed to the development of the renewed “Conception of Foreign Language Study” stimulated the implementation of the elements of the Methodology of Content and Language Integrated Learning into teaching process and created the basis for further research.

Thus, we have analyzed such official documents from Zaporizhzhia National university site as: The Statute, Study Regulations, Strategic Plan for 2016-2020, Strategic Plan for 2011-2020 and Admission Rules considering the aspects of language policy. We can conclude that Ukrainian as the state language is in priority in Zaporizhzhia National University, though there are multiple options for teaching other foreign languages (English, German and French), minority languages are not ignored. The Renewed Conception of Teaching Foreign languages contributes to the idea of language importance in the process of Ukrainian European integration, facilitating academic mobility resulting in effective international collaboration.
2.3. Profiles of University Community Members

University language policies are predominantly shaped by university communities’ needs and expectations in view of state language policies and requirements. In the spring term of the academic year 2016/2017 a questionnaire-based survey was conducted at Zaporizhzhia National University to provide data about ZNU community’s language profiles, their perception of language needs in the educational process and research, their opinions about language policies at the university and their attitudes towards multilingual education models in tertiary education.

Four questionnaires were composed to receive opinions and ideas from the university community: one for undergraduate, graduate students, one for postgraduate students, one for academic staff and one for administrative staff (Appendices 1,2,3,4). The first drafts of the questionnaires were discussed and tested by project members in small target groups until necessary updates had been made to meet the requirements of the study and the specifics of the university community. The questions were aimed at the description of the linguistic background of the university community and their attitude toward multilingual practices and policies at the university level.

The questionnaires were distributed via the Internet in corresponding Goggle forms. Simple random sampling (both descriptive – to collect information about the university community, and analytical – to compare the information obtained from its different groups) was used to include students (undergraduate and graduate), post-graduate students (PhD students), members of the academic staff and administrative staff from all 13 faculties of the University.
Table 1. The size of the sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups</th>
<th>Total number of group members (N)</th>
<th>Sample size (n)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate/graduate students</td>
<td>7050</td>
<td>1478</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-graduate students</td>
<td>310</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic staff</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>37.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative staff</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8810</td>
<td>1832</td>
<td>20.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zaporizhzhia National University is the largest university in the area. The student population of the university includes about 7500 full-time students (undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate). The staff of the university consists of teaching staff and administrative staff. The teaching staff include 630 instructors, lecturers and professors. The administrative staff can be divided into two subgroups: those who directly deal with students (like secretaries, librarians etc.) and those who do not deal with students (drivers, cooks etc.). The total number of administrative staff who directly deal with students reaches 120 people. The sample for our questionnaire varied from 14.8% to 72.5% for different groups. The largest number of answers (though not the largest fraction) was given by undergraduate and graduate students with the total number of 1478 answers making it 20.7%. 46 post-graduate students took part in the questionnaire reaching 14.8%. 235 university professors gave their views on the linguistic situation at the university, meaning that every third representative of the academic staff joined the survey. Representatives of the administrative staff were most active and 87 people (or three in four) participated in the study. Averagely, 1846 people or 21% (or every fifth) student or employee participated in the survey what gives us quite reliable figures and a rich representative sample pool.

2.3.1. University Community’s Background

Students
The first questions of the questionnaires were asked to identify respondents’ background (their department, year of studies for students, work experience for lecturers and administration members, their age, countries of birth and education, nationalities, etc.).

The sample of students includes two sub-groups: undergraduate and graduate students under one name “students” and post-graduate students (under the name of "PhD students"). Overall, 1524 students (1349 undergraduate students, 129 graduate students, 46 PhD students) participated in the survey and agreed to answer the questionnaire. They come from all departments of the university, follow different programmes and are representatives of different year groups:
As for the year of studies, the respondents can be arranged in the following diagram.

**Table 2. Year of Studies**

The diagram shows that the lowest number of responses was submitted by graduate and post-graduate students (9% and 3% respectively), while the number of answers from undergraduate students, totally reaching 88%, who are in different years of studies was more or less evenly distributed with a slightly lower sample pool of third-year undergraduate respondents.

As for the students’ departments of studies, the same sample pool of answers can be presented in a different way, what is actually given below.

**Table 3. Department of Studies**

The diagram shows that the lowest number of responses was submitted by graduate and post-graduate students (9% and 3% respectively), while the number of answers from undergraduate students, totally reaching 88%, who are in different years of studies was more or less evenly distributed with a slightly lower sample pool of third-year undergraduate respondents.
The undergraduate, graduate and PhD students from the Department of Foreign Philology gave the largest portion of answers. Notable is the fact that this department is the largest at the university and roughly every sixth student at the university majors in foreign languages. Another reason why the students from the Department of Foreign Philology were so active is the nature of the questionnaire which focuses on the use and role of languages in their lives.

As for the age, all student respondents can be divided into two groups of different sizes, relevant to our study. The first group includes those students who were born before 1991 or during the USSR period and the second group is represented by interviewees who were born after 1991, otherworldly, after Ukraine gained independence. Only 6% of student respondents were born during the Soviet times, mostly the respondents belong to the new generation.

Table 4. Year of Birth

![Year of Birth](image)

Another question of the survey also related to the students’ background, not to their attitudes concerning the language situation and language policy at ZNU and in Ukraine. This question asked the students’ country of birth. 97% of respondents said that they were born in Ukraine, among other countries were mentioned Armenia, Belarus, Germany, Italy, Moldova, the Netherlands, Poland, Russia, Slovenia, the USA, Uzbekistan, Viet Nam, two PhD students mentioned the USSR as their country of birth. This pool of answers is presented graphically below. The diagram clearly shows that the dominant majority of the students who participated in the survey were born in Ukraine.

Table 5. Country of Birth

![Country of Birth](image)
As for the countries of studies for both secondary education and bachelor / master / PhD degrees as well as the countries of living during the past 5 years, the situation at the university is even more homogeneous. Only 11 people (0.7%) said that they obtained secondary education in another country. These countries are the USA (3 students), Poland (2 students), one answer for Germany, Kazakhstan, Spain, and Moldova, one respondent mentioned the USSR as the country of birth.

As for bachelor’s / master’s degrees, 10 people (0.7%) said that they studied abroad. Among the mentioned countries are Azerbaijan, Germany, Japan, the Netherlands, Poland, South Korea, Spain, the UK, the USA, with one respondent mentioning the USSR.

As for the countries where the ZNU students spent the past 5 years, 99.5% of the surveyed students named Ukraine, while 7 respondents (0.5%) mentioned the USA (2 answers), China, Italy, the Netherlands, Singapore, and South Korea.

The information about the background of students concerning their country of birth, of secondary and higher education as well as the country of living over the past 5 years is given in the chart below.

**Table 6. Countries of residence and education**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country of living over the past 5 years</th>
<th>Ukraine</th>
<th>Other countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Country of studying for bachelor’s / master’s degree</td>
<td>1450</td>
<td>1460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of secondary education</td>
<td>1470</td>
<td>1480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of birth</td>
<td>1490</td>
<td>1500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, the student sample group shows that they represent different departments and different years of studies more or less evenly, though Foreign Philology students (undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate) were more active during this survey, probably due to the area of their studies and the nature of the survey. The results of the questionnaire show that the interviewed students were mostly born in Ukraine during the independence period, thus the views about the languages they submitted can be considered as views of youth of independent Ukraine from the South-East region still slightly influenced by the Soviet past and post-Soviet mentality. The surveyed students also went to school and university in Ukraine as well as spent in this country past 5 years of their life. We can also see that the student body of the university is not internationalized yet, 99% of the sample group never attended classes abroad, thus they are not familiar with the nature of the educational systems in other countries and the likelihood that their friends went abroad to study and shared their experiences is very low. In this context, the university is strongly advised to encourage their students to apply for academic exchange programmes, summer schools and other forms of formal and non-formal education abroad. The university should become more involved into the international programmes and prepare and provide the grounds for students to travel abroad, to expand their mind and bring new ideas to the university to modernize it and make it correspond international level and requirements.
**Academic Staff**

The sample of ZNU academic staff includes 234 respondents overall, the dominant majority – 224 of them are full time lecturers (95.7 %), 10 – have part-time employment contract (4.3%). The answers are presented in the following pie chart:

**Table 7. Type of employment contract**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of employment contract with the University</th>
<th>full time lecturers</th>
<th>part-time lectures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents from ZNU academic staff come from 13 departments, the number of the engaged respondents from each department is in proportion to the overall number of academic staff: Department of Biology: 10 (Chair of Forest Biology, Hunting Studies and Ichthyology – 3 (1,3%), Chair of General and Applied Ecology and Zoology – 3 (1,3%), Chair of Park and Garden Management and Genetics – 2 (0,9%), Chair of Physiology, Immunology and Biochemistry, Civil Defense and Medicine – 2 (0.9%)), Department of Economics: 16 (Chair of Economic Cybernetics – 2 (0,9%), Chair of International Economics, Natural Resources and Economic Theory – 13 (5,6%), Chair of Auditing and Taxation – 1 (0,4%)), Department of History: 16 (Chair of World History and International Relations – 8 (3,4%), Chair of Source Study, Historiography and Special History Disciplines – 4 (1,7%), Chair of History of Ukraine – 2 (0,9%), Chair of New History of Ukraine – 4 (1,7%)), Department of Mathematics: 6 (Chair of Software Engineering– 6 (2,6%)), Department of Journalism: 15 (Chair of Publishing and Editing – 5 (2,1%), Chair of Journalism – 3 (1,3%), Chair of Media Communication, Advertisement and Public Relations – 7 (3%)), Department of Foreign Philology: 65 (Chair of Theory and Practice of English Translation – 11 (4,75%), Chair of Second Language Teaching – 15 (6,4%), Chair of Foreign Languages for Specific Purposes- 17 (7,3%), Chair of English Philology – 9 (3,8%), Chair of German Philology and Translation – 8 (3,4%), Chair of Romance Philology and Translation – 5 (2,1%)). Department of Management: 24 (Chair of Business Administration and Management of International Economic Activity – 6 (2,6%), Chair of Business Communication – 12 (5,1%), Chair of Entrepreneurship, Management of Enterprise and Logistics- 6 (2,6%), Department of Social Pedagogics and Psychology: 17 (Chair of Psychology – 6 (2,6%), Chair of Social Pedagogics” – 6 (2,6%), Chair of Theatrical Art and Design – 1 (0,4%), Chair of Pedagogics and Psychology of Educational Activity – 4 (1,7%), Department of Sociology and Administration: 13 (Chair of Political Studies – 2 (0,9%), Chair of Social Philosophy and Administration – 3 (1,3%), Chair of Sociology – 5 (2,1%) Chair of Social Philosophy – 3 (1,3%)). Department of Physical Training: 11 (Chair of Tourism – 8 (3,4%), Chair of Physical Training and Sport – 1 (0,4%), Chair of Physical Rehabilitation – 2 (0,9%)), Department of Physics: 3 (Chair of Applied Physics and Nanomaterials – 2 (0,9%),
Chair of Physics and Methods of Teaching – 1 (0,4%), Department of Philology: 16 (Chair of Slavic Philology – 6 (2,6%), Chair of Ukrainian Literature – 3 (1,3%), Chair of Ukrainian Language – 7 (3%)), Department of Law: 22 (Chair of Administrative and Economic Law – 4 (1,7%), Chair of History and Theory of State and Law – 6 (2,5 %), Chair of Constitutional and Employment Law” – 4 (1,7%), Chair of Criminal Law and Justice – 4 (1,7%), Chair of Civil Law – 4 (1,7%) respectively).

The pie chart below shows the percentage of academic staff respondents from each department:

Table 8. Academic staff department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Staff Departments</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biology</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalism</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociology and Administration</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physics</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Law</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economics</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mathematics</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Philology</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Pedagogics and Psychology</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical Training</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philology</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart below demonstrates that the majority of the sample pool is represented by Candidates of Sciences (PhD equivalent) – 163, lower number of 21 Doctors of Science (9%) and 35 Masters (15%) and the lowest number of 15 Specialists (6, 4%), reflecting the current situation in ZNU:
Table 9. Academic degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Academic Degree</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Doctors of Science</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Candidates of Science (PhD equivalent)</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialists</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As for the age, all academic staff respondents can be divided into six groups with the first of the smallest size and the forth and the fifth being the most numerous:

1 – 8 (3 %) born before 1950;
2 – 18 (8%) between 1950-1960;
3 – 35 (15%) between 1960-1970;
4 – 80 (34 %) between 1970-1980;
5 – 73 (31 %) between 1980-1990;
6 – 20 (9 %) after 1991

Table 10. Age of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of the Respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>born before 1950</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 1950-1960</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 1960-1970</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 1970-1980</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 1980-1990</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>after 1991</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The survey shows that the dominant majority of the respondents were born in Ukraine (202-91%), 9 (4 %) were born in Russia, 4 (2 %) in Belarus, 19 (8%) in other countries specified as USSR, Poland, Kazakhstan, Germany, Uzbekistan, Armenia.
Table 11. Country of Birth

Almost all the members of the ZNU academic staff surveyed named Ukraine as the country where they received general secondary education, masters and candidate degrees (with 6 %, 4.3 % and 4.4 % exception respectively). Four respondents specified Russia as the country where they received secondary education and their master's degree, five respondents got their candidate degree in Russia and only one lived in Russia over the past 5 years. The small rest of the surveyed specified in the option "other" the former Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic. This pool of answers is presented graphically below.

Table 12. Countries of Residence and Education

Thus, the results of the first part of the questionnaires identified the academic staff respondents’ characteristics, their background and demonstrate at least two traits. The very fact that the dominant majority of the interviewed are full time lecturers with PhD, representing their departments in proportion to the overall number of the employed academicians, aged in the range of 27 – 47, may be assessed positively and proves sustainability, appropriate qualification and high potential of the academic staff. Though, the fact that most of the surveyed were born in Ukraine, received their secondary, graduate and PhD education in Ukraine and all the Doctors of Science received their post-doctoral degree in Ukraine may demonstrate certain “confined” features in the system of academic training due to lack of possibilities and imperfect legislation policy.
Non-academic staff

Totally, 74 representatives of the administrative staff, of those who directly deal with students, took part in the survey. That number makes 62% of people who work in different offices: PhD Department, Academic Office, Office of Pre-University preparation, Counseling Guidance and Employment Office, Office of Student Human Resources, International Office, Office of Project Management, Library, Science and Research Office, University Newspaper, University Media Portal “Porohy”, University Press-Center, University Radio “Universe”, Rectorat, Sports and Health Complex, Students’ Council, Center of Culture, Center of Independent Sociological Research. The most active were respondents from Library (27 respondents), Academic Office (11 respondents), Science and Research Office (7 respondents), Office of Student Human Resources (6 respondents). The pie chart shows this information graphically.

Table 13. Administrative Offices

The answers among the offices are not evenly distributed as they vary in size considerably.

As for the year of birth, all administrative staff can be divided by decades from before 1950 to after 1991, when Ukraine gained independence. The decades are evenly distributed, with only fewer people born in 1951-1960. The spectrum of the administrative staff age is given in the chart below:
As 38% of administrative staff representatives are almost over 50 years old, they may turn out to have forgotten the languages they learnt as students or be less reluctant to learn languages now.

Another question of the survey also related to the employees' background, not to their attitudes concerning the language situation and language policy at ZNU and in Ukraine. This question asked the respondents' country of birth. 91% of the interviewees said that they were born in Ukraine, among other countries were mentioned Russia, Kazakhstan, one person mentioned the USSR as their country of birth. This pool of answers is presented graphically below. The diagram clearly shows that the dominant majority of the people who participated in this survey were born in Ukraine.
in another country. These countries are Russia (3 respondents), the USSR (1 respondent). As for the specialist’s / master’s / PhD / post-doc degrees, they were all received in Ukraine. All the respondents said that they had lived in Ukraine for the last 5 years.

Overall, the administrative representatives show that they represent different offices and belong to different generations. The results of the questionnaire show that this group is almost 100% homogeneous as 90% of them were born in Ukraine, where they all received higher education and spent last 5 years. In this context, the university is strongly advised to stimulate their non-academic staff to apply for exchange programmes and projects abroad.

2.3.2 The Main Languages of the University Community

**Students**

The questionnaires provide data about the degree of multilingualism of the university community in terms of how many languages they know and what the perceived level of language mastery in each group of respondents is. It should be noted that the level of language mastery is self-assessed and can differ from their real level of language when tested; still self-assessment is a good index as it can show the degree to which the respondents understand a foreign language, written and oral speech, everyday vocabulary and vocabulary for special purposes.

As for the languages known by ZNU students, the results of the survey show that the language spectrum is quite wide and knowledge and mastery of languages vary from A1 to C2, depending on the wide-spreadness and popularity of the language in the modern world, territorial closeness, common historical past and the level of economic development of the country that speaks the language.

The total number of languages mentioned by students in the survey (not necessarily spoken by them) is as high as 45. Among them are such living languages as Afrikaans, Arabic, Armenian, Azerbaijani, Belorussian, Bulgarian, Chechen, Chinese, Crimean Tatar, Czech, Dutch, English, Finnish, French, Georgian, German, Greek, Hebrew, Hindi, Japanese, Korean, Lithuanian, Moldavian, Norwegian, Polish, Portuguese, Romanian, Romany, Russian, Samoan, Sindhi, Slovenian, Spanish, Swahili, Swedish, Tajik, Telugu, Turkish, Ukrainian, Vietnamese, such dead languages as Old Slavic and Latin, a constructed language of Esperanto and “surzhyk” which is a dialect typical of South-East Ukraine that is half-Russian half-Ukrainian mongrel language. In the survey the sign language was also mentioned as a system of communication.

Different aspects of the students’ view of the linguistic situation at ZNU and Zaporizhzhia region can be summarized and visualized in a number of following tables and graphs.

Before the analysis of skills of different languages, it is necessary to identify the languages students speak and the order in which they were acquired. Table 2 shows the number of students who mentioned the languages in the order they were learnt. It turns out that the questionnaire suggested mentioning four acquired languages, while some students identified their skills in 5 and sometimes even in 6 languages. For this reason, the number of answers in different parts of the survey can vary a little.
Table 16. Language mastery of ZNU students (i.e. Languages known by students)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>L4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>858</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>1204</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>474</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same table, if it mentions the percentage, can give a better understanding of the linguistic past of the ZNU student sample (1524 respondents).

