What fieldworks tell us on language learning attitudes

**Objectives**
The MIME team at the University of Milano-Bicocca analyzed different fieldworks involving people in mobility, language contact and therefore issues of language learning and inclusion in the hosting society. Several variables were taken into account:

- **Level of education and learning variable**
- **Age**
- **Motivation behind mobility** (e.g. forced, voluntary, study, job)
- **Direction and type of mobility** (e.g. seasonal, temporary, long-term)
- **Language repertoire at the beginning of mobility**
- **Repertoire typology of the recipient area**
- **Language distance**

**Results**
Some common patterns have been found across the four fieldworks:

- **Metalinguistic awareness** is crucial in the process of inclusion, both in maintaining the language(s) of the origin and in acquiring the language(s) of the hosting society;
- **An instrumental attitude** can hinder inclusion, if satisfied by relying on English as a lingua franca, which does not foster cultural acclimation in the hosting environment (Vasa/Vaasa, AEGEE) or using intercomprehension as a multilingual strategy (Andorra) or if it is related to negative attitudes towards learning local varieties (e.g. German dialects in South Tyrol);
- **Modalities of acquisition** influence language use: languages learnt in formal settings (such as school or University) tend to be used formally, while conversely languages acquired informally will have more influence on a daily-based use.

**Methodology & Fieldworks**
The main methodological tool for data elicitation has been language biographies, in the fieldworks:

1) Ex-Yugoslavian migrants in multilingual South Tyrol (Italy, 2013-2014).
2) Members of AEGEE gathering in summer universities in Genoa (Italy, 2015), Niš (Serbia, 2015), La Laguna (Tenerife, Spain, 2016).
4) White-collar workers in corporations settled in Vasa/Vaasa (Finland, 2015), coming from abroad.

**Linguistic ease for linguistic justice**
Minimizing the level of linguistic unease, i.e. when “speakers feel that their pragmatic linguistic competence is not fitting the communicative requirements of the linguistic act they are about to perform – or even that the symbolic value of their speech acts is perceived as misplaced (Dell’Aquila, Gobbo & Iannaccaro, in press)” may be a good indicator to achieve linguistic justice on a personal level, avoiding risks of semilingualism, i.e. when the individual is in discomfort with all languages in the repertoire.
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