1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

I Attitudes towards English in Society

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

1 Olivia Walsh

2 1 Attitudes towards English in France

3
4
5 **Abstract:** It is often claimed that French speakers display a particularly high
6 level of concern about the effect that English has on the French language. The
7 *Académie française* is seen to be representative of such an outlook, as are the
8 many official measures taken to protect the language from English influence,
9 such as the introduction of the 1975 *Bas-Lauriol* and 1994 *Toubon* laws, which
10 attempt to curtail the use of English in certain official domains, and the creation
11 of bodies such as the *Délégation à la langue française et aux langues de France*
12 and the French terminology commissions which introduce replacement French
13 terms for English borrowings. These all relate to language activity at the official
14 level, however. If we are to provide a representative picture of attitudes towards
15 English in contemporary France, it is important to consider language activity at
16 the non-official level also. This paper therefore investigates the language use
17 and attitudes of individual members of the speech community in France towards
18 the English language in general and, more specifically, towards the use of
19 anglicisms in French, to determine whether ‘ordinary’ speakers of French in
20 France reflect the concerns displayed at the official level.

21
22 **Keywords:** anglicisms, borrowings, language attitudes, language policy,
23 language ideology
24
25

26 1 Introduction

27
28 French speakers in France are often seen to display great concern about the
29 effect that English has on the French language and to be particularly eager
30 to protect their language from borrowings from English. The existence of the
31 *Académie française* and official language planning measures such as the creation
32 of linguistic laws and terminology commissions in France, along with the publica-
33 tion of high-profile works such as Étiemble’s (1964) *Parlez-vous franglais?* have
34 served to bolster this view. These all relate to language activity at the official
35 level, however. It appears to be widely assumed that the French population in
36 general also displays this concern for their language, but there have been very
37 few studies to determine whether or not this is in fact the case. We will first
38 outline some of the official language planning measures taken in France, which
39 are representative of a certain attitude towards the English language, before
40

1 outlining the design and results of two studies undertaken to determine whether
 2 or not this official attitude is mirrored by members of the general speech com-
 3 munity in France.

6 2 Official positions towards English in France

8 The French language enjoyed a particularly privileged status in the past, acting
 9 as the international language of diplomacy and education: the privileged lan-
 10 guage of a small and advantaged elite. This led to the French language becom-
 11 ing associated with a high level of prestige and to a number of myths about the
 12 language, for example, that it is exceptionally clear, logical and pure (cf. Lodge
 13 1998). However, French no longer enjoys this privileged status as an inter-
 14 national, elite language, and directly related to this is the fact that France no
 15 longer has the political power it once had and has had to make a transition
 16 from dominant power to relatively minor player in the global arena (Oakes
 17 2001: 154). As France's role in the world has diminished, the United States has
 18 become increasingly more influential and powerful in the economic, political
 19 and cultural spheres and so too has the English language. This has arguably
 20 had an effect on language attitudes in France, leading to the notion that not
 21 only is the French language losing prestige, but that it is under attack from
 22 English or Anglo-American. As Schiffman (1996: 77) puts it:

24 Today, there is widespread concern in France about the loss of the international status
 25 French had acquired during the Enlightenment, and as Anglophone visitors to France are
 26 well aware, much of the blame for this loss is laid at the feet of Anglo-American culture
 27 and the English language.

28 This concern has been seen to lead to a “crisis of French”¹ in current-day France
 29 (cf. Adamson 2007: xi–xx). Although the issue of whether or not there really is a
 30 language “crisis” in France is debatable, it is clear that at least some French
 31 speakers in France believe their language to be seriously threatened. One of
 32 the first major indications of this perceived threat to the language was at the
 33 founding of the United Nations in 1945, where the French language was granted
 34 official status by one vote only. Since then, and as American English has
 35 increasingly gained ground as the major world language, French political dis-
 36 course has begun more and more to give voice to the feeling that French society,
 37 and in particular its cultural symbols (e.g. language) are threatened and menaced

40 ¹ *crise du français* (all English translations mine, unless otherwise stated).

by change. For example, members of parliament talk of attacks on the language, the culture it conveys and the civilisation it symbolises, and governments, groups and individuals use the military language of defence and stability (Ager 1999: 9). In order to deal with this threat, various political strategies have been devised to try and improve the status of French and maintain its prestige. These include new language policies and state language planning (status and corpus planning).