Table 17. Language mastery of ZNU students (i.e. Languages known by students), percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>L4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>32.2%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>97.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>31.1%</td>
<td>39.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19 undergraduate, graduate and post-graduate respondents said that they learnt Armenian, Azerbaijani, Belorussian, Chechen, Georgian, Polish, Romanian, Slovenian, Turkish, Vietnamese as first or second language. As for the third or fourth languages, students frequently mentioned Spanish and Italian.

It is noteworthy that all the respondents say that they have learned and speak at least three languages, though their level of mastery varies as the further analysis shows. Moreover, over two thirds (68%) have studied the fourth language in their life. The data shows that 1522 responders (99.9%) learnt Ukrainian as their first, second, third or fourth language. Two responders did not mention Ukrainian in their answers, either it was the fifth language they acquired and the fifth language was not an option provided by the questionnaire or they may have assumed that the mother tongue is beyond mentioning and they did not pay attention to it.

The Russian language is another most frequent language learnt as L1 or L2, but on the background of four acquired languages it is a little behind English which is said to have been studied by 1485 or 97.5% of the student responders while 1479 responders or 97% claimed that they learnt Russian. This disproportion in the number of Russian and English learners is again explained by the fact that respondents may have assumed that Russian is beyond mentioning as it happened with Ukrainian. Another possible explanation is that students might have thought that this survey is about the languages they learnt officially and had classes of
and Russian is not a compulsory subject at schools in Ukraine, thus, they did not learn it officially and did not mention it in the survey.

German and French hold the fourth and the fifth positions respectively as they have been studied by 608 (39.9%) and 276 (18.1%) respondents. 225 surveyed students have studied other languages, what falls for 14.76% of respondents.

It also should be noted that there are no monolingual students at ZNU, everybody speaks at least 3 languages, and some have acquired more. There are also such multilingual students who can speak more than four languages like:

- over 100 students claimed that they speak Ukrainian, Russian, English and two more languages among which are German, French, Spanish or Italian;
- 5 students speak Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, Polish;
- 3 students speak Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, Bulgarian;
- 2 students speak Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, Korean;
- 2 students speak Ukrainian, Russian, English, French, Polish;
- 2 students speak Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, Japanese;
- 2 students speak Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, Armenian;
- 2 students speak Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, Turkish;
- 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, French, and Armenian;
- 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, French, and Czech;
- 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, French, and Korean;
- 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, German and Swedish;
- 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, Georgian;
- 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, Spanish, Azerbaijani.

From the skills assessment part of the survey it is clear that 13 students speak six languages, among them are:

- 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, French, Polish, Czech;
- 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, French, Spanish, Polish;
- 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, French, Spanish, Portuguese;
- 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, French, Spanish, Turkish;
- 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, French, Armenian;
- 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, French, Bulgarian;
- 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, French, Dutch;
- 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, French, Lithuanian;
- 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, French, Polish;
• 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, Spanish, Bulgarian;
• 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, Spanish, Japanese;
• 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, Spanish, Polish;
• 1 student speaks Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, Spanish, Vietnamese.

Thus, the survey shows that the situation at ZNU is far from being monolingual, some students claim multilingualism reaching 6 languages at times. The survey results show very good prospects for the internationalization of the university as all the students are the speakers of at least three languages: Ukrainian, as the official state language, Russian, the local language and the language of international communication in the post-Soviet world, and a third language usually English, sometimes German or French, though English has a much higher fraction (1485 or 97.5%) of learners. Keeping in mind that some students can speak 4, 5 or even 6 languages, the prospects of the university for internationalization only increase.

The linguistic situation at ZNU is the mirror of the linguistic situation in Ukraine and the next question revealed it well. Since 2013 Ukraine has been going through a very difficult political and economic crisis, and the consequence is the rejection of Russian by some citizens in some aspects or areas of communication. In this respect we should mention the fact that Russian as the first acquired language stopped to be the mother tongue for some respondents. Overall, there is a tendency to identify Ukrainian, not Russian, as a mother tongue, though it does not mean that it was not the first language learnt, that they do not use it more frequently for daily communication at home or at university. It is more a political issue, the issue of national principle than of use and communication. 29 students also said that they use surzhyk or Russia-Ukrainian mongrel dialect at home, 3 responders use Russian and Ukrainian equally frequently. This all is shown in the table below.

Table 18. First Language, Mother Tongues, Home language, percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mother tongue</th>
<th>Home Language</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>576</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>812</td>
<td>53.28%</td>
<td>259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>60.04%</td>
<td>694</td>
<td>45.54%</td>
<td>1213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>2.16%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1.18%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>1524</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This general tendency can be presented in a graph to show the rise and fall of language preferences among the interviewed students depending on the situation. We can see that the popularity of Ukrainian as a mother tongue is increasing at the expense of the decreasing status of Russian and other languages, though it reaches just a bit over a half of responses (53.3%). The situation changes dramatically at home, where Ukrainian is mostly avoided or ousted by Russian which is the language of home communication for over 80% of respondents.
Other languages spoken at home are Armenian, Belorussian, Chechen, Chinese, Polish, Romanian, Turkish, and Vietnamese.

As for the use of different languages within the university walls as languages of instruction, they are presented in the chart below. It shows that almost all students admit using different languages, though the degree varies considerably. The three most often spoken languages as languages of instruction are Ukrainian (1524 responses), Russian (1523 responses) and English (1481 responses). It is also notable that 817 respondents stated that Russian is used at the permanent basis at the university, while Ukrainian reaches only 616 responses. One student claimed that Russian is not used for studies at ZNU. In terms of their use, Ukrainian, Russian and English are followed by German, French, Spanish, Polish, Bulgarian and other languages, among which, according to the surveyed students, are Arabic, Armenian, Azerbaijani, Belorussian, Chechen, Chinese, Crimean Tatar, Hebrew, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Latin, Old Slavic, Portuguese, Turkish, Vietnamese, and surzhyk – Russian-Ukrainian mongrel dialect.

Table 20. Frequently used languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>1 (almost never)</th>
<th>2 (seldom)</th>
<th>3 (often)</th>
<th>4 (usually)</th>
<th>5 (always)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The contrary to the chart of used languages, a chart of rarely used languages is presented below.

**Table 21. Rarely used languages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Median (ML)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>4.045276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>4.293307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2.295879</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1.253937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0.906824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>0.703412</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>0.500656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>0.39895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.372703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though almost every student mentioned the use of at least 3 languages within the university, the degree and frequency of their use vary considerably. The following chart presents the arithmetic median for every language. The mean was calculated this way:

\[
M_L = \frac{(A_5 \times 5 + A_4 \times 4 + A_3 \times 3 + A_2 \times 2 + A_1 \times 1 + A_0 \times 0)}{1524},
\]

where \(A_5, A_4, A_3, A_2, A_1, A_0\) are the numbers of students’ answers for every language multiplied by the points students gave to them and divided by the total number of responders.

Thus, the arithmetic medians for different languages acquired such numbers:

- \(M_{Ukrainian} = 4.045276\)
- \(M_{Russian} = 4.293307\)
- \(M_{English} = 2.295879\)
- \(M_{German} = 1.253937\)
- \(M_{French} = 0.906824\)
- \(M_{Spanish} = 0.703412\)
- \(M_{Polish} = 0.500656\)
- \(M_{Bulgarian} = 0.39895\)
- \(M_{Other} = 0.372703\)

This bar graph clearly shows that on average Russian is slightly more frequently used within the university walls as a language of instruction. The attitude towards both Russian and Ukrainian as mother tongues, first and second acquired languages, languages of communication at home allows using them equally for the overall benefit of the students in terms of both multilingualism and internationalization of the educational establishment.
The surveyed students also expressed their linguistic preferences for both official and unofficial communication and the use of different languages for different purposes like studies, hobbies, interests, work etc. It should be mentioned that students were allowed to choose multiple languages in this part of the questionnaire. The summarized data of language preference for specific purposes is given in the following chart.

**Table 23. Students’ Language Preferences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Ukrainian</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Bulgarian</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family communication</td>
<td>839</td>
<td>1383</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community communication and languages you overhear in the streets</td>
<td>1164</td>
<td>1509</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University communication for studies and learning</td>
<td>1254</td>
<td>1301</td>
<td>637</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University communication: with administration</td>
<td>1114</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International projects</td>
<td>1084</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>933</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/academic writing (course and diploma papers, etc.) at university</td>
<td>1500</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The chart below represents the same information, but in terms of fraction this time.

Table 24. Students’ Language Preferences, percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Ukrainian</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Bulgarian</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Communication at work</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>90.7%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community communication and languages you overhear in the streets</td>
<td>76.4%</td>
<td>99%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>35.4%</td>
<td>36.7%</td>
<td>34.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University communication for studies and learning</td>
<td>82.3%</td>
<td>85.4%</td>
<td>41.8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University communication: with administration</td>
<td>73.1%</td>
<td>71.9%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
<td>0.07%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International projects</td>
<td>71.1%</td>
<td>38.8%</td>
<td>61.2%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/academic writing (course and diploma papers, etc.) at university</td>
<td>98.4%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If we summarize all the analyzed parameters, we can see that the students who study at ZNU predominantly resort to Ukrainian, Russian and English, with Russian getting high points for almost every category, among them are family communication, community communication, reading, songs, sports, TV, the Internet and traveling. Ukrainian and Russian are used with about the same frequency for communication with administration (73.1% vs 71.9%, respectively), for studies (82.3% vs 85.4% respectively), for communication at work (67.9% vs 68.4% respectively) and TV and mass media (80.5% vs 79.4% respectively). We can also say that Ukrainian, Russian and English are the languages of choice for traveling (63.3 – Ukrainian, 76.4% – Russian, 62.7% – English). Ukrainian considerably ousts other languages for research and academic writing (98.4% – Ukrainian, 12.9% – Russian, 15.7% – English). As for international projects, Ukrainian and English are the languages of preference (71.1% – Ukrainian, 38.8% – Russian, 61.2% English). According to the survey, students prefer songs in English (95% – English, 86.5% – Russian, 73.4% – Ukrainian). As for the languages students miss at university, every fourth respondent said that they miss English and every third respondent said that they do not miss any language. The only case when other language (not Ukrainian, Russian or English) was frequently mentioned was when students responded that they listen to music in French. Totally, the chart above shows that Russian is the language of informal communication, family communication and leisure, Ukrainian is the language of official communication and academic writing, English is the language of international projects, music and songs and the Internet and social media. English, thus, has excellent grounds for establishing itself as a language of instruction at ZNU. It is advisable that the university diversify the languages of education and give the higher portion for classes where foreign languages can be used. One of the ways is to offer a wider choice of elective courses in English.

In the next part of the survey the students were to assess their level and knowledge of different languages. The suggested language choices included the languages often studied at ZNU and the range encompasses Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, French, and Spanish. The students were also provided with an option to assess their skills in other languages not mentioned in the questionnaire. The total overview of the language mastery runs the figures given below in a number of charts.
The analysis of students’ mastery of different languages clearly shows that all the university students are able speakers of at least 3 languages. Firstly, we suggest analyzing their skills in Ukrainian with the help of the previously used formula that is:

\[ S_{\text{Language}} = \frac{C2*6+C1*5+B2*4+B1*3+A2*2+A1*1}{x}, \]

where \(C2, C1, B2, B1, A2, A1\) are the numbers of students’ answers with the corresponding skills for a definite language multiplied by the points from 6 to 1 that and divided by \(x\) which is the total number of students who evaluated their skills in a particular language.

\[ Table\ 25.\ Average\ Mastery\ of\ Ukrainian\]

\[ Table\ 26.\ Average\ Mastery\ of\ Russian\]
On average, the students’ skills of Russian vary between 5.3 and 5.6, that is between C1 and C2. As we can see, the skills of Russian are by 0.1 higher than of Ukrainian.

1423 students (93.4%) answered the questionnaire about English and evaluated their skills. The summarized median skills in English are given in the chart below:

**Table 27. Average Mastery of English**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>3.15</th>
<th>3.2</th>
<th>3.25</th>
<th>3.3</th>
<th>3.35</th>
<th>3.4</th>
<th>3.45</th>
<th>3.5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, the students’ skills of English vary between 3.2 and 3.5, that is between B1 and B2. Again, it shows that the university has very high prospects for introducing courses in English and making itself more open to the students and academia from abroad if the general skills of students are boosted by just one level.

618 students (40.6%) answered the questionnaire about German, what allowed calculating the average skills of respondents.

**Table 28. Average Mastery of German**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>1.39</th>
<th>1.4</th>
<th>1.41</th>
<th>1.42</th>
<th>1.43</th>
<th>1.44</th>
<th>1.45</th>
<th>1.46</th>
<th>1.47</th>
<th>1.48</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
On average, the students’ skills of German vary between 1.4 and 1.5, that is between A1 and A2. It is noteworthy that over 40% of the respondents have learnt this language and, thus, this language presents a huge potential for both the students and the university if the skills of the students are further developed.

297 respondents (19.5%) gave their views on their skills of French. Their median level of the acquired language is presented in the graph below:

Table 29. Average Mastery of French

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Mastery of French</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, the students’ skills of French vary between 1.0 and 1.1, that is around A1. German is more common and every third student can speak it at least at the minimum level. This, however, is not the case with French, which is spoken by every fifth respondent, mostly from the department of Foreign Philology.

156 students (10.2%), who participated in the survey, said that they know Spanish. Their average skills can be presented in the following chart:

Table 30. Average Mastery of Spanish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Mastery of Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for academic purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On average, the students’ skills of Spanish vary between 2.6 and 2.8, that is between B1 and B2. This time the number of respondents is so high due to the students of Department of Foreign Philology where this language is one of 4 languages of instruction. Outside the Department, the skills of Spanish are very low and the language is not very common.
77 surveyed students (5.1%) said that they can speak other languages and assessed themselves and their skills in these languages. The median skills are shown below:

**Table 31. Average Mastery of Other Languages**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ukrainian</strong></td>
<td>1524</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Russian</strong></td>
<td>1477</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>69.7%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>English</strong></td>
<td>1423</td>
<td>93.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>German</strong></td>
<td>618</td>
<td>40.6%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French</strong></td>
<td>297</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spanish</strong></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>19.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other languages</strong></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The bar chart shows that their skills on average vary from 2.8 to 3.3, that is from B1 to B2. The most common language mentioned was Polish, followed by Bulgarian and Italian. All the three languages are taught at ZNU. As for other languages, students responded that they know Armenian, Azerbaijani, Chinese, Czech, Dutch, Japanese, Korean, Lithuanian, Portuguese, Romanian, Samoan, Slovenian, Swedish, Turkish, Vietnamese.

Resorting to the average skills of different languages in different terms, we can also present percentage of respondents who identified their skills within a particular knowledge group, what is shown in the chart below.

**Table 32. Language mastery at ZNU**
From this chart we can see that 80-90% of surveyed students identified their skills of Ukrainian and Russian as advanced and proficient overall, from everyday communication to academic writing. English occupies a valuable third position as it is spoken/learnt by over 90% of students and 50% of users identify their skills as intermediate or higher, with almost 25% mentioning that their knowledge is just a level lower than intermediate. The skills of other languages decrease and they go in the following order: German, French, Spanish and other languages, like Polish and Bulgarian.

Overall, the survey of students’ views of the linguistic situation and their mastery of different languages identifies ZNU as a multilingual educational establishment that has a huge potential to develop linguistically and internationally. To achieve it, it is necessary that a wise policy of multilingual education should be introduced. On average, English is already at intermediate level, but it should be noted that the students self-assessed their skills and their self-assessment may differ from official tests and international exams. English is currently more a language of unofficial communication, language of hobbies, music and social media, but it can be turned into the language of official communication and instruction if the university attracts foreign teachers or speakers, introduces more elective courses in English, sets up speaking clubs, holds events in English, engages students more actively into foreign projects and encourages more students to become exchange students or volunteer during holidays in some projects abroad. The university can also offer free tests for students at the end of semester for them to see their progress and strengths and analyze their weaknesses. With the current situation and suggested approaches, the university can prosper both nationally and internationally as it will supply efficient and skillful specialists to the job market.

**Academic Staff**

The questionnaires provide data about the degree of multilingualism of the university academic staff community in terms of how many languages they know and the perceived level of language mastery. It should be noted that though the representatives of the surveyed academic staff are expected to be conscious of the level of language mastery, their self-assessment can differ from their real level of language when tested. However, as it was already mentioned, self-assessment is a good index as it can show the degree to which the respondents understand a foreign language, written and oral speech, everyday vocabulary and vocabulary for special purposes.

As for the languages known by ZNU academic staff respondents, the results of the survey show that the language spectrum is narrower compared to students-respondents’ pool, knowledge and mastery of languages vary from A1 to C2. The total number of languages mentioned by lecturers in the survey (not necessarily spoken by them) is as high as 17. Among them there are such living languages as Belorussian, Bulgarian, Chechen, Chinese, Dutch, English, French, German, Hindi, Japanese, Norwegian, Polish, Russian, Spanish, Turkish, Ukrainian, such dead language as Latin.

The academic staff vision of the linguistic situation at ZNU and Zaporizhzhia region can be summarized in a number of following tables and graphs.

Before the analysis of skills of different languages, it is necessary to identify the languages lecturers speak and the order in which they were acquired. Table 33 shows the number of teachers who mentioned the languages in the order they were learnt.
Table 33. Language mastery of ZNU academic staff (i.e. Languages known by academic staff respondents)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>L4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same table, if it mentions the percentage, can give a better understanding of the linguistic past of the academic staff sample (234 respondents).

Table 34. Language mastery of ZNU academic staff (i.e. Languages known by academic staff respondents), percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>L4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>99.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>63.7%</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>94.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>25.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Two surveyed respondents mentioned Polish as the second language they know in order of acquisition, two respondents named Bulgarian and three respondents – Spanish as the third language; ten – mentioned Polish, six – Spanish, two – Bulgarian, one – Belarus and one – Italian as the forth language of acquisition.

It is important to note that all the respondents said that they learned and speak at least three languages, though their level of mastery varies as the further analysis shows. Moreover, almost two thirds (51.9 %) have studied the fourth language in their life. The data shows that all the 234 respondents (100 %) learned Ukrainian as their first, second, third or fourth language.

The Russian language is another most frequent language learnt as L1 or L2, learnt by 232 (99.6 %), English is only a little behind which is said to have been studied by 203 (99.4 %).

German and French hold the fourth and the fifth positions respectively as they have been studied by 95 (51.9%) and 50 (28.1%) respondents. 43 surveyed students have studied other languages, what falls for 25.6% of respondents.

The next issue considered referred to the status and priority of languages applied in different situations. Overall, more representatives of academic staff identify Ukrainian as a mother tongue – 129 (55.1%), compared to those 105 (44.9 %) who mentioned Russian as their mother
tongue. The situation changes dramatically at home, since only 73 (30.8%) respondents name Ukrainian as their home language and 161 (68.8%) apply mostly Russian in their home communication. This all is shown in the table below and in a graph.

Table 35. Language mastery of ZNU academic staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mother tongue</th>
<th>Home Language</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>39.3%</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>55.1%</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>44.9%</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>234</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 36. First language, Mother Tongue, Home Language

As for the frequency of different languages within the university walls as languages the academic staff use for instruction, they are presented in the chart below. It shows that almost all respondents admit using different languages, though the degree varies considerably. The dominant majority of respondents (232 answers) assert that they always, usually or often use Ukrainian in the process of teaching, more than two thirds (167 answers) say that they also use Russian either always, usually or often, and more than half of the respondents (128 answers) choose English as such an option. Thus the three most often spoken languages as languages of instruction are Ukrainian, Russian and English. They are followed by German with almost one third of the respondents (68 answers), French — one fifth (43 answers) and the rest of the languages – Spanish, Polish, Bulgarian and others (Latin, Italian, Belarus) presented in the minority.
Table 37. Frequently used languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>4.521368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>2.893162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>2.175214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>0.636752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0.431624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>0.222222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>0.166667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>0.222222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.683761</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Even though almost all the members of academic staff mentioned the use of at least 3 languages within the university, the degree and frequency of their use vary considerably. The following chart presents the arithmetic median for every language. The mean was calculated this way:

\[
M_L = \frac{A_5 \times 5 + A_4 \times 4 + A_3 \times 3 + A_2 \times 2 + A_1 \times 1 + A_0 \times 0}{234},
\]

where \(A_5, A_4, A_3, A_2, A_1, A_0\) are the numbers of lectures' answers for every language multiplied by the points the members of academic staff gave to them and divided by the total number of responders.

Thus, the arithmetic medians for different languages acquired such numbers:

- \(M_{\text{Ukrainian}} = 4.521368\)
- \(M_{\text{Russian}} = 2.893162\)
- \(M_{\text{English}} = 2.175214\)
- \(M_{\text{German}} = 0.636752\)
- \(M_{\text{French}} = 0.431624\)
- \(M_{\text{Spanish}} = 0.222222\)
- \(M_{\text{Polish}} = 0.166667\)
- \(M_{\text{Bulgarian}} = 0.222222\)
- \(M_{\text{Other}} = 0.683761\)

The results of the survey show that the university academic staff function in compliance with the University Statute, which gives priority to Ukrainian as the language of instruction in Zaporizhzhia National University, and it focuses on the creation of lifelong language learning providing mandatory mastering of the Ukrainian language and the possibility to learn native (national) and foreign languages. The bar graph clearly shows that on average Ukrainian is more frequently used by the members of the academic staff as the language of instruction. The second popular language is Russian, the third place is occupied by English, and the rest of the languages are in the minority.
The surveyed members of the academic staff also expressed their linguistic preferences for both official and unofficial communication and the use of different languages for different purposes like studies, hobbies, interests, work etc. It should be mentioned that the respondents were allowed to choose multiple languages in this part of the questionnaire. The summarized data of language preference for specific purposes is given in the following chart.

**Table 39. Academic Staff’s Language Preferences**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Ukrainian</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Bulgarian</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family communication</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community communication and languages you overhear in the streets</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University communication for studies and learning</td>
<td>226</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University communication: with administration</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International projects</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research/academic writing (course and diploma papers, etc.) at university</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Not interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication at work</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with friends</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading for leisure</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to music</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV and mass media</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet/social networking</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I miss this language at university</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart below presents the same information graphically.

**Table 40. Language use at ZNU**

![Graph showing language use at ZNU](image_url)
If we summarize all the analyzed parameters, we can see that academic respondents at ZNU predominantly resort to Ukrainian, Russian and English, with Ukrainian and Russian getting high points for almost every category.

It is also noteworthy that in official communication (university communication for studies and learning, university communication with administration, International projects, Research/academic writing) Ukrainian tends to dominate significantly, that is, in university communication for studies and learning 96.6% respondents prefer Ukrainian compared to 40.2% who choose Russian, in university communication with administration 96.2% prefer Ukrainian vs 37.2% Russian, for International projects – 57.3% vs 27.8, for Research/academic writing – 98.3% vs 17.1%.

Unofficial communication represents mostly certain equality between Ukrainian and Russian with even some dominance of the latter as the language more frequently used for family communication (88% vs 70.9%) and the language heard in the street (98.3% vs 85.9%). Ukrainian and Russian are considered to be almost equally used with a slight dominance of Ukrainian for work outside the University (62% vs 57.7%, respectively), communication with colleagues (82.1% vs 79.5% respectively), sports (61.1% vs 51.3% respectively), Internet/social networking (82.9% vs 82.1% respectively), traveling (79.9% vs 76.1% respectively); TV and mass media (88.5% vs 70.9% respectively), listening to music (90.6% vs 83.3% respectively). A slight dominance of Russian can be seen only when the languages are used in reading for leisure (77.8% vs 81.6% respectively).

We can also say that English is in priority as the language for international projects (74.8%), frequently used in Internet/social networking (61.1%), traveling (67.1%), and rivals with Ukrainian in listening to music (90.6% vs 90.2% respectively). The only case when other language (not Ukrainian, Russian or English) was frequently mentioned was when students responded that they listen to music in French (49.6%).

As for the languages lecturers miss at university, 20.9% respondents said that they miss English (20.8%), Ukrainian (10.3%), German (4.7%), Russian (3.4%), and 56.4% respondents said that they do not miss any language.

In the next part of the survey the members of ZNU academic staff were to assess their level and knowledge of different languages. The suggested language choices included the languages commonly taught and studied at ZNU and the range encompasses Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, French, and Spanish. The lecturers were also provided with an option to assess their skills in other languages not mentioned in the questionnaire. The total overview of the language mastery runs the figures given below in a number of charts.

The analysis of lecturers’ mastery of different languages clearly shows that all the members of ZNU academic staff can speak at least 3 languages. Firstly, we suggest analyzing their skills in Ukrainian with the help of the previously used formula that is:

\[ S_{\text{Language}} = \frac{(C2 \times 6 + C1 \times 5 + B2 \times 4 + B1 \times 3 + A2 \times 2 + A1 \times 1)}{x}, \]

where C2, C1, B2, B1, A2, A1 are the numbers of academic staff responders’ answers with the corresponding skills for a definite language multiplied by the points from 6 to 1 that and divided by x which is the total number of students who evaluated their skills in a particular language.
234 members of ZNU academic staff answered the questions concerning their skills in Ukrainian. On average, the lecturers are proficient users and their skills of Ukrainian vary between 5.5 and 5.9, that is almost between C1 and C2. The results are shown in the chart below.

**Table 41. Average Mastery of Ukrainian**

![Chart showing average mastery of Ukrainian skills](chart.png)

227 respondents answered the questions concerning their skills in Russian. The summarized results are presented in the chart below:

**Table 42. Average Mastery of Russian**

![Chart showing average mastery of Russian skills](chart.png)

On average, the lecturers' skills of Russian vary between 5.7 and 5.84, that is between C1 and C2. As we can see, the skills of Russian are by 0.1 lower than of Ukrainian.

199 respondents from the academic staff pool (85 %) answered the questionnaire about English and evaluated their skills. The summarized median skills in English are given in the chart below:
Table 43. Average Mastery of English

On average, the lecturer’s skills of English vary between 3.25 and 3.7, which is between B1 and B2. Again, it shows that the university has very high prospects for European integration and introducing courses in English would make it more open to the students and academia from abroad.

54 members of ZNU academic staff (23%) answered the questionnaire about German, what allowed calculating the average skills of respondents.

Table 44. Average Mastery of German

On average, the lecturers’ skills of German vary between 3.3 and 3.9, that is between B1 and B2. It is noteworthy that 51.9% of the respondents have learnt this language and, thus, this language presents a huge potential for both the students and the university if the skills of the students are further developed.

Only 37 respondents (15.8%) gave their views on their skills of French. Their median level of the acquired language is presented in the graph below:
Table 45. Average Mastery of French

![Average Mastery of French](image)

On average, the lecturers’ skills of French vary between 3.75 and 4.25, that is between around B1 and C2. It is obvious, that German is more common both among lecturers and students. Though, it is natural, that academic staff assessed their level of French higher compared to students.

15 lecturers (6.4%), who participated in the survey, said that they know Spanish. Their average skills can be presented in the following chart:

Table 46. Average Mastery of Spanish

![Average Mastery of Spanish](image)

On average, the lecturers’ skills of Spanish vary between 4.25 and 4.7, that is around C2. The respondents are not numerous, though their skills of Spanish are very high, probably at the expense of the Department of Foreign language participating in the survey.

17 surveyed representatives of ZNU academic staff (7.3%) said that they can speak other languages and assessed themselves and their skills in these languages. The languages mentioned
were Belorussian (2 answers), Bulgarian (5 answers), Italian (2 answers), Polish (6 answers), Turkish (1 answer). The median skills are shown below:

Table 47. Average Mastery of Other languages

The bar chart shows that their skills on average vary from 3.18 to 4.09, that is from B1 to B2. Resorting to the average skills of different languages in different terms, we can also present percentage of respondents who identified their skills within a particular knowledge group, what is shown in the chart below.

Table 48. Language mastery at ZNU

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Total number of respondents</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>82.9%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>20.9%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23.08%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>19.3%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>23.5%</td>
<td>28.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>28.1%</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>29.3%</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other languages</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>17.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From this chart we can see that more than 99% of surveyed lecturers identified themselves as proficient and independent users of Ukrainian and Russian overall, from everyday communication to academic writing. English occupies a valuable third position as it is spoken by over 85% of respondents and more than 65% of users identify their skills as pre-intermediate or higher, with almost 30% mentioning that they are basic users. 71.1% and 75.5% respondents identify themselves as proficient and independent users of German and French respectively. The skills of Spanish speaking members of the academic staff are assessed higher as only 11.5% claim to be basic users. Overall, the survey of academic staff members with reference to linguistic situation and lecturers’ mastery of different languages identifies ZNU as a multilingual educational establishment with Ukrainian, Russian and English as the languages spoken by the majority with a high level of mastery; German, French and Spanish are spoken by considerably fewer surveyed, though highly assessing their skills as well. Thus the presented results can be considered another manifestation of ZNU huge potential to develop linguistically and internationally.

**Administrative staff**

The administrative staff of the university also participated in the survey. The analyzed results provide data about the degree of multilingualism of the university community in terms of how many languages they know and the self-assessed level of mastery of different languages. It should be noted that as the level of language mastery is self-assessed, it can differ from the respondents’ real level of language when tested. Nonetheless, self-assessment is a good index as it can show the degree to which the respondents understand a foreign language, both written and oral speech, everyday communication and communication for special purposes.

As for the languages practiced by ZNU administrative staff, the results of the survey show that the language spectrum is relatively wide and the mastery of languages varies from A1 to C2, depending on the language, its position in the modern world, the historical past of this language on the territory of Ukraine, the availability of schools where the language is taught etc. Totally, 74 people took part in the questionnaire and they make 62% of the administrative staff of the departments that directly deal with students.

The results of the survey show that the range of the languages mentioned by the administrative staff is even narrower than those of both students’ and lecturers’. The variety of languages reaches 14 and is represented by Belorussian, Bulgarian, Chinese, English, Estonian, French, Georgian, German, Italian, Polish, Romany, Russian, Spanish, Ukrainian, and “surzhyk” dialect of South-East Ukraine.

Different aspects of the administrative staff’s view of the linguistic situation at ZNU and Zaporizhzhia region are summarized and visualized in a number of tables and graphs below.

Before the analysis of skills of different languages, it is necessary to identify the languages university administrative staff speak and the order in which they were acquired by the interviewees. Table 49 shows the number of respondents who mentioned the languages in the order they were learnt in childhood.
Table 49. Languages known by administrative staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>L4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The same table, if it mentions the percentage, can give a better understanding of the linguistic past of the ZNU administrative staff sample (74 respondents).

Table 50. Languages known by administrative staff, percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>L1</th>
<th>L2</th>
<th>L3</th>
<th>L4</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>54.0%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>98.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>66.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>21.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7 employees of different departments said that they learnt Belorussian, Bulgarian, Italian, Spanish and Polish as second, third or fourth languages. It is worth noting that all the administrative staff representatives said that they speak and/or have learnt at least three languages, though their level of mastery varies as the further statistical analysis shows. Moreover, over one in five (21.8%) have studied the fourth language in their life.

The data shows that 73 responders (98.7%) learnt Ukrainian as their first, second, third or fourth language. One respondent did not mention Ukrainian in the answers, either it was the fifth language they acquired and the fifth language was not an option provided by the questionnaire or they may have assumed that the mother tongue is beyond mentioning and did not pay attention to it. The Russian language is another most frequent language learnt as L1, L2 or L3, and 100% of respondents mentioned it.

Ukrainian and Russian are followed by English which was learnt by almost 80% of the interviewees. German and French hold the fourth and the fifth positions respectively as they have been studied by 14 (19%) and 11 (14.1%) respondents. Only 7 surveyed employees have studied other languages, what falls for 9.6% of respondents.
It also should be noted that there are no monolingual employees at ZNU, everybody speaks at least 3 languages, and some have acquired more. None of the employees mentioned that they can speak more than 4 languages. Thus, the language spectrum of administrative staff is much narrower than of students’ and lecturers’.

Thus, the survey shows that the situation at ZNU is far from being monolingual. The survey results show very good prospects for the internationalization of the university as all the representatives of administrative departments are the speakers of at least three languages: Ukrainian, as the official state language, Russian, the local language and the language of international communication in the post-Soviet world, and a third language usually English, sometimes German or French, though English has a much higher fraction (80%) of responses. Thus, the prospects for the internationalization of the university are quite high. The level of English is not very high, as the analysis later will show, though, the grounds are profound.

The linguistic situation at ZNU is the mirror of the linguistic situation in Ukraine and the next question showed it well. Since 2013 Ukraine has been going through a very difficult political and economic crisis, and the consequence is the rejection of Russian by some citizens in some aspects or areas of communication. In this respect we should mention the fact that Russian as the first acquired language stopped to be the mother tongue for some respondents. Overall, there is a tendency to identify Ukrainian, not Russian, as a mother tongue, though it does not mean that it was the first language learnt, that they do use it more frequently for daily communication at home or at work. It is more a political issue, the issue of national principle than of use and communication. 1 respondent also said that they use Russian and Ukrainian equally frequently as well as surzhyk at home.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>L1</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mother tongue</th>
<th>Home Language</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>39.2%</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>54.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (both Russian and Ukrainian)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This general tendency can be presented in a graph to show the rise and fall of language preferences among the interviewed administrative staff depending on a situation. We can see that the popularity of Ukrainian as a mother tongue is increasing at the expense of the decreasing status of Russian, though it reaches just a bit over a half of responses (54.1%). The situation changes dramatically at home, where Ukrainian is mostly avoided or ousted by Russian which is the language of home communication for over 70% of respondents. Other languages are not used in everyday communication by the respondents from administrative offices of the university.
As for the use of different languages within the university walls as languages of administrative communication, they are presented in the chart below. It shows that almost all administrative employees admit using different languages, though the degree varies considerably. The three most often spoken languages as languages of administrative communication are Ukrainian (73 responses), Russian (72 responses) and English (44 responses). One respondent claimed that Ukrainian is not used for studies at ZNU and two respondents said that Russian is not used for administrative communication. In terms of their use, Ukrainian, Russian and English are followed by German, French, Polish, Bulgarian and Spanish. One of the surveyed respondents mentioned Chinese as a language of communication in ZNU.

The contrary to the chart of used languages, a chart of rarely used languages is presented below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>1 (almost never)</th>
<th>2 (seldom)</th>
<th>3 (often)</th>
<th>4 (usually)</th>
<th>5 (always)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Even though almost every respondent mentioned the use of at least 3 languages within the university, the degree and frequency of their use vary considerably. The following chart presents the arithmetic median for every language. The mean was calculated this way:

$$M_L = \frac{(A_5 \cdot 5 + A_4 \cdot 4 + A_3 \cdot 3 + A_2 \cdot 2 + A_1 \cdot 1 + A_0 \cdot 0)}{74},$$

where $A_5, A_4, A_3, A_2, A_1, A_0$ are the numbers of students’ answers for every language multiplied by the points students gave to them and divided by the total number of responders.

Thus, the arithmetic medians for different languages acquired such numbers:

- $M_{Ukrainian} = 4.608108108$
- $M_{Russian} = 3.5$
- $M_{English} = 1.283783784$
- $M_{German} = 0.445945946$
- $M_{French} = 0.364864865$
- $M_{Spanish} = 0.27027027$
- $M_{Polish} = 0.324324324$
- $M_{Bulgarian} = 0.27027027$
- $M_{Other} = 0.094594595$

This bar graph clearly shows that on average Russian is slightly more frequently used within the university walls as a language of instruction. The attitude towards both Russian and Ukrainian as mother tongues, first and second acquired languages, languages of communication at home allows using them equally for the overall benefit of the students in terms of both multilingualism and internationalization of the educational establishment.

Table 55. Median Use of Different Languages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Median Use</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>4.6081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>1.2838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>0.4459</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>0.3649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>0.2703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td>0.3243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td>0.2703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.0946</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The surveyed university administrative staff also expressed their linguistic preferences for both official and unofficial communication and the use of different languages for different purposes like work, hobbies, interests etc. It should be mentioned that the respondents were
allowed to choose multiple languages in this part of the questionnaire. The summarized data of language preference for specific purposes is given in the following chart.

### Table 56. Students’ Language Preferences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Ukrainian</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Bulgarian</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community communication and languages you overhear in the streets</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University communication: with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University communication: with teachers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University communication: with administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International projects</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work outside the university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading for leisure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to music</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV and mass media</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet /social networking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I miss this language at university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The chart below represents the same information, but in terms of fraction this time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Ukrainian</th>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>English</th>
<th>German</th>
<th>French</th>
<th>Polish</th>
<th>Bulgarian</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Not interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Family communication</td>
<td>75.7%</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local community communication and languages you overhear in the streets</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>24.3%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University communication: with students</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University communication: with teachers</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University communication: with administration</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>55.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International projects</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>36.8%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work outside the university</td>
<td>47.3%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication with colleagues</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>91.2%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading for leisure</td>
<td>83.8%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening to music</td>
<td>94.6%</td>
<td>93.2%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>52.7%</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37.8%</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TV and mass media</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet /social networking</td>
<td>87.8%</td>
<td>90.5%</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling</td>
<td>82.4%</td>
<td>79.7%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I miss this language at university</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60.8%</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If we summarize all the analyzed parameters, we can see that the ZNU administrative staff predominantly resort to Ukrainian, Russian and sometimes English. Unlike with students where Russian was followed by Ukrainian and English, ZNU administration prefer Ukrainian to Russian within the university walls when they deal with students (94.6% vs 83.8%), teachers (97.3% vs 77%), administration (97.3% vs 55.4%). They prefer Russian to Ukrainian in family communication (75.7% vs 94.6%) and believe that Russian is a more common language in the streets (Russian – 100% vs Ukrainian – 93.2%). They equally rely on both Ukrainian and Russian for work outside the university (47.3% vs 52.7%), communication with colleagues (93.2% vs 91.2%), reading for pleasure (83.8% vs 90.5%), listening to music (94.6% vs 93.2%), sports...
(50% vs 52.7%), TV and mass media (90.5% vs 82.4%), Internet and social networking (87.8% vs 90.5%) and travelling (82.4% vs 79.7%).

The only case when English outdid Russian in terms of popularity among the administration was for international projects, though Ukrainian keeps the top position (Ukrainian: 86.5% vs Russian: 36.8% vs English: 52.7%). English is also often mentioned as the language overheard in the streets (24.3%), of reading for leisure (14.9%), of music (86.5%), of the Internet (35.1%) and travelling (21.6%). This is the most missed language at the university (21.6%), followed by Ukrainian (17.6%), though 60.8% of respondents said that the situation is ideal and they do not miss any languages.

German, French, Polish, Bulgarian, Spanish and other languages were not often mentioned by the respondents of the administrative offices. Still interviewees mentioned that they frequently use German, French, Polish (10.8% vs 13.5% vs 9.5%, respectively) for international projects and they often listen to songs in foreign languages (French – 52.7%, German – 14.9%, Spanish – 13.5%).

Totally, the charts above show that Ukrainian is the language of official communication in communication with students, teachers, and administration. At the same time Russian is the language of family communication. Both Ukrainian and Russian are equally used for work outside the university, communication with colleagues, reading for pleasure, sports, TV and mass media, Internet and social networking, and travelling. Ukrainian and English are preferred as means of communication for international projects, followed by Russian, German, French, and Polish. The respondents said that they listen to music in different languages.

In the next part of the survey the administrative staff were asked to identify the mastery of their language skills, that is to assess their level and knowledge of different languages. The suggested language choices included the languages studied at ZNU and this range encompasses Ukrainian, Russian, English, German, French, and Spanish. The administrative staff were also provided with an option to assess their skills in other languages not mentioned in the questionnaire. The total overview of the language mastery runs the figures given below in a number of charts.

The analysis of respondents’ mastery of different languages clearly shows that all the university administrative employees are able speakers of at least 3 languages. Firstly, we suggest analyzing their skills in Ukrainian with the help of the previously used formula that is:

\[ S_{\text{Language}} = \frac{(C2*6+C1*5+B2*4+B1*3+A2*2+A1*1)}{x}, \]

where C2, C1, B2, B1, A2, A1 are the numbers of employees’ answers with the corresponding skills for a definite language multiplied by the points from 6 to 1 that and divided by x which is the total number of respondents who evaluated their skills in a particular language.
All 74 representatives of the administrative offices answered the questions about Ukrainian. On average, their skills of Ukrainian vary between 5.1 and 5.6, that is between C1 and C2.

72 respondents (97.3%) answered the questions concerning their skills in Russian. The summarized results are presented in the chart below:

97% of respondents answered the questions about Russian. On average, their skills of Russian vary between 5.4 and 5.8, that is between C1 and C2. As we can see, the skills of Russian are by 0.2 higher than of Ukrainian.

51 respondents (68.9%) answered the questionnaire about English and evaluated their skills. The summarized median skills in English are given in the chart below:
On average, the respondents’ skills of English vary between 2.3 and 2.6, that is between A2 and B1. This median is much lower than of students’ and teachers’. Still, it shows that the university has some prospects for making itself more open to the students and academia from abroad if the general skills of non-academic staff are boosted.

Only 7 representatives of the administrative staff (9.5%) answered the questionnaire about German, what allowed calculating the average skills of respondents.

On average, the students’ skills of German vary between 1.5 and 2.5, which is between A1 and A2.

9 respondents (12.2%) gave their views on their skills of French. Their median level of the acquired language is presented in the graph below:
On average, the respondents’ skills of French vary between 1.5 and 2.5, which is between A1 and B1.

2 respondents (2.7%), who participated in the survey, said that they know Spanish A1 and C1. Only 2 respondents among the administrative representatives have skills in Polish and Bulgarian ranging from A1 to B1. For the small amount of representatives they are not shown in separate charts.

Resorting to the average skills of different languages in different terms, we can also present percentage of respondents who identified their skills within a particular knowledge group, what is shown in the chart below. Spanish, Polish and Bulgarian (represented by 4 only people) are not included into the chart.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Total number of respondents</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>97.3%</td>
<td>77.6%</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
<td>16.3%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From this chart it is clear that 80-90% of surveyed administrative staff identified their skills of Ukrainian and Russian as advanced and proficient overall, both for everyday communication and administrative purposes. English occupies the third position, though it is largely behind both Ukrainian and Russian. Other languages take minor positions and cannot significantly change the language situation.

Overall, the survey of administration’s views of the linguistic situation and their mastery of different languages identifies ZNU as a multilingual educational establishment that has a huge potential to develop linguistically and internationally, though it still has to make a big step forward as English is at elementary level. English is currently a language of international projects and a language of unofficial communication, language of hobbies, music and social media, traveling.

2.3.4. Summary of profiles of the university community

In the survey 1832 students, PhD students, lecturers and representatives of administrative offices were interviewed. They mentioned 46 languages from different language families, Esperanto, Latin, Old Slavic, and Sanskrit are among them, as well as surzhyk – a Russian-Ukrainian mongrel dialect.
Even though, the range of mentioned languages was very wide, most respondents mentioned 3-4 spoken languages, mostly Ukrainian, Russian, English and another foreign language such as German, French, Spanish, Italian, Polish, and Bulgarian. It is notable that in the university there are students who are able to speak 5-6 languages and sometimes they opt for such rare for Ukraine languages as Korean, Japanese, Turkish, Chinese, Swedish, and Dutch etc. The range of languages spoken or learnt by the academic staff is much narrower 3-4 languages, sometimes 5.

Most respondents identified Russian as the first language and a language of home communication, while they identified Ukrainian as their mother tongue, even though they resort to it less frequently. 80-97% of all respondents identified their skills of Ukrainian and Russian as proficient, with a bit higher mastery of Russian.

English, as a foreign language, was learnt by 93% of students, 85% of lecturers and 69% of administration. 32% of lecturers, 19% of students, and 13% of non-academic staff identified themselves as proficient users and further 34% of teachers, 55% of students, and 27% of administration ranked themselves as independent users. English was most frequently mentioned as the most missed language, while a large proportion also said that they do not miss any languages. The skills of other languages were considerably lower and peaked at Department of Foreign Languages, but not university-wide.

Both Ukrainian, Russian, and English are used as languages of formal and informal communication at the university, they are languages of instruction and languages of leisure (sport, reading, songs, travelling, media, social networking etc.). Notable is the fact that students say that both Ukrainian and Russian are used equally as the languages of instruction, while only one fourth of lecturers said they can use Russian during their classes.

From the summarized results of the survey we can see that English has firmly established itself within the university walls and has occupied the third position turning ZNU into a university with a high multilingual and international potential. To achieve it, the elements of multilingual education may be introduced.

The university can introduce elective courses in English, set up speaking clubs, hold events in English, engage students more actively into foreign projects and encourage more students to become exchange students or volunteer abroad. The university can also offer free tests for students at the end of semester for them to notice their progress and strengths and analyze their weaknesses. The university can prosper both nationally and internationally as it will supply efficient and skillful specialists to the job market.

At the same time the model of multilingual education will modernize the teaching methods, and consequently the university. It will become more open and attractive to foreign students, guest lecturers, and partner institutions. At the same time the university will preserve its valuable academic and administrative staff.
3. PROPOSALS FOR A MULTILINGUAL LANGUAGE POLICY
3.1 The Multilingual Language Policy: Criteria

With the EU Strategy “Europe 2020” placing a special focus on enhancing “the performance and international attractiveness of Europe’s higher education” (2010:14) the issue of improving quality of higher education in multilingual Europe has become a topical theme. Quality is strongly associated with provision and support of diversity and multilingualism at societal and individual levels, i.e. in multilingual Europe universities pay equal attention to “the connection between language and political, economic, social, cultural and educative forces” (Fortanet-Gómez 2012:7), on the one hand, and to how university students “acquire their second and foreign languages and the psychological processes involved in this acquisition” (Ibid.), on the other. Multilingualism is viewed broadly – it does not only imply the knowledge and use of a mother tongue and mastery of the English language but also the knowledge of languages of neighbouring countries and languages of ethnic minorities. Hence, today universities’ concerns are connected with implementing multilingual educational models not limited to bilingual programmes focused on English medium teaching. (Raud, Raik, 2014).

There are five distinct levels of creating a truly multilingual environment: 1) university policies and state policies in language studies/specialists’ training; 2) university’s administration and management; 3) academic life, including teaching, learning (incl. in-service training for academic and administrative staff) and research in multilingualism and multiculturalism; 3) pedagogical-psychological individual and group counselling for students; 5) all outside university extra-curricular activities to connect with communities and the labour market. These are the levels which can be taken as the criteria to assess multilingual universities’ models. With all possible differences in the implementation of the multilingual university model these aspects should be given first priority. (Raud, Raik, 2014).

3.1.1. Structure and Form

The multilingual language policy which is suggested herewith by the researchers’ team presupposes the institutional support and policy’s impact on the ZNU community and the university as a higher educational institution. As a consequence, all members of the university community, i.e. students, administrative staff and administration, shall be equally involved in the process of developing and implementation of the language policy proposed by the researchers’ team. The policy shall take a form of a plan; the plan will be based on the research
outcomes described in the present report and, hence, will take into consideration university community’s language profiles, the current use of languages by the university community in various spheres of university’s life and the analysis of expectations and topical issues as perceived by the university community members. The plan will have specific objectives, an action plan to realize the policy and corresponding measures to assess the progress of its realization along with indicators of its success/progress.

Moreover, the language policy proposed by the researchers’ team shall not be viewed as a separate document; it can be aligned with the key ZNU’s legal acts and regulations such as the Statute, Study Regulations, Strategic Plan for 2016-2020, Strategic Plan for 2011-2020 and Admission Rules, The Renewed Conception of Teaching Foreign languages, etc.

The structure of the language policy shall cover three main areas of the University’s life: 1) institutional support at the level of administrative acts and policies; 2) administration and management of the study/learning process; 3) academic life and research.

Structurally, the language policy shall take into consideration and cover the following factors in the above mentioned areas:

**I Institutional support at the level of administrative acts and polices**

- Quality assurance, incl. monitoring and research of multilingualism in a university
- Multilingualism in university development plans and other documents, incl. the role of the English language; availability of the university language strategy
- Language requirements for admission to a university in accordance with the European Framework of Reference for Languages documents
- Language requirements for university graduation in accordance with the European Framework of Reference for Languages documents
- Languages of instruction at different study levels and specialties
- Curricula language(s) of instruction, share of languages of instruction in study courses and curricula; curricula flexibility

**II Administration/ Management /Counselling**

- Administrative staff’s mother tongue and language skills, requirements to administrative staff
- University language of environment
- University language of information and communication and institutional information
- Availability of counselling services for students
III Academic Life

Students

- Students’ language studies (national languages, minority language, foreign languages) language study extent and whether it is mandatory, language study status, students’ motivation
- Students’ and academic staff’s academic mobility, its organization in university
- Multicultural and intercultural awareness component in curricula; students’ attitude

Teaching

- Methodology: methods used for teaching in foreign languages, incl. multilingual courses, terminology in several languages, use of several languages in teaching a subject, requirements to obligatory literature, incl. e-learning, internship in various language environments, etc.
- Availability of study materials, translation and development of study materials
- Academic staff
  - Academic staff’s mother tongue and language skills, requirements to academic staff, lecturers’ salary dependence on languages of instruction
- Language(s) of research work
- Academic staff in-service training in teaching methods, language training
- Academic staff’s cooperation

The language policy shall also refer to community needs in terms of labour market requirements to language mastery and the level of cooperation with other educational institutions and organizations, which will be considered as a benefit to realize university language policies.

3.1.2 Objectives and the plan and expected outcomes

The background and context of the ZNU make it evident that the university belongs to the group of Ukrainian universities with the “State Language Priority in Teaching Plus Foreign Languages Option Approved by the University Council”. The conducted analysis highlights the importance of support to teaching in foreign languages of non-language disciplines; the overall preparedness of the university community is assessed quite positively to include more teaching and research in foreign languages. Ukrainian is fully and extensively used in all areas of university’s life and it does not require any additional attention and support. However, foreign languages as mediums of instruction require institutional support and development in all areas of university’s life. It makes it highly topical to implement content and language integrated learning (CLIL) at different levels of studies and in various university curricula.
As English is globally used as a lingua franca it is advisable to make a particular focus on University’s needs to use and teach English for academic language proficiency (CALP). English language teaching and learning environment has to be in both academic and professional contexts.

Individual multilingualism is considered as an important asset and outcome of the language policy. The aim is that all members of the university community become competent users of several languages – mother tongue, second language, at least one foreign language. The linguistic diversity shall be highly valued and respected.

The language policy's objectives can be formulated at two levels – from the most general to the most specific ones. At the general level the objectives are the following:

- To promote and expand the use of foreign languages to realize the option approved by the University Council;
- To collaborate closely with other universities in border regions, to realize multilingual approaches to teaching and research by implementing CLIL and other forms of multilingual education;
- To attract foreign students to study at ZNU who know English but do not have a good knowledge of Ukrainian on their arrival;
- To contribute to the internationalization of the ZNU by increasing teaching in foreign language of non-language disciplines and specialist curricula, by participating in networks with European universities in research and teaching.

Multilingualism shall be considered as an added value for the university and its community. Depending on a particular context (teaching and learning, research, university management) more specific aims can be formulated for:

**Teaching and learning:**
- Development of academic contexts to use Ukrainian and foreign languages (English in particular) in all majors so that students could have opportunities to use foreign languages for academic purposes (studies and research).

**Research:**
- Improvement of the knowledge and use of English/other foreign languages to widen the production and dissemination of research outcomes at the international level.

**Management:**
- Defining ways, approaches and strategies to be applied to guarantee the use of University community’s languages for teaching, learning, research and academic mobility.

The ideal outcome of this language policy is that ZNU becomes a model of multilingual university community which corresponds to the European standards of higher education.
3.2. The Multilingual Language Policy and University Community members

University multilingual language policy is objectively pre-conditioned by the university community’s language mastery, which, in case of ZNU, is quite favourable for implementing such policies.

3.2.1. Students

The conducted study allows the researchers’ team to state that “the situation at ZNU is far from being monolingual, some students claim multilingualism reaching 6 languages at times. The survey results show very good prospects for the internationalization of the university as all the students are the speakers of at least three languages: Ukrainian, as the official state language, Russian, the local language and the language of international communication in the post-Soviet world, and a third language usually English, sometimes German or French, though English has a much higher fraction. English is currently more a language of unofficial communication, language of hobbies, music and social media, but it can be turned into the language of official communication and instruction if the university attracts foreign teachers or speakers, introduces more elective courses in English, sets up speaking clubs, holds events in English, engages students more actively into foreign projects and encourages more students to become exchange students or volunteer during holidays in some projects abroad. The university can also offer free testing for students at the end of semester for them to see their progress and strengths and analyze their weaknesses. With the current situation and suggested approaches, the university can prosper both nationally and internationally as it will supply efficient and skillful specialists to the job market” (see p.42 above).

The last part of the survey focused on the attitudes of the students and their readiness to become multilingual in all university contexts, in a multitude of dimensions. Here, the students were asked 18 questions on the use of different languages and their views on the possible use of languages in the educational system in general and within the ZNU walls. The questions included aspects concerning the learning of foreign languages, languages of education, multilingual programmes, internship, term papers and theses, the number of language
classes etc. The answers of respondents could range from 5 – “totally agree” to 1 – “totally disagree”. The system of presenting the attitude to questions coincided with the Ukrainian assessment system: 5 – excellent (strongly agree), 4 – good (agree), 3 – satisfactory (neither agree nor disagree), 2 – bad (disagree), 1 – very bad (strongly disagree). The intensity of blue will show the positive attitude. The more positive the students are about the idea, the bluer the diagram is.

Question 1 was about Ukrainian and other European languages and whether they should be allowed in all stages of education. 66% of students were positive about it and supported the idea, 22% gave “3” that can be viewed that they do not reject the statement, though they do not express any particular interest in this problem. 12% of respondents did not support the idea.

Table 64. Reaction to Question 1.

1. Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be equally allowed in all stages of the education system in Ukraine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 2 was about the languages of instruction and multilingual education. 61% supported or fully supported multilingual education, at the same time 19% rejected this approach to education, 20% of respondents gave “3” and may be viewed as indifferent to this question. It should be noted that foreign language learning has a higher support than using foreign languages as languages of instruction.

Table 65. Reaction to Question 2.

2. Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union should be used as LANGUAGES of INSTRUCTION from the 1st grade of primary school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Question 3 gained more support than Question 1 and Question 2. As the results show, 70% of respondents agreed that Ukrainian and two EU languages should be used for university studies, 12% disagree with this statement, 18% expressed neither enthusiasm, nor disapproval.

**Table 66. Reaction to Question 3.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3. Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union should be equally used for university studies and learning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Question 4 the students were asked to give their views on Ukrainian and EU languages and whether they should be allowed to be used for graduation papers. 61% said that students should be allowed to write theses in different languages, 18% rejected it, and 21% remained indifferent to the question. The answers to this question contradict the answers to the next question.

**Table 67. Reaction to Question 4.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4. Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be allowed to be used for university graduation theses writing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 5 asked the students if the graduation thesis is to be obligatory written in the languages of the EU. This idea was not welcomed by the students and only 28% are positive about it, almost half (49%) expressed their negative attitude to the statement. Almost a quarter (23%) were indifferent. Thus, it is understood from the survey answers that students do not oppose to having a wider spectrum of languages for theses, but they oppose strict obligations.
Table 68. Reaction to Question 5.

5. The language of graduation theses writing should be one of languages of the European Union (e.g. English)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15%</td>
<td>4 - agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23%</td>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13%</td>
<td>1 - strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 6 concentrated on the languages of education and the students were asked if the volume of classes taught in the EU languages should be increased. 56% supported this idea, and it was rejected by one third (33%). 21% of the respondents were indifferent.

Table 69. Reaction to Question 6.

6. The volume of teaching in other than Ukrainian language should be increased to internationalise university studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>35%</td>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12%</td>
<td>4 - agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>1 - strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 7 was about the academic staff who are ready to teach in the EU languages. 57% of students replied that they support such changes, while 24% said that they do not agree with such a language policy, 19% gave “3”, thus, meaning that they do not mind it, but do not express any enthusiasm about it.
Question 8 was meant to find out if the students support the idea of obligatory availability of study materials in foreign languages for every course. As with all questions with obligations, the number of students who expressed positive attitude decreased considerably. 43% felt positive about it, while 32% were negative and every fourth student (25%) said that they do not care for it.

Question 9 asked the views of students on being allowed to take exams in the EU languages. The statement was supported and rejected by almost the same number of people (36% vs 35%) almost one third (29%) remained indifferent to it.
Table 72. Reaction to Question 9.

9. Each university course (both content and language) should allow students to use languages of the European Union in final assessment papers/exams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>19%</th>
<th>19%</th>
<th>16%</th>
<th>29%</th>
<th>17%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 10 was about the minimum level of B1 of a foreign language to be allowed to apply for university studies. The students met this question with rejection (44%), 25% of respondents were hesitating and only 31% supported the idea. This is one of the most rejected questions in the survey.

Table 73. Reaction to Question 10.

10. To be enrolled in a university programme a candidate should have a foreign language mastery at B1 level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>27%</th>
<th>18%</th>
<th>13%</th>
<th>17%</th>
<th>25%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 11 was about the obligatory level B1 to C2 for university graduates. Surprisingly, but this question provoked more positive attitude. It was supported and rejected by the same number of respondents (38%) and 24% were hesitating. The more positive attitude to this response means that students understand the necessity of learning foreign languages, are ready to work for them and understand that the university is the place where they can improve their skills.
Table 74. Reaction to Question 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - strongly disagree</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. To graduate from a university study programme a graduate should be certified on having acquired a foreign language mastery at specialist’s level (depending on a speciality from B1 to C2)

Question 12, that also has some shade of obligation, received rejection from the students. The students were asked if they have to at least once participate in exchange programmes during their studies. 59% (over half of respondents) disagreed with this idea. Only 25% think that it the situation should be changed. The possible explanation for such high figures is that students are rarely given an opportunity to participate in exchange programmes and it was the case when their self-defense mechanism worked.

Table 75. Reaction to Question 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agreement Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - strongly disagree</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. To complete a university programme a student should participate in international exchange programmes at least once during the study period

Question 13 received even stronger disapproval as they were asked their views on obligatory participation in international conferences / projects and presenting their outcomes in a EU language. This time 63% rejected the idea, 18 % were hesitating and only 19% were positive about such policies. This answer, once again, proved that students felt insecure about their future and unexpectedly high requirements.
Table 76. Reaction to Question 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13. To complete a university programme a student should participate in international conferences/projects at least once during the study period to present his/her academic study outcomes in a language of the European Union</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 14 was about the equal use of the mother tongue and the languages of the European Union for internship. This question was better received by the students, even though it has some aureole of obligation. 47% were positive, 27% were hesitating, and 26% refused the idea. This answer means that about half of students know the foreign language they are learning and are sure of their abilities, both in everyday and professional communication.

Table 77. Reaction to Question 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14. Internship should have equal proportions of practice of mother tongue and languages of the European Union</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Question 15 was about the multilingualism of a graduate and their ability to speak 4 languages. This question was not supported by the students. Only 31% were positive about it, 45% were negative about it, and 24% were hesitating. This question and answers say that this kind of multilingualism is too high for Ukraine for now.
Table 78. Reaction to Question 15.

15. The university graduate should be multilingual to know at least 4 languages (state language and 3 foreign languages)

- 16% strongly agree
- 27% agree
- 18% neither agree nor disagree
- 24% disagree

Question 16 was about the volume of classes of foreign languages and if they should be increased. Over half (55%) said that they agreed with the question, this statement did not resonate in the hearts of a quarter (26%) of respondents, and 19% were hesitant to answer.

Table 79. Reaction to Question 16.

16. I would like to have more classes of foreign languages

- 39% strongly agree
- 19% agree
- 16% neither agree nor disagree
- 10% disagree

Question 17 was about the establishing a bigger number of language clubs and language trainings. This statement was met with high support as half (49%) were positive about it, 28% were negative about it and 23% were neither positive nor negative about this fact.

Table 80. Reaction to Question 17.

17. I would like to have more language clubs and language trainings

- 32% strongly agree
- 16% agree
- 23% neither agree nor disagree
- 12% disagree

Question 18 was about foreign teachers and lecturers who can visit the university. Almost half (48%) strongly agreed, 14% agreed, 18% were hesitating and 20% felt negative about this idea. This is the third most supported question by the students, following Question 3 (Ukrainian
and at least two languages of the European Union should be equally used for university studies and learning) and Question 1 (Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be equally allowed in all stages of the education system in Ukraine).

**Table 81. Reaction to Question 18.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thus, we may conclude that the students are open to foreign languages as languages of instruction, they want to have more classes, clubs and foreign guests, at the same time they expressed sheer rejection in questions that were formulated as duties, not as options, like obligatory exchange programmes or obligatory thesis in an EU language.

If we take the results of 1525 students, we can find out the absolute average for each question and then arrange the absolute average on the scale. The absolute average will be afterwards arranged on the scale, from top minimum to top maximum, to show the results explicitly.

As the students were asked to show their attitude to the problem by using the standard grading system for Ukraine, the same approach will be taken to assess their attitude:

- 5 – very good (2 points);
- 4 – good (1 point);
- 3 – satisfactory (0 points);
- 2 – unsatisfactory (-1 point);
- 1 – very unsatisfactory (-2 points).

Though, 3 is satisfactory we decided to attribute 0 points to it as students do not reject the statement, and at the same time they do not show any interest in this statement.

Thus, the absolute average can be calculated this way:

$$AA = \frac{(VG*2+G*1+S*0+U*(-1)+VU*(-2))}{1524},$$

where VG is the number of responses that received “5”;
G is the number of responses that received “4”;
S is the number of responses that received “3”;
U is the number of responses that received “2”;
VU is the number of responses that received “1”.
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U is the number of responses that received “2”;
VU is the number of responses that received “1”;
1524 is the number of respondents.

For example, the absolute average for question 1 is:

\[ AA_1 = \frac{638 \times 2 + 375 \times 1 + 337 \times 0 + 85 \times (-1) + 89 \times (-2)}{1524} = 0.911 \]

The similar calculations for questions 2-18 gave the following results:

\[ AA_1 = 0.911 \]
\[ AA_2 = 0.717 \]
\[ AA_3 = 0.99 \]
\[ AA_4 = 0.741 \]
\[ AA_5 = -0.423 \]
\[ AA_6 = 0.572 \]
\[ AA_7 = 0.554 \]
\[ AA_8 = 0.192 \]
\[ AA_9 = 0.035 \]
\[ AA_{10} = -0.212 \]
\[ AA_{11} = -0.051 \]
\[ AA_{12} = -0.623 \]
\[ AA_{13} = -0.781 \]
\[ AA_{14} = 0.336 \]
\[ AA_{15} = -0.247 \]
\[ AA_{16} = 0.513 \]
\[ AA_{17} = 0.358 \]
\[ AA_{18} = 0.785 \]
As the graph shows the students’ attitudes towards the introduction of other languages of instruction (besides Ukrainian) vary greatly, from -0.781 to 0.99 on average. Only 6 questions out of 18 questions given acquired negative meaning, 12 questions on average gained the positive response.

Thus, the university should focus on following those suggestions that resonate in the students’ heart and only afterwards try to introduce other steps. The answers of the students can be divided into 3 groups: steps students are open to, steps students do not mind, and steps students reject.

Thus, the university can internationalize itself in seven aspects, having much support from the students. The students are very open to:

1) Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union being equally used for university studies and learning;
2) equally allowing Ukrainian and languages of the European Union in all stages of the education system in Ukraine;
3) being more frequently visited by foreign teachers who give lectures in foreign languages;
4) allowing Ukrainian and languages of the European Union to be used for university graduation theses writing;
5) using Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union as LANGUAGES of INSTRUCTION from the 1st grade of primary school;
6) increasing the volume of teaching in other than Ukrainian languages to internationalize university studies;
7) increasing the number of academic staff members who are ready to teach subjects in foreign languages;

8) having more classes of foreign languages.

The steps students do not mind include 4 directions, such as:

1) having more language clubs and language trainings;

2) having equal proportions of practice of mother tongue and languages of the European Union during their internship;

3) each university course (other than a language course) being supported by study materials in foreign languages (English, German, French, etc.);

4) being allowed to use languages of the European Union in final assessment papers/exams each university course;

The steps students reject to include:

1) compulsory participation in international conferences/projects to present their academic study outcomes in a language of the European Union for the completion of a university programme;

2) compulsory participation in international exchange programmes Union for the completion of a university programme;

3) writing graduation theses in one of languages of the European Union (e.g. English);

4) multilingual graduates able to speak at least 4 languages (state language and 3 foreign languages);

5) compulsory B1 level of a foreign language mastery to be enrolled in a university programme;

6) compulsory B1 to C2 certificate in a foreign language for a graduate (depending on a study programme).

Thus, the possible outcomes can include introducing foreign languages as languages of instruction, multilingual programmes, and internationalization of the university, as a result.

To achieve it, according to the survey, the university should improve the skills of both students and professors, invite foreign speakers and allow the graduation papers to be written in foreign languages. They will prepare the grounds for some more steps like using Ukrainian and other languages of the EU for internship, taking exams, introducing more language clubs, and supporting the classes with materials in foreign languages.

At the same time, students expressed disagreement when the points related to compulsory multilingualism like compulsory foreign language skills, compulsory participation in exchange programmes, international conferences or projects, compulsory writing of graduation papers in foreign languages. They believe that students should be allowed to practice multilingualism, but they oppose compulsory multilingualism. If the university introduces the soft policy of multilingualism, the students will support it and they may even become the stimulus for the university development. Unlike academic and non-academic staff, they are now more internationalized and open the way to the introduction of multilingual education.
3.2.2. Academic staff

The multilingual language policy will influence lecturers in their everyday teaching and research in a number of ways by increasing language mastery requirements to teach and conduct researches in international teams and networks. The analysis of academic staff’s multilingualism allows the researchers’ team to conclude that ‘academic staff members with reference to linguistic situation and lecturers’ mastery of different languages identifies ZNU as a multilingual educational establishment with Ukrainian, Russian and English as the languages spoken by the majority and high level of mastery; German, French and Spanish spoken by considerably fewer surveyed, though highly assessing their skills as well. Thus the presented results can be considered another manifestation of ZNU huge potential to develop linguistically and internationally’ (see p. 52 above).

In this part of the questionnaire the members of the academic staff were asked to express their opinion of the priorities of languages, indicate if they agree with the statements by giving points from 1 to 5, where 1 stands for “you do not agree” and 5 means “agree completely”. The first statement “Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be equally allowed in all stages of the education system in Ukraine” was supported completely by 64 % of respondents, almost supported by 12 %, accepted by 16 % and rejected by 8 % of respondents who gave 1 or 2 points. The results are shown in the following pie chart, which also manifests that 92 % of the representatives of the academic staff realize the need of allowing Ukrainian as the official language and languages of the European Union in all stages of the education system in Ukraine:

Table 83. Reaction to Question 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction to Question 1</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - strongly disagree</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second statement “Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union should be used as LANGUAGES of INSTRUCTION from the 1st grade of primary school” was completely or almost supported by more than half of the respondents – 61 %, 19 % showed that they are not against such an idea, and 20% expressed their partial or complete disagreement:
The third statement “Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union should be used as equally used for university studies and learning” was completely or almost supported by 67.5% of respondents giving 5 or 4 points, 44% demonstrated their acceptance giving 3, and only 14% were against. The results clearly manifest that the members of ZNU teaching staff realize the importance of the state language alongside with the languages of the European Union for university studies and learning. Although it is noteworthy that more respondents accept the importance of multiple languages acquisition for university, and underestimate the role of multilingual approach in primary and secondary schools.

The fourth statement “Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be allowed to be used for university graduation theses writing” is approved by 73% of respondents, accepted by 16% and rejected only by 11% of the surveyed:
The fifth statement “The language of graduation theses writing should be one of languages of the European Union (e.g. English)” is completely approved only by 16 % of respondents, almost supported by 11 %, partially supported by 26% and 47 % of the members of the university staff disapproved the statement by giving 2 or 1 points:

The sixth statement “The volume of teaching in other than Ukrainian language should be increased to internationalize the university studies” is supported by more than half of (54%) of the respondents, partially supported by 21 % and disapproved by 24 %, which shows a tendency to diversification of teaching languages:
Table 88. Reaction to Question 6.

6. The volume of teaching in other than Ukrainian language should be increased to internationalise university studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - strongly disagree</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The seventh statement “The number of academic staff members who are ready to teach subjects of university specialities in foreign languages should be increased” was supported by 54% of the respondents, partially accepted by 20%, rejected by 26%:

Table 89. Reaction to Question 7.

7. The number of academic staff members who are ready to teach subjects of university specialities in foreign languages should be increased

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - strongly disagree</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The eighth statement “Each university course (other than a language course) should be supported by study materials in foreign languages (English, German, French, etc.)” was supported by 47%, mainly at the expense of the Department of Foreign languages, partially approved by 24% and 30% disapproved the statement:
The ninth statement “Each university course (both content and language) should allow students to use languages of the European Union in final assessment papers/exams” was approved by 41% of the respondents, who assessed it giving 4 or 5 points, partially approved by 24%, who gave 3 points, and disapproved by 35%:

The tenth statement “To be enrolled in a university programme a candidate should have a foreign language mastery at B1 level” was completely supported by 27%, almost approved by 10%, mostly at the expense of the answers of the members of the academic staff of the Department of Foreign languages, partially approved by 19% and disapproved by 44% of respondents, which shows that the surveyed realize all the difficulties the applicants face entering the university and express their concern about the quality of professional training:
Table 92. Reaction to Question 10.

10. To be enrolled in a university programme a candidate should have a foreign language mastery at B1 level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - strongly disagree</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The eleventh statement “To graduate from a university study programme a graduate should be certified on having acquired a foreign language mastery at specialist’s level (depending on a speciality from B1 to C2)” was supported 42%, partially supported by 22% and rejected by 36%.

Table 93. Reaction to Question 11.

11. To graduate from a university study programme a graduate should be certified on having acquired a foreign language mastery at specialist’s level (depending on a speciality from B1 to C2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - strongly disagree</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The twelfth statement “To complete a university programme a student should participate in international exchange programmes at least once during the study period” was supported by 26%, neither supported nor rejected by 23% and rejected by more than half of the respondents, which shows the current state of affairs reflecting the worry of the surveyed concerning the possibility of the university undergraduates to participate in international exchange programmes:
Table 94. Reaction to Question 12.

12. To complete a university programme a student should participate in international exchange programmes at least once during the study period

The thirteenth statement “To complete a university programme a student should participate in international conferences /projects at least once during the study period to present his/her academic study outcomes in a language of the European Union” was accepted by 29 %, neither supported nor rejected by 27 %, rejected by 44 %:

Table 95. Reaction to Question 13.

13. To complete a university programme a student should participate in international conferences /projects at least once during the study period to present his/her academic study outcomes in a language of the European Union

The fourteenth statement “Internship should have equal proportions of practice mother tongue and languages of the European Union” was supported completely by 26 %, almost supported by 18%, partially – by 30 % and rejected by 26%:
Table 96. Reaction to Question 14.

14. Internship should have equal proportions of practice mother tongue and languages of the European Union

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - strongly disagree</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fifteenth statement “The university graduate should be multilingual to know at least 4 languages (state language and 3 foreign languages)” was supported completely or almost only by 27%, partially – by 24% and rejected by 49%:

Table 97. Reaction to Question 15.

15. The university graduate should be multilingual to know at least 4 languages (state language and 3 foreign languages)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - strongly disagree</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sixteenth statement “I would like to have classes of foreign languages for university academic staff” was supported completely by 65%, almost supported by 11%, partially – by 16% and rejected only by 8%, demonstrating that the introduction of classes for academic staff on a regular basis was a bright idea and it should be developed:

Table 98. Reaction to Question 16.

16. I would like to have classes of foreign languages for university academic staff

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - strongly disagree</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The seventeenth statement “I would like to have more language clubs and language trainings for university academic staff” was supported completely by 58 %, almost supported by 15%, partially – by 15 % and rejected only by 12%:

Table 99. Reaction to Question 17.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The eighteenth statement “I would like the university to be more frequently visited by foreign teachers who give lectures in foreign languages” was supported completely by 63 %, almost supported by 15%, partially – by 13 % and rejected only by 9%:

Table 100. Reaction to Question 18.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The last part of the questionnaire suggests the respondents expressed their opinion on the issue giving commentaries and additions. 10 members of the academic staff presented their ideas on the problem under consideration. Some respondents believe that Ukrainian as official language should be used as the only language of instruction and express their fear and concern as for the quality of teaching certain subjects. They are concerned lest the equal usage of Ukrainian and languages of the European Union as the languages of instruction may have negative influence on professional training in some fields: “overloading” academic programmes distracting students and diffusing their focus which should be placed primarily on the content (Integration into the European Union should not reduce the volume of specialized subjects in the programmes offered.)
Some respondents believe that learning foreign languages should become an opportunity that is provided and encouraged by different programmes and means of motivation; it should be based on a conscious and free choice. Being imposed will improve neither the quality of education, nor the university image. They insist on the idea that studying 2nd or 3rd foreign language should be optional and belong to the elective part of the programmes. Meanwhile, in their opinion specialized courses in foreign languages should be offered for all the departments to teach both general knowledge and language skills and professional vocabulary to give the students opportunities to master academic writing to stimulate and facilitate their participation in international activity. (Students should receive high-quality professional training in their native language, though those students who intend to work abroad should have opportunities to study professionally-orientated subjects in foreign languages.) The members of the ZNU academic staff express their desire to perfect their knowledge and skills in foreign languages, emphasizing on the possibility to attend free language classes, to motivate financially the lecturers delivering their classes in foreign languages.

If we take the answers of 234 members of ZNU academic staff, we can find out the absolute average for each question and then arrange the absolute average on the scale. The absolute average will be afterwards arranged on the scale, from top minimum to top maximum, to show the results explicitly.

As the respondents were asked to show their attitude to the problem by using the standard grading system for Ukraine, the same approach will be taken to assess their attitude:

- 5 – very good (2 points);
- 4 – good (1 point);
- 3 – satisfactory (0 points);
- 2 – unsatisfactory (-1 point);
- 1 – very unsatisfactory (-2 points).

Though, 3 is satisfactory we decided to attribute 0 points to it as students do not reject the statement, and at the same time they do not show any interest in this statement.

Thus, the absolute average can be calculated this way:

$$ AA = \frac{(VG*2+G*1+S*0+U*(-1)+VU*(-2))}{234}, $$

where VG is the number of responses that received “5”;

G is the number of responses that received “4”;

S is the number of responses that received “3”;

U is the number of responses that received “2”;

VU is the number of responses that received “1”;

234 is the number of respondents.
For example, the absolute average for question 1 is:

\[ AA_1 = \frac{(149*2+29*1+37*0+10*(-1)+9*(-2))}{234}=1.28 \]

The similar calculations for questions 2-18 gave the following results:

\[ AA_2 = 1.278 \]
\[ AA_3 = 0.761 \]
\[ AA_4 = 1 \]
\[ AA_5 = 1.115 \]
\[ AA_6 = -0.385 \]
\[ AA_7 = 0.577 \]
\[ AA_8 = 0.491 \]
\[ AA_9 = 0.308 \]
\[ AA_{10} = 0.085 \]
\[ AA_{11} = -0.098 \]
\[ AA_{12} = 0.077 \]
\[ AA_{13} = -0.397 \]
\[ AA_{14} = -0.227 \]
\[ AA_{15} = 0.286 \]
\[ AA_{16} = -0.325 \]
\[ AA_{17} = 1.278 \]
\[ AA_{18} = 1.269 \]
Table 101. Absolute Average.

The attitudes of the members of ZNU academic staff towards the introduction of other languages of instruction (besides Ukrainian) vary greatly from -0.385 to 1.278 on average. Only 5 questions out of 18 questions given acquired negative reaction, 13 questions on average gained positive response.

The answers of the members of ZNU academic staff can be divided into 3 groups: changes the lecturers are ready to follow and accept, changes the lecturers do not mind to be made, and those changes the respondents reject.

Thus, the university can internationalize itself in six aspects, having much support from the members of the academic staff. The lecturers agree with the following changes to be made:

1) Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union being equally used for university studies and learning;
2) classes of foreign languages for university academic staff;
3) being more frequently visited by foreign teachers who give lectures in foreign languages;
4) having more language clubs and language trainings;
5) allowing Ukrainian and languages of the European Union to be used for university graduation theses writing;
6) Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union being equally used for university studies and learning.
The steps ZNU academic staff do not mind include 7 directions, such as:

1) using Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union as LANGUAGES of INSTRUCTION from the 1st grade of primary school;

2) increasing the volume of teaching in other than Ukrainian languages to internationalize university studies;

3) increasing the number of academic staff members who are ready to teach subjects in foreign languages;

4) each university course (other than a language course) being supported by study materials in foreign languages (English, German, French, etc.);

5) internship having equal proportions of practice mother tongue and languages of the European Union equally;

6) being allowed to use languages of the European Union in final assessment papers/exams each university course;

7) Certification of university graduates on having acquired a foreign language mastery at specialist’s level (depending on a speciality from B1 to C2).

The steps ZNU lecturers reject to include:

1) compulsory B1 level of a foreign language mastery to be enrolled in a university programme;

2) compulsory participation in international conferences/projects to present their academic study outcomes in a language of the European Union for the completion of a university programme;

3) multilingual graduates able to speak at least 4 languages (state language and 3 foreign languages);

4) writing graduation theses in one of languages of the European Union (e.g. English);

5) compulsory participation in international exchange programmes Union for the completion of a university programme.

Thus, taking into account the abovementioned analysis, we can suggest the possible outcomes which focus on introducing foreign languages as languages of instruction, multilingual programmes, and internationalization of the university. The results of the survey show that the members of the academic staff are ready to implement certain changes to allow Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union to be equally used for university studies and learning classes. They are aware of the need to increase the number of academic staff members who are ready to teach subjects in foreign languages, to improve the level of knowledge of foreign languages; they realize the necessity of increasing the volume of teaching in other than Ukrainian languages and having more language clubs and language trainings, they are open to visits of foreign teachers who give lectures in foreign languages, accept allowing Ukrainian and languages of the European Union to be used for university graduation theses writing.

ZNU members of academic staff expressed their disapproval exactly to the same ideas as students in their survey. The statements related to compulsory multilingualism like compulsory...
3.2. THE MULTILINGUAL LANGUAGE POLICY AND UNIVERSITY COMMUNITY MEMBERS

In general the results of the students’ and lecturers’ survey demonstrate great similarity. The only significant divergence of opinions can be stated on commenting the statement “To graduate from a university study programme a graduate should be certified on having acquired a foreign language mastery at specialist’s level (depending on a speciality from B1 to C2)”; the students’ absolute average was negative, lecturers’ absolute average – positive, which may show that any compulsory action is rejected.

3.2.3. Administrative staff

The administrative staff, as the conducted survey shows, can be characterized as plurilingual with a flexible use of Ukrainian, Russian and sometimes English in their work. However, the ZNU administration prefer Ukrainian to Russian within the university walls when they deal with students (94.6% vs 83.8%), teachers (97.3% vs 77%), administration (97.3% vs 55.4%). (see p.58 above). Ukrainian and English are preferred as means of communication for international projects, followed by Russian, German, French, and Polish.

In this part of the questionnaire 74 members of ZNU administrative staff were asked to express their opinion on the priorities of languages, indicate if they agree with the statements by giving points from 1 to 5, where 1 stands for “you do not agree” and 5 means “agree completely”. The first statement “Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be equally allowed in all stages of the education system in Ukraine” was supported completely by 64 % of respondents, almost supported by 12 %, neither supported nor rejected by 14 % and rejected only by 10 %. The results are shown in the following pie chart, which also manifests that 90 % of the representatives of the administrative staff realize the need of allowing Ukrainian as the official language and languages of the European Union in all stages of the education system in Ukraine:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>5 - strongly agree</th>
<th>4 - agree</th>
<th>3 - neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>2 - disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be equally allowed in all stages of the education system in Ukraine</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second statement “Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union should be used as LANGUAGES of INSTRUCTION from the 1st grade of primary school” was
completely or almost supported by 68% of the respondents, 16% showed that they are not against such an idea, and 16% expressed their partial or complete disagreement:

Table 103. Reaction to Question 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The third statement “Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union should be used as equally used for university studies and learning” was completely or almost supported by 84% of respondents giving 5 or 4 points, 4% demonstrated their acceptance giving 3, and only 12% are against. The results clearly manifest that the members of ZNU administrative staff realize the importance of the state language alongside with the languages of the European Union for university studies and learning. Although it is noteworthy that more respondents accept the importance of multiple languages acquisition for university, and underestimate the role of the Multilanguage approach in primary and secondary schools.

Table 104. Reaction to Question 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 points</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 points</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 points</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fourth statement “Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be allowed to be used for university graduation theses writing” is completely approved by 47%, approved by 19% of respondents, accepted by 19% and rejected only by 15% of the surveyed:
Table 105. Reaction to Question 4.

4. Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be allowed to be used for university graduation theses writing

The fifth statement “The language of graduation theses writing should be one of languages of the European Union (e.g. English)” is completely approved only by 8% of respondents, almost supported by 19%, neither supported nor rejected by 12% and 44% of the members of the university administrative staff disapproved the statement by giving 2 or 1 points:

Table 106. Reaction to Question 5.

5. The language of graduation theses writing should be one of languages of the European Union (e.g. English)

The sixth statement “The volume of teaching in other than Ukrainian language should be increased to internationalise university studies” is supported completely or almost by 46% of the respondents, neither supported nor rejected by 22% and disapproved by 22%:

Table 107. Reaction to Question 6.
The seventh statement “The number of academic staff members who are ready to teach subjects of university specialities in foreign languages should be increased” is supported by 64% of the respondents, neither accepted nor rejected by 20%, rejected by 16%:

**Table 108. Reaction to Question 7.**

- **5 - strongly agree:** 49%
- **4 - agree:** 20%
- **3 - neither agree nor disagree:** 15%
- **2 - disagree:** 4%
- **1 - strongly disagree:** 12%

The eighth statement “Each university course (other than a language course) should be supported by study materials in foreign languages (English, German, French, etc.)” was supported by 45%, neither approved nor disapproved by 28% and rejected by 27%:

**Table 109. Reaction to Question 8.**

- **5 - strongly agree:** 23%
- **4 - agree:** 28%
- **3 - neither agree nor disagree:** 11%
- **2 - disagree:** 22%
- **1 - strongly disagree:** 16%

The ninth statement “Each university course (both content and language) should allow students to use languages of the European Union in final assessment papers/exams” was approved by 45% of the respondents, who assessed it giving 4 or 5 points, neither approved nor rejected by 24%, who gave 3 points, and disapproved by 31%:
Table 110. Reaction to Question 9.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Each university course (both content and language) should allow students to use languages of the European Union in final assessment papers/exams</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The tenth statement “To be enrolled in a university programme a candidate should have a foreign language mastery at B1 level” is completely supported by 22%, almost approved by 17%, mostly at the expense of the answers of the members of the administrative staff of the Department of Foreign languages, neither approved nor disapproved by 26% and disapproved by 35% of respondents, which shows that the surveyed realize all the difficulties the applicants face entering the university and express their concern about the quality of professional training:

Table 111. Reaction to Question 10.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither Agree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10. To be enrolled in a university programme a candidate should have a foreign language mastery at B1 level</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The eleventh statement “To graduate from a university study programme a graduate should be certified on having acquired a foreign language mastery at specialist’s level (depending on a speciality from B1 to C2)” was supported by half of the respondents – 50%, neither nor rejected by 28%, rejected by 22%:
Table 112. Reaction to Question 11.

11. To graduate from a university study programme a graduate should be certified on having acquired a foreign language mastery at specialist’s level (depending on a speciality from B1 to C2)

The twelfth statement “To complete a university programme a student should participate in international exchange programmes at least once during the study period” was supported by 32 %, neither supported nor rejected by 15 % and rejected by 53 %, which shows the current state of affairs reflecting the worry of the surveyed concerning the possibility of the university undergraduates to participate in international exchange programmes:

Table 113. Reaction to Question 12.

12. To complete a university programme a student should participate in international exchange programmes at least once during the study period

The thirteenth statement “To complete a university programme a student should participate in international conferences /projects at least once during the study period to present his/her academic study outcomes in a language of the European Union” was accepted by 35 %, neither supported nor rejected by 13 % and rejected by 52 %:

Table 114. Reaction to Question 13.

13. To complete a university programme a student should participate in international conferences /projects at least once during the study period to present his/her academic study outcomes in a language of the European Union
The fourteenth statement “Internship should have equal proportions of practice mother
tongue and languages of the European Union” was supported completely by 34 %, almost
supported by 15%, partially – by 27 % and rejected by 24%:

Table 115. Reaction to Question 14.

| 14. Internship should have equal proportions of practice mother
tongue and languages of the European Union |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fifteenth statement “The university graduate should be multilingual to know at least 4
languages (state language and 3 foreign languages)” was supported completely or almost only
by 18 %, partially – by 24 % and rejected by 58 %:

Table 116. Reaction to Question 15.

| 15. The university graduate should be multilingual to know at least
4 languages (state language and 3 foreign languages) |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 - strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 - neither agree nor disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The sixteenth statement “I would like to have classes of foreign languages for university aca-
demic staff” was supported completely by 51 %, almost supported by 23 %, partially – by 11 %
and rejected only by 15 %, demonstrating that the introduction of classes for academic staff
on a regular basis was a bright idea and it should be developed:
Table 117. Reaction to Question 16.

16. I would like to have classes of foreign languages for university administrative staff

- 5 - strongly agree: 4%
- 4 - agree: 11%
- 3 - neither agree nor disagree: 23%
- 2 - disagree: 51%

The seventeenth statement “I would like to have more language clubs and language trainings for university administrative staff” was supported completely by 46 %, almost supported by 19 %, partially – by 16 % and rejected only by 19%:

Table 118. Reaction to Question 17.

17. I would like to have more language clubs and language trainings for university administrative staff

- 5 - strongly agree: 14%
- 4 - agree: 16%
- 3 - neither agree nor disagree: 46%
- 2 - disagree: 19%

The eighteenth statement “I would like the university to be more frequently visited by foreign teachers who give lectures in foreign languages” was supported completely by 42 %, almost supported by 20 %, partially – by 22 % and rejected only by 16 %:

Table 119. Reaction to Question 18.

18. I would like the university to be more frequently visited by foreign teachers who give lectures in foreign languages

- 5 - strongly agree: 7%
- 4 - agree: 22%
- 3 - neither agree nor disagree: 42%
- 2 - disagree: 20%

The last part of the questionnaire invites the respondents to give comments and additions; the only one commentary is found with the idea that knowledge of different languages empowers people, develops their culture.
So, if we take the replies of 74 members of ZNU administrative staff, we can find out the absolute average for each question and then arrange the absolute average on the scale. The absolute average will be afterwards arranged on the scale, from top minimum to top maximum, to show the results explicitly.

As the respondents were asked to show their attitude to the problem by using the standard grading system for Ukraine, the same approach will be taken to assess their attitude:

- 5 – very good (2 points);
- 4 – good (1 point);
- 3 – satisfactory (0 points);
- 2 – unsatisfactory (-1 point);
- 1 – very unsatisfactory (-2 points).

Thus, the absolute average can be calculated this way:

\[ AA = \frac{(VG \times 2 + G \times 1 + S \times 0 + U \times (-1) + VU \times (-2))}{74}, \]

where VG is the number of responses that received “5”;
G is the number of responses that received “4”;
S is the number of responses that received “3”;
U is the number of responses that received “2”;
VU is the number of responses that received “1”;
744 is the number of respondents.

For example, the absolute average for question 1 is:

\[ AA_1 = \frac{(47 \times 2 + 9 \times 1 + 10 \times 0 + 7 \times (-1) + 1 \times (-2))}{74} = 1.28 \]

The similar calculations for questions 2-18 gave the following results:

- \( AA_1 = 1.270 \)
- \( AA_2 = 0.932 \)
- \( AA_3 = 1.297 \)
- \( AA_4 = 0.932 \)
- \( AA_5 = -0.446 \)
- \( AA_6 = 0.581 \)
- \( AA_7 = 0.919 \)
- \( AA_8 = 0.243 \)
Table 120. Absolute Average.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The attitudes of the members of ZNU administrative staff towards the introduction of other languages of instruction (besides Ukrainian) vary greatly from -0.729 to 1.297 on average. Only 3 questions out of 18 questions given acquired negative reaction, 15 questions on average gained positive response.

The answers of the members of ZNU administrative staff can be divided into 3 groups: changes the responders are ready to follow and accept, changes they do not mind to be made, and those ideas the respondents reject.

Thus, the university can internationalize itself in three aspects, having much support from the members of the administrative staff. The administrative staff members agree with the following changes to be made:
1) Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union being equally used for university studies and learning;

2) Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be equally allowed in all stages of the education system in Ukraine;

3) classes of foreign languages for university administrative staff.

The most numerous group includes the statements ZNU administration is ready to accept, though some members have indefinite feelings concerning the issues. **The steps ZNU academic staff do not mind to include, such as:**

1) Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union should be used as LANGUAGES of INSTRUCTION from the 1st grade of primary school;

2) Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be allowed to be used for university graduation theses writing;

3) The number of academic staff members who are ready to teach subjects of university specialities in foreign languages should be increased;

4) There should be more language clubs and language trainings for university academic staff;

5) the university should be more frequently visited by foreign teachers who give lectures in foreign languages;

6) The volume of teaching in other than Ukrainian language should be increased to internationalise university studies;

7) Internship should have equal proportions of practice mother tongue and languages of the European Union;

8) To graduate from a university study programme a graduate should be certified on having acquired a foreign language mastery at specialist’s level (depending on a speciality from B1 to C2);

9) Each university course (both content and language) should allow students to use languages of the European Union in final assessment papers/exams;

10) Each university course (other than a language course) should be supported by study materials in foreign languages (English, German, French, etc.);

11) To be enrolled in a university programme a candidate should have a foreign language mastery at B1 level.

**The steps ZNU administration rejects to include:**

1) compulsory participation in international exchange programmes Union for the completion of a university programme;

2) writing graduation theses in one of languages of the European Union (e.g. English);

3) multilingual graduates able to speak at least 4 languages (state language and 3 foreign languages).
ZNU administrative staff appears to be the most reserved and careful part of the surveyed in relation to the issues under consideration. Though, the results of the survey manifest great similarity to the results of the surveyed ZNU students and academic staff. The graph below provides the summary of the results:

Table 121. Absolute average: comparison

![Graph showing the comparison of absolute average between students, lecturers, and administration]

According to the survey the respondents of all three categories mostly realize the priority of the state language and are sure that Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be equally allowed in all stages of the education system in Ukraine (AA1), while they are aware of the fact that for ZNU to accomplish its mission effectively Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union should be used as equal for university studies and learning (AA3) and for the members of the administrative staff it appears an issue of primary concern.

Both lecturers and administrators highly assess their foreign language classes and insist on their necessity, students are also positive in this issue (AA16), they would like to have more language clubs and language trainings (AA17). Both students and administration would like the university to be more frequently visited by foreign teachers who give lectures in foreign languages, but the lecturers consider the issue more important (AA18). All three categories of the respondents agree that Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be allowed to be used for university graduation theses writing (AA4), emphasizing the necessity to diversify the university language environment.

It is noteworthy that all respondents realize that Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union should be used as languages of instruction from the 1st grade of primary school (AA2), though this necessity is valued most by administration.

In relation to the issue of increasing the volume of teaching in other than Ukrainian language to internationalise university studies (AA6) all the respondents are unanimously and
unequivocally positive. Although concerning the need to increase the number of academic staff members who are ready to teach subjects of university specialities in foreign languages the opinions (AA7) are a bit different, with the administration being the most decisive.

All the respondents agree that each university course (other than a language course) should be supported by study materials in foreign languages (English, German, French, etc.) (AA9) and that each university course (both content and language) should allow students to use languages of the European Union in final assessment papers/exams (AA10), though the latter idea is not very popular, especially among students. All three categories of respondents also agree that internship should have equal proportions of practice in mother tongue and languages of the European Union (AA14).

The statement that to be enrolled in a university programme a candidate should have a foreign language mastery at B1 level (AA10) gave rise to differences of opinions among the respondents’ categories: only the members of administration results demonstrate a positive absolute, students and lecturers absolute is negative, showing that they are not ready to accept the idea. The idea that to graduate from a university study programme a graduate should be certified on having acquired a foreign language mastery at specialist’s level (depending on a speciality from B1 to C2) (AA11) also appeared controversial: the administrative staff approve of the idea, the academic staffs’ absolute is lower, though positive, while the students rejected the idea.

Four statements – the language of graduation theses writing should be one of languages of the European Union (e.g. English) (AA5), to complete a university programme a student should participate in international exchange programmes at least once during the study period (AA12), to complete a university programme a student should participate in international conferences/projects at least once during the study period to present his/her academic study outcomes in a language of the European Union (AA13), the university graduate should be multilingual to know at least 4 languages (state language and 3 foreign languages) (AA15) generated unanimous negation and rejection, demonstrating that the respondents are not ready for compulsory obligatory measures.

Thus, general recommendations grounded on the overall analyses are the following:

- Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be equally allowed in all stages of the education system in Ukraine;
- Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union should be used as languages of instruction from the 1st grade of primary school;
- Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union should be equally used for university studies and learning;
- Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be allowed to be used for university graduation theses writing;
- The volume of teaching in other than Ukrainian language should be increased to internationalise university studies;
- The number of academic staff members who are ready to teach subjects of university specialities in foreign languages should be increased;
- Each university course (other than a language course) should be supported by study materials in foreign languages (English, German, French, etc.);
• Each university course (both content and language) should allow students to use languages of the European Union in final assessment papers/exams;

• Internship should have equal proportions of practice in mother tongue and languages of the European Union;

• More classes of foreign languages should be provided for students, academic and administrative staff;

• More language clubs and language trainings should be organized;

• The university should be more frequently visited by foreign teachers who give lectures in foreign languages.

Although we should take into account that grounding on the results of absolute average we may fail to consider or take for granted the interests and needs of certain individual groups and it may cause negative reaction. Therefore, suggesting the abovementioned possible outcomes focusing on introducing foreign languages as languages of instruction, multilingual programmes, and internationalization of the university, we emphasize the necessity for further surveys which can take into consideration the specific character of ZNU departments, their resources and potential, the requirements of the changing labour market environment, etc.
4. CONCLUSIONS
124 LANGUAGE POLICIES OF ZAPORIZHZHIA NATIONAL UNIVERSITY (ZNU), UKRAINE
This report presents a contextualized case of Zaporizhzhia National University which is analyzing opportunities for university's internationalization in terms of its language policy. The first part of the study introduces the context and historical background of the use of languages in the educational area in Ukraine by defining key events and political decisions which have shaped the modern language policy of higher education in Ukraine. Historically, Ukraine has always enjoyed a strategically important position in the center of Europe where multilingualism has always been considered as a valuable cultural and linguistic asset. With the dominant role of Ukrainian as the only state language of the country, the place of foreign languages has been clearly defined by main legal acts of Ukraine throughout its modern history. The overview of historical events and legal acts issued at various periods of Ukrainian history convincingly explains why the multilingual language policy in higher education might be a topical issue in Ukrainian higher education now when Ukraine is becoming more and more open to the European higher education and has chosen a pro-European direction. In this respect, the survey conducted by the researchers’ team on the basis of the questionnaires is viewed as a starting point to establish the level of multilingualism the university community has, i.e. if the university community in its background knowledge of languages and its attitude to language learning and usage in the professional and personal lives is prepared for any developments/updates in the university’s language policy.

The second stage of the study focuses on the comparative analysis of regulations and legal acts (Statutes, Development strategies) of the leading Ukrainian universities located in all 25 regions of Ukraine, including border regions, with the aim to define universities’ internal factors for multilingualism. With 85% of the universities under analysis prioritizing language policy in their official legal acts, it can be assumed that it is a matter of prestige and necessity to follow a particular language strategy in teaching, learning and research for Ukrainian universities, which can be grouped as universities in whose legal acts the place of languages is defined as 1) State Language Priority in Teaching Plus Foreign Languages Option Approved by the University Council; 2) State Language Priority in Teaching Plus Foreign Languages Option Plus Minority Languages Approved by the University Council; 3) State Regulation Priority Policy in Teaching; 4) Teaching Language is not mentioned. This fact might be used as evidence proving the importance of language policy in the tertiary system of education of Ukraine. Though there are general regulations in language policy documents in all universities, the western part of Ukraine tends to be more cosmopolitan, and the eastern one to be more flexible and ambiguous concerning the language policy in higher educational institutions. The researchers’ team has also revealed in the regulations and acts of the universities the presence of certain important tendencies such as the desire of Ukraine to be involved in
the Eurointegration process, to enhance universities’ participation in international mobility programmes, to popularize Ukrainian achievements and its readiness for cooperation in the international tertiary education area. The comparative study of universities’ language policy acts creates a background to understand ZNU’s internal factors which influence its own language policy.

The third stage of the study considers ZNU as a member of the first group of universities where the priority of the state language as the language of instruction is clearly defined, and where instruction in foreign languages is officially approved by the University Council. Legal documents (the Statute, Study Regulations, Strategic Plan for 2011-2020, Strategic Plan for 2016-2020, and Admission Rules) refer to various aspects of language policy and make it clear that the priority of the Ukrainian language is university’s basic principle; legal acts also encourage teaching in foreign languages (English, German and French) and welcome the use of minority languages as well. Multilingualism is considered to be very important for the processes of integration, mobility and international cooperation in ZNU.

The analysis of the need for an updated multilingual language policy at ZNU from the perspective of the university’s community is presented in the final part of the report where opinions of academic staff members, students and administration are considered as a necessary pre-condition for the introduction of any recommendations to update university’s language policy at all levels of the university life (studies, teaching, research, management). The criteria of multilingual universities (Raud, Raik, 2014) are applied to structure the proposals of the multilingual language policy. The proposals are presented in three sections and are based on the data received during the survey conducted among the university community.

A questionnaire was designed to reveal the language situation. The questionnaire consists of three parts: the background of the respondents, the linguistic situation at the university and the region, the aspirations of the interviewees. 1832 respondents took part in the questionnaire: 1524 students, 234 teachers and 74 representatives of non-academic staff. Totally, over 20% of day-time university students, academic and non-academic staff took part in the survey.

Overall, the survey of students’ views of the linguistic situation and their mastery of different languages identifies ZNU as a multilingual educational establishment that has a huge potential to develop linguistically and internationally. The first part of the questionnaire concentrated on the background of the respondents. It should be noted that the majority of respondents said that they were born in Ukraine (86-97% for different groups). Most student respondents were born in independent Ukraine, while the situation is different for the academic and administrative staff, some of whom come from the former USSR republics. No single respondent was monolingual. The usual number included 3-4 languages, with some multilingual students speaking 6 languages.

The linguistic situations of the three groups had much in common. Over half of respondents of all groups said that their first language was Russian, while their mother tongue was Ukrainian. The dominant majority assessed their skills of both everyday and academic Ukrainian and Russian as proficient, C1-C2. The third most frequently mentioned language was English, and it took the third place in terms of both frequency and mastery. Over 90% of respondents learned it and just over half assessed themselves as independent and proficient speakers. The cohort of the interviewed students turned out to be most open and ready for the internationalization, if compared with the academic and administrative staff, the latter were most conservative. The results of the teachers’ survey give grounds to conclude that ZNU
academic members are open to the internationalization, but, at the same time they worry about the quality of teaching, the responsibility and new obligations imposed on them, they feel they need to improve their language skills before they start teaching in English.

The ZNU representatives were found to be generally positive about the broadening of language choices and multilingual education, though some questions receive overall support, while others, including strong obligations, were generally rejected. All university respondents are positive about learning Ukrainian and foreign languages from school onwards, using Ukrainian and foreign languages as languages of instruction, giving a wider spectrum of language choice for study materials, tests, exams, term papers, graduation theses, and internships. They want to have more classes of foreign languages, teach (be taught) in foreign languages, have language clubs and lingo trainings. It is also notable that the academic and administrative staff were more positive about the multilingual language policy, that can be explained by the fact that students realize that is a good idea, but it will cost them extra effort to study in a foreign language.

The questionnaire also revealed that English is currently more a language of unofficial communication, language of hobbies, music and social media rather than a language of instruction, though it is used for official purposes. It can become one if the university slightly changes its policies, introduces more elective courses in English, sets up more speaking clubs, holds events in English, engages students more actively into foreign projects and encourages more students to become exchange students or volunteer abroad. The university can also offer free test for students at the end of semester for them to track their progress and strengths and analyze their weaknesses. With the current situation and suggested approaches, the university can prosper both nationally and internationally as it will supply efficient and skillful specialists to the job market.

The results of the survey show that the new policy of the Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine about the state language priority and wider implication of EU languages as languages of instruction fully resonates with the answers of the respondents. With the inner drive of the university and the outer governmental support the university will have high chances for establishing itself in the European educational space and providing high educational services to the university students for the competitive markets.
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6. APPENDICES
Language policies at University (Ukraine): Students

1. Department and study programme you are enrolled in

   Department of Biology “Biology”
   Department of Biology “Genetics”
   Department of Biology “Ecology and environment protection”
   Department of Biology “Forest, Park and Garden Management”
   Department of Biology “Wildlife Management”
   Department of Biology “Chemistry”
   Department of Economics “Economics of Environment and Natural Resources”
   Department of Economics “Economic Cybernetics”
   Department of Economics “Marketing”
   Department of Economics “International Economics”
   Department of Economics “Accounting and Auditing”
   Department of Economics “Human Resources Management and Economics of Labour”
   Department of Economics “Project Management”
   Department of Economics “Banking and Finance”
   Department of History “History”
   Department of History “Country Studies”
   Department of Mathematics “Information Science”
   Department of Mathematics “Mathematics”
Department of Mathematics “Applied Mathematics”
Department of Mathematics “Software Engineering”
Department of Journalism “Publishing and Editing”
Department of Journalism “Journalism”
Department of Journalism “Media Communication”
Department of Journalism “Advertisement and Public Relations”
Department of Foreign Philology “Translation (English)”
Department of Foreign Philology “Translation (German)”
Department of Foreign Philology “Translation (French)”
Department of Foreign Philology “English Language and Literature”
Department of Foreign Philology “German Language and Literature”
Department of Foreign Philology “French Language and Literature”
Department of Foreign Philology “Spanish Language and Literature”
Department of Management “Business Administration”
Department of Management “Logistics”
Department of Management “Management of International Economic Activity”
Department of Management “Management of Organizations and Administration”
Department of Management “Management”
Department of Social Pedagogics and Psychology “Psychology”
Department of Social Pedagogics and Psychology “Social Pedagogics”
Department of Social Pedagogics and Psychology “Theatrical Art”
Department of Sociology and Administration “Public Service”
Department of Sociology and Administration “Political Studies”
Department of Sociology and Administration “Social Work”
Department of Sociology and Administration “Sociology”
Department of Sociology and Administration “Philosophy”
Department of Physical Training “Olympic and Professional Sport”
Department of Physical Training “Tourism”
Department of Physical Training “Physical Rehabilitation”
Department of Physical Training “Physical Training”
Department of Physics “Applied Physics”
Department of Physics “Physics”
Department of Philology “Translation (Ukrainian, Russia, Bulgarian)”
Department of Philology “Translation (Ukrainian, Russia, Polish)”
Department of Philology “Russian Language and Literature”
Department of Philology “Ukrainian Language and Literature”
Department of Law “Jurisprudence”

2. Year of education
   1 year
   2 year
   3 year
   4 year
   Specialist
   Master

3. Year of birth
   before 1991
   after 1991

4. Countries where you have lived
   Country of birth
   Ukraine
   Russia
   Belarus
   Other
   If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

   Country of general secondary education
   Ukraine
   Russia
   Belarus
   Other
   If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________
Country of undergraduate/graduate education

Ukraine
Russia
Belarus
Other
If you have chosen "other", please, specify it ____________________

Country where you lived most of the time in the last 5 years

Ukraine
Russia
Belarus
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ____________________

5. Please state the languages you know in order of acquisition
First language (L1)

Ukrainian
Russian
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ____________________

Second language (L2)

Ukrainian
Russian
English
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ____________________

Third language (L3)

Ukrainian
Russian
6. Please name the languages you use as:

a mother tongue

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

a home language

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

a community/local language _________________________
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

7. Languages by their volume at ZNU (5 – most frequently used, 0 – never used)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

8. Please mark your languages with one of the following aspects (more than one aspect can be marked):
Family communication
Ukrainian
Russian
English
Local community communication and languages you overhear in the streets

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _______________

University communication for studies and learning

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _______________
University communication with administration

- Ukrainian
- Russian
- English
- German
- French
- Polish
- Bulgarian
- Spanish
- Other
  If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _______________

International study projects

- Ukrainian
- Russian
- English
- German
- French
- Polish
- Bulgarian
- Spanish
- Other
  If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _______________

Research/academic writing (course and diploma papers, etc.) at university

- Ukrainian
- Russian
- English
- German
- French
- Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Communication at work
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Communication with friends
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Reading for leisure
Ukrainian
Listening to music

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other

Not interested in music

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

Sports

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other

Not interested in sports
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

TV and mass media
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
Not interested in TV and mass media
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

Internet /social networking
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
Not interested in Internet /social networking
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________
Travelling

- Ukrainian
- Russian
- English
- German
- French
- Polish
- Bulgarian
- Spanish
- Other

Not interested in traveling

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

I miss this language at university

- Ukrainian
- Russian
- English
- German
- French
- Polish
- Bulgarian
- Spanish
- Other

I do not miss any

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________
9. Please identify the level of language mastery* you have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Proficiency Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Proficient User | C2 | **90-100%**  
Written and oral speech of any level of difficulty of any subject, free participation in discussions  
Can understand with ease virtually everything heard or read. Can summarise information from different spoken and written sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can express him/herself spontaneously, very fluently and precisely, differentiating finer shades of meaning even in more complex situations. |
|             | C1 | **75-90%**  
Written and oral speech of high level, participation in discussions without major problems  
Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognise implicit meaning. Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices. |
| Independent User | B2 | **60-75%**  
Basic ideas and details of complicated texts, relative participation in discussion on different subjects  
Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialisation. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party. Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options. |
|             | B1 | **45-60%**  
Basic ideas and details of simple and clear texts, participation in discussion on everyday problems  
Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. Can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. Can produce simple connected text on topics, which are familiar, or of personal interest. Can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes & ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans. |
| Basic User  | A2 | **25-45%**  
Not complicated oral and written texts, participation in dialogues about yourself, your family, hobbies  
Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment). Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters. Can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need. |
|             | A1 | **25%**  
Simple everyday phrases  
Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help. |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ukrainian</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for academic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for academic purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for academic writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of academic/scientific sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Russian</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for academic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for academic purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for academic writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of academic/scientific sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for academic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for academic purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for academic writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>French</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of academic /scientific sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of academic /scientific sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have you know any other language, please, specify it _________________ and complete the chart.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for academic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for academic purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for academic writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of academic /scientific sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Please indicate if you agree with the following statements (1 stands for “you do not agree” and 5 means “agree completely”)

<p>| Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be equally allowed in all stages of the education system in Ukraine | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  |
| Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union should be used as LANGUAGES of INSTRUCTION from the 1st grade of primary school | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  |
| Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union should be used as equally used for university studies and learning | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  |
| Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be allowed to be used for university graduation theses writing | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  |
| The language of graduation theses writing should be one of languages of the European Union (e.g. English) | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  |
| The volume of teaching in other than Ukrainian language should be increased to internationalise university studies | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  |
| The number of academic staff members who are ready to teach subjects of university specialities in foreign languages should be increased | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  |
| Each university course (other than a language course) should be supported by study materials in foreign languages (English, German, French, etc.) | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  |
| Each university course (both content and language) should allow students to use languages of the European Union in final assessment papers/exams | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  |
| To be enrolled in a university programme a candidate should have a foreign language mastery at B1 level | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  |
| To graduate from a university study programme a graduate should be certified on having acquired a foreign language mastery at specialist’s level (depending on a speciality from B1 to C2) | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To complete a university programme a student should participate in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>international exchange programmes at least once during the study period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To complete a university programme a student should participate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in international conferences /projects at least once during the study</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>period to present his/her academic study outcomes in a language of the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship should have equal proportions of practice mother</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tongue and languages of the European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university graduate should be multilingual to know at least 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>languages (state language and 3 foreign languages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to have more classes of foreign languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to have more language clubs and language trainings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like the university to be more frequently visited by foreign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>teachers who give lectures in foreign languages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. **I also want to add**

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________
1. Department and chair

Department of Biology “Chair of Forest Biology, Hunting Studies and Ichthyology”

Department of Biology “Chair of General and Applied Ecology and Zoology”

Department of Biology “Chair of Park and Garden Management and Genetics”

Department of Biology “Chair of Physiology, Immunology and Biochemistry, Civil Defense and Medicine”

Department of Biology “Chair of Chemistry”

Department of Economics “Chair of Economic Cybernetics”

Department of Economics “Chair of International Economics, Natural Resources and Economic Theory”

Department of Economics “Chair of Auditing and Taxation”

Department of Economics “Chair of Human Resources Management and Marketing”

Department of Economics “Chair of Financial and Economic Security and Project Management”

Department of Economics “Chair of Finances, Banking and Insurance”

Department of History “Chair of World History and International Relations”

Department of History “Chair of Source Study, Historiography and Special History Disciplines”

Department of History “Chair of History of Ukraine”

Department of History “Chair of New History of Ukraine”

Department of Mathematics “Chair of General Mathematics”

Department of Mathematics “Chair of Information Science”

Department of Mathematics “Chair of Fundamental Mathematics”

Department of Mathematics “Chair of Software Engineering”

Department of Journalism “Chair of Publishing and Editing”

Department of Journalism “Chair of Journalism”

Department of Journalism “Chair of Media Communication, Advertisement and Public Relations”

Department of Foreign Philology “Chair of Theory and Practice of English Translation”

Department of Foreign Philology “Chair of Second Language Teaching”

Department of Foreign Philology “Chair of Foreign Languages for Specific Purposes”
Department of Foreign Philology “Chair of English Philology”
Department of Foreign Philology “Chair of German Philology and Translation”
Department of Foreign Philology “Chair of Romance Philology and Translation”
Department of Management “Chair of Business Administration and Management of International Economic Activity”
Department of Management “Chair of Business Communication”
Department of Management “Chair of Entrepreneurship, Management of Enterprise and Logistics”
Department of Social Pedagogics and Psychology “Chair of Psychology”
Department of Social Pedagogics and Psychology “Chair of Social Pedagogics”
Department of Social Pedagogics and Psychology “Chair of Theatrical Art and Design”
Department of Social Pedagogics and Psychology “Chair of Pedagogics and Psychology of Educational Activity”
Department of Sociology and Administration “Chair of Political Studies”
Department of Sociology and Administration “Chair of Social Philosophy and Administration”
Department of Sociology and Administration “Chair of Sociology”
Department of Sociology and Administration “Chair of Philosophy”
Department of Physical Training “Chair of Tourism”
Department of Physical Training “Chair of Physical Training”
Department of Physical Training “Chair of Physical Training and Sport”
Department of Physical Training “Chair of Physical Rehabilitation”
Department of Physical Training “Chair of Medical and Biological Basics of Physical Training and Sport”
Department of Physical Training “Chair of Theory and Methods of Physical Training and Sport”
Department of Physics “Chair of Applied Physics and Nanomaterials”
Department of Physics “Chair of Physics of Metals”
Department of Physics “Chair of Physics and Methods of Teaching”
Department of Philology “Chair of Slavic Philology”
Department of Philology “Chair of Ukrainian Studies”
Department of Philology “Chair of Ukrainian Literature”
Department of Philology “Chair of Ukrainian Literature”
2. **Type of employment contract you have with the University**
   - a full-time contract
   - a part-time contract *
   - a visiting lecturer’s contract

   For a part-time employment, please, specify your full-time employment ________________________________

3. **Academic degree you possess**
   - Doctor of Science
   - Doctor (PhD equivalent)
   - Master
   - Specialist

4. **Year of birth**
   - before 1950
   - between 1950-1960
   - between 1960-1970
   - between 1970-1980
   - between 1980-1990
   - after 1991

5. **Sex**
   - m
   - f
5. *Countries where you have lived*

Country of birth
- Ukraine
- Russia
- Belarus
- Other

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Country of general secondary education
- Ukraine
- Russia
- Belarus
- Other

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Country of graduate education
- Ukraine
- Russia
- Belarus
- Other

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Country of PhD education
- Ukraine
- Russia
- Belarus
- Other

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Country of Doctor of Science education
- Ukraine
Country where you lived most of the time in the last 5 years

Ukraine
Russia
Belarus
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

6. Please state the languages you know in order of acquisition

First language (L1)

Ukrainian
Russian
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Second language (L2)

Ukrainian
Russian
English
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Third language (L3)

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

Fourth language (L4)
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

7. **Please name the languages you use as:**

a mother tongue
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

a home language
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________
a community/local language _________________________

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

8. Languages you use teaching at ZNU (5 – most frequently used, 0 – never used)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

9. Please mark your languages with one of the following aspects (more than one aspect can be marked):
Family communication

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

Local community communication and languages you overhear in the streets
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

University communication for teaching
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

University communication with administration
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

International study projects
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Research/academic writing (course and diploma papers, etc.) at university
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________
Work outside the University

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

Communication with colleagues

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

Reading for leisure

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Listening to music

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other

Not interested in music
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

Sports

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other

Not interested in sports
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________
TV and mass media

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
Not interested in TV and mass media

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Internet /social networking

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
Not interested in Internet /social networking

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Travelling

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
Not interested in traveling
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

I miss this language at university
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
I do not miss any
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

10. Please identify the level of language mastery* you have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
<td>Can understand with ease virtually everything heard or read. Can summarise information from different spoken and written sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can express him/herself spontaneously, very fluently and precisely, differentiating finer shades of meaning even in more complex situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>75-90%</td>
<td>Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognise implicit meaning. Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>60-75%</td>
<td>Basic ideas and details of complicated texts, relative participation in discussion on different subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>45-60%</td>
<td>Basic ideas and details of simple and clear texts, participation in discussion on everyday problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>25-45%</td>
<td>Not complicated oral and written texts, participation in dialogues about yourself, your family, hobbies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>&lt;25%</td>
<td>Simple everyday phrases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ukrainian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>Level</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for academic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for academic purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for academic writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of academic /scientific sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Russian</strong></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for academic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for academic purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for academic writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of academic /scientific sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>German</strong></th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for academic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for academic purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for academic writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of academic /scientific sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>French</strong></th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for academic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for academic purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for academic writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of academic/scientific sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Spanish**

| Everyday oral communication | C2 | C1 | B2 | B1 | A2 | A1 |
| Oral Communication for academic needs |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Listening comprehension for everyday purposes |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Listening comprehension for academic purposes |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Writing skills necessary for informal communication |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Writing skills necessary for academic writing |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Reading comprehension of academic/scientific sources for research and study purposes |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language |   |   |   |   |   |   |

If you have you know any other language, please, specify it _________________ and complete the chart

**Other**

| Everyday oral communication | C2 | C1 | B2 | B1 | A2 | A1 |
| Oral Communication for academic needs |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Listening comprehension for everyday purposes |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Listening comprehension for academic purposes |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Writing skills necessary for informal communication |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Writing skills necessary for academic writing |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication |   |   |   |   |   |   |
| Reading comprehension of academic/scientific sources for research and study purposes |   |   |   |   |   |   |
11. Please indicate if you agree with the following statements (1 stands for “you do not agree” and 5 means “agree completely”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be equally allowed in all stages of the education system in Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union should be used as LANGUAGES OF INSTRUCTION from the 1st grade of primary school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union should be used as equally used for university studies and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be allowed to be used for university graduation theses writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The language of graduation theses writing should be one of languages of the European Union (e.g. English)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The volume of teaching in other than Ukrainian language should be increased to internationalise university studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of academic staff members who are ready to teach subjects of university specialities in foreign languages should be increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each university course (other than a language course) should be supported by study materials in foreign languages (English, German, French, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each university course (both content and language) should allow students to use languages of the European Union in final assessment papers/exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be enrolled in a university programme a candidate should have a foreign language mastery at B1 level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To graduate from a university study programme a graduate should be certified on having acquired a foreign language mastery at specialist's level (depending on a speciality from B1 to C2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To complete a university programme a student should participate in international exchange programmes at least once during the study period</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To complete a university programme a student should participate in international conferences /projects at least once during the study period to present his/her academic study outcomes in a language of the European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internship should have equal proportions of practice mother tongue and languages of the European Union</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The university graduate should be multilingual to know at least 4 languages (state language and 3 foreign languages)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like the classes of foreign languages for university academic staff to continue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I would like to have more language clubs and language trainings for university academic staff

I would like the university to be more frequently visited by foreign teachers who give lectures in foreign languages

12. I also want to add

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________

_______________________________________________________________________________
Language policies at University (Ukraine): Administrative Staff

PhD Office
Office of Educational Work
Office of Pre-University preparation, Professional Orientation and Employment
Office of Student Human Resources
International Office
Office of Project Management
Office of Education
Library
Science and Research Office
Regional Educational Newspaper
Portal “Porogy”
Press-Center
Radio “Universe”
Rectorat
Sports and Health Complex
Students’ Council
Center of Culture
Center of Independent Sociological Research

1. Year of birth
   before 1950
   between 1950-1960
   between 1960-1970
   between 1970-1980
   between 1980-1990
   after 1991
2. Sex
   m
   f

3. Countries where you have lived
   Country of birth
     Ukraine
     Russia
     Belarus
     Other
     If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

   Country of general secondary education
     Ukraine
     Russia
     Belarus
     Other
     If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

   Country of graduate education
     Ukraine
     Russia
     Belarus
     Other
     If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

   Country of PhD education
     Ukraine
     Russia
     Belarus
     Other
     If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________
Country of Doctor of Science education

Ukraine
Russia
Belarus
Other

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _______________

Country where you lived most of the time in the last 5 years

Ukraine
Russia
Belarus
Other

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _______________

4. Please state the languages you know in order of acquisition
First language (L1)

Ukrainian
Russian
Other

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _______________

Second language (L2)

Ukrainian
Russian
English
Other

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _______________

Third language (L3)

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Fourth language (L4)
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

5. Please name the languages you use as:
a mother tongue
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

a home language
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Other
If you have chosen "other", please, specify it ________________

a community/local language _________________________
   Ukrainian
   Russian
   English
   German
   French
   Other
   If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

6. Languages of Administration and Management (5 – most frequently used, 0 – never used)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Language</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>German</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

7. Please mark your languages with one of the following aspects (more than one aspect can be marked):

Family communication
   Ukrainian
   Russian
   English
   German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Local community communication and languages you overhear in the streets
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

University communication: with students
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________
University communication: with academic staff

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

University communication: with administration

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

International projects

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Work outside the University
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Communication with colleagues
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Reading for leisure
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other

Listening to music
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
Not interested in music
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _______________

Sports
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
Not interested in sports
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _______________
TV and mass media

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
Not interested in TV and mass media
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ___________________

Internet /social networking

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
Not interested in Internet /social networking
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ___________________

Travelling

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
Not interested in traveling
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

I miss this language at university
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
I do not miss any
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

8. Please identify the level of language mastery* you have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
<td>Can understand with ease virtually everything heard or read. Can summarise information from different spoken and written sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can express him/herself spontaneously, very fluently and precisely, differentiating finer shades of meaning even in more complex situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1</td>
<td>75-90%</td>
<td>Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognise implicit meaning. Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2</td>
<td>60-75%</td>
<td>Basic ideas and details of complicated texts, relative participation in discussion on different subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1</td>
<td>45-60%</td>
<td>Basic ideas and details of simple and clear texts, participation in discussion on everyday problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>25-45%</td>
<td>Not complicated oral and written texts, participation in dialogues about yourself, your family, hobbies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>Simple everyday phrases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ukrainian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Skill</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for administrative needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for administrative purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for administrative writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of administrative sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for administrative needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for administrative purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for administrative writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of administrative sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>German</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for administrative needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for administrative purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for administrative writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of administrative sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>French</strong></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>A1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for administrative needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for administrative purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for administrative writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of administrative sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Spanish</strong></th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for administrative needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for administrative purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for administrative writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of administrative sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you have you know any other language, please, specify it _________________ and complete the chart.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Other</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for administrative needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for administrative purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for administrative writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of administrative sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Please indicate if you agree with the following statements (1 stands for “you do not agree” and 5 means “agree completely”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be equally allowed in all stages of the education system in Ukraine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union should be used as LANGUAGES of INSTRUCTION from the 1st grade of primary school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian and at least two languages of the European Union should be used as equally used for university studies and learning</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukrainian and languages of the European Union should be allowed to be used for university graduation theses writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The language of graduation theses writing should be one of languages of the European Union (e.g. English)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The volume of teaching in other than Ukrainian language should be increased to internationalise university studies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of academic staff members who are ready to teach subjects of university specialities in foreign languages should be increased</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each university course (other than a language course) should be supported by study materials in foreign languages (English, German, French, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each university course (both content and language) should allow students to use languages of the European Union in final assessment papers/exams</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To be enrolled in a university programme a candidate should have a foreign language mastery at B1 level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To graduate from a university study programme a graduate should be certified on having acquired a foreign language mastery at specialist’s level (depending on a speciality from B1 to C2)

To complete a university programme a student should participate in international exchange programmes at least once during the study period

To complete a university programme a student should participate in international conferences/projects at least once during the study period to present his/her academic study outcomes in a language of the European Union

Internship should have equal proportions of practice mother tongue and languages of the European Union

The university graduate should be multilingual to know at least 4 languages (state language and 3 foreign languages)

I would like to have classes of foreign languages for university administrative staff

I would like to have more language clubs and language trainings for university administrative staff

I would like the university to be more frequently visited by foreign teachers who give lectures in foreign languages

10. I also want to add

_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________________________
1. Area of Studies

Biology
Ecology
Economics
Journalism
History and Archaeology
Computer Science and Information Technology
Marketing
Management
Political Studies
Law
Applied Mathematics
Applied Physics and Nanomaterials
Professional Education
Psychology
General Education
Social Work
Sociology
Physics and Astronomy
Physical Culture and Sport
Philology (Foreign Languages)
Philology (Ukrainian Language)
Philosophy
Chemistry

2. Form of Education

full-time
part-time *
3. **Academic degree you possess**
   - Doctor (PhD equivalent)
   - Master
   - Specialist

4. **Year of birth**
   - before 1991
   - after 1991

5. **Sex**
   - m
   - f

6. **Countries where you have lived**
   **Country of birth**
   - Ukraine
   - Russia
   - Belarus
   - Other
   If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

   **Country of general secondary education**
   - Ukraine
   - Russia
   - Belarus
   - Other
   If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________
Country of graduate education
   Ukraine
   Russia
   Belarus
   Other
   If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Country of PhD education
   Ukraine
   Russia
   Belarus
   Other
   If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Country where you lived most of the time in the last 5 years
   Ukraine
   Russia
   Belarus
   Other
   If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

6. Please state the languages you know in order of acquisition
First language (L1)
   Ukrainian
   Russian
   Other
   If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Second language (L2)
   Ukrainian
   Russian
English
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _______________

Third language (L3)
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _______________

Fourth language (L4)
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _______________

7. Please name the languages you use as:
a mother tongue
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _______________
a home language

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

a community/local language ________________

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

8. Languages you use teaching at ZNU (5 – most frequently used, 0 – never used)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>0</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
1  | Ukrainian
   | Russian
   | English
   | German
   | French
   | Polish
   | Bulgarian
   | Spanish
   | Other

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________
9. Please mark your languages with one of the following aspects (more than one aspect can be marked):

Family communication

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _______________

Local community communication and languages you overhear in the streets

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _______________

University communication for studying

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen "other", please, specify it _________________

University communication with administration

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

International study projects

Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________
Research/academic writing (course and diploma papers, etc.) at university

- Ukrainian
- Russian
- English
- German
- French
- Polish
- Bulgarian
- Spanish
- Other

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Communication at work

- Ukrainian
- Russian
- English
- German
- French
- Polish
- Bulgarian
- Spanish
- Other

If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Communication with colleagues

- Ukrainian
- Russian
- English
- German
- French
- Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Reading for leisure
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other

Listening to music
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
Not interested in music
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it _________________

Sports
Ukrainian
Not interested in sports
If you have chosen "other", please, specify it ________________

TV and mass media
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other
Not interested in TV and mass media
If you have chosen "other", please, specify it ________________

Internet /social networking
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other

Not interested in Internet/social networking
If you have chosen "other", please, specify it ____________________

Travelling
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other

Not interested in traveling
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________

I miss this language at university
Ukrainian
Russian
English
German
French
Polish
Bulgarian
Spanish
Other

I do not miss any
If you have chosen “other”, please, specify it ________________
10. Please identify the level of language mastery* you have:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Language Proficiency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>C2 Proficient User</td>
<td>90-100%</td>
<td>Can understand with ease virtually everything heard or read. Can summarise information from different spoken and written sources, reconstructing arguments and accounts in a coherent presentation. Can express him/herself spontaneously, very fluently and precisely, differentiating finer shades of meaning even in more complex situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C1 Independent User</td>
<td>75-90%</td>
<td>Can understand a wide range of demanding, longer texts, and recognise implicit meaning. Can express him/herself fluently and spontaneously without much obvious searching for expressions. Can use language flexibly and effectively for social, academic and professional purposes. Can produce clear, well-structured, detailed text on complex subjects, showing controlled use of organisational patterns, connectors and cohesive devices.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B2 B1 Basic User</td>
<td>60-75%</td>
<td>Can understand the main ideas of complex text on both concrete and abstract topics, including technical discussions in his/her field of specialisation. Can interact with a degree of fluency and spontaneity that makes regular interaction with native speakers quite possible without strain for either party. Can produce clear, detailed text on a wide range of subjects and explain a viewpoint on a topical issue giving the advantages and disadvantages of various options.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B1 B2 Basic User</td>
<td>45-60%</td>
<td>Can understand the main points of clear standard input on familiar matters regularly encountered in work, school, leisure, etc. Can deal with most situations likely to arise whilst travelling in an area where the language is spoken. Can produce simple connected text on topics, which are familiar, or of personal interest. Can describe experiences and events, dreams, hopes &amp; ambitions and briefly give reasons and explanations for opinions and plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2 Ao 25% Basic User</td>
<td>25-45%</td>
<td>Can understand sentences and frequently used expressions related to areas of most immediate relevance (e.g. very basic personal and family information, shopping, local geography, employment). Can communicate in simple and routine tasks requiring a simple and direct exchange of information on familiar and routine matters. Can describe in simple terms aspects of his/her background, immediate environment and matters in areas of immediate need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1 Ao 20% Basic User</td>
<td>20-25%</td>
<td>Can understand and use familiar everyday expressions and very basic phrases aimed at the satisfaction of needs of a concrete type. Can introduce him/herself and others and can ask and answer questions about personal details such as where he/she lives, people he/she knows and things he/she has. Can interact in a simple way provided the other person talks slowly and clearly and is prepared to help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ukrainian</strong></td>
<td>C2</td>
<td>C1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for academic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for academic purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for academic writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of academic/scientific sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Russian</strong></th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for academic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for academic purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for academic writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of academic/scientific sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>German</strong></th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for academic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for academic purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for academic writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of academic /scientific sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>French</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for academic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for academic purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for academic writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of academic /scientific sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from another language into mother tongue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-linguistic skills for translation purposes from mother tongue into another language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>C2</th>
<th>C1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>A2</th>
<th>A1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Everyday oral communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oral Communication for academic needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for everyday purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Listening comprehension for academic purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for informal communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Writing skills necessary for academic writing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension for leisure and everyday communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading comprehension of academic /scientific sources for research and study purposes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Please indicate if you agree with the following statements (1 stands for “you do not agree” and 5 means “agree completely”)
Each university course (other than a language course) should be supported by study materials in foreign languages (English, German, French, etc.)

Each university course (both content and language) should allow students to use languages of the European Union in final assessment papers/exams

To be enrolled in a university programme a candidate should have a foreign language mastery at B1 level

To graduate from a university study programme a graduate should be certified on having acquired a foreign language mastery at specialist’s level (depending on a speciality from B1 to C2)

To complete a university programme a student should participate in international exchange programmes at least once during the study period

To complete a university programme a student should participate in international conferences /projects at least once during the study period to present his/her academic study outcomes in a language of the European Union

Internship should have equal proportions of practice mother tongue and languages of the European Union

The university graduate should be multilingual to know at least 4 languages (state language and 3 foreign languages)

I would like PhD students to have more classes of foreign languages

I would like to have more language clubs and language trainings for university academic staff

I would like the university to be more frequently visited by foreign teachers who give lectures in foreign languages

12. I also want to add