2.1 Linguistic legislation in France

The 1960s saw a flurry of language and political activity. It was during this period that René Étiemble's *Parlez-vous franglais?* (1964) was published, which denounced the "Atlantic pidgin"² that he claimed was emerging due to the "bad" influence of American English on French. This work was deliberately extremist, as Étiemble wanted to alert the public to the dangers he felt were posed by English. Indeed, in his detailed study of Étiemble's work, Bogaards (2008: 108) states:

The message in *Parlez-vous franglais?* is clear: the French use too many English words; this endangers not only the purity of their language but also their economic and cultural independence, and even their intellectual integrity. If we want to prevent the worst from happening, it is therefore of the utmost urgency that we step in and take carefully thought-out measures [...] His objective is not to describe the state the language is in, in an even remotely objective manner, but to alert the public. And in this context, he has the right to overdo it. Which he has done, a little, and sometimes a lot.³

The fact that this work was reprinted three times and is still available for purchase today is perhaps an indication of the fear felt by some French people that their language was seriously threatened by English. Its popularity may also, however, have been due to a more general anti-American feeling, as France saw its international standing in the world diminished in the decades after the Second World War (Bogaards 2008: 133). Étiemble's work was swiftly followed by a concrete state manifestation of linguistic anti-Americanism: the founding

² *sabir Atlantique*. Note that the term *sabir* in French has very negative connotations, which is not necessarily true of the term 'pidgin' in English.

³ Le message de *Parlez-vous franglais?* est clair: les Français se servent trop de mots repris à l'anglais; cela met en danger non seulement la pureté de leur langue, mais aussi leur indépendance économique et culturelle, voire leur intégrité intellectuelle. Il est donc de la plus grande urgence, si on veut éviter le pire, d'intervenir et de prendre des mesures bien senties [...] son objectif n'était pas de décrire, d'une façon un tant soit peu objective, l'état de la langue, mais d'alerter le public. Et dans ce cadre, il avait le droit d'exagérer. Ce qu'il fit, un peu, et parfois beaucoup.

of the *Haut Comité pour la défense et l'expansion de la langue française*⁴ by Pompidou in 1966 (Bogaards 2008: 151). The task of the *Haut Comité* was “to create or encourage all initiatives relating to the defence of the French language or the promotion of its use abroad”.⁵ The use of the term “defence” clearly reflects the state’s desire to “protect” the French language, as does the language used by Pompidou when discussing this law; he refers to the “the corruption of our language”⁶ and to “the bastardisation of the vocabulary”⁷ (Bogaards 2008: 151). Although the decree creating the *Haut Comité* does not explicitly mention the English language, it is clear that it is English, rather than any other language, which is perceived as constituting a threat.

This desire for “protection” eventually led to the adoption of the first linguistic law in France, the Bas-Lauriol law of 1975 and, later, the Toubon law of 1994. These laws are fairly similar; the Toubon law is seen as an update and expansion of the Bas-Lauriol, which did not prove to be very effective. The Bas-Lauriol law of 13 December 1975 (law no. 75-1349)⁸ was intended to act as a form of consumer and employee protection by making the use of French compulsory in various domains to protect the French from misinformation arising from the use of a foreign language (Judge 2000: 77). French was required to be used in product descriptions and advertisements (consumer information), in contracts of employment, and in all radio and television programs except those aimed at a foreign audience, and foreign terms were explicitly forbidden: “The use of any foreign term or expression is prohibited when an approved expression or term already exists” (article 1)⁹ This law therefore clearly displayed

⁴ The *Haut Comité* changed names several times. It became the *Haut Comité de la langue française* in 1973, and was then split into two bodies in 1984, the *Comité consultatif de la langue française* and the *Commissariat générale à la langue française*. In 1989 these became the *Conseil Supérieur de la langue française* and the *Délégation générale à la langue française*, respectively, and the latter was further renamed as the *Délégation générale à la langue française et aux langues de France* in 2001, DGLFLF “Les institutions chargées de la langue française” (01/2014), <<http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dglf/lois/archives/histoire1.htm>>

⁵ “de susciter ou d’encourager toutes initiatives se rapportant à la défense et à l’expansion de la langue française”, DGLFLF “Décret n° 66-203 du 31 mars 1996 portant création d’un Haut Comité pour la défense et l’expansion de la langue française” (01/2014), <http://www.dglf.culture.gouv.fr/lois/archives/31_03_66.htm>

⁶ “corruption de notre langue”

⁷ “l’abâtardissement du vocabulaire”

⁸ Legifrance, “Loi n° 75-1349 du 31 décembre 1975 relatif à l’emploi de la langue française” (01/2014), <http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/jopdf/common/jo_pdf.jsp?numJO=0&dateJO=19760104&numTexte=&pageDebut=00189&pageFin>

⁹ “Le recours à tout terme étranger ou à toute expression étrangère est prohibé lorsqu’il existe une expression ou un terme approuvés” (article 1).

the intent not only to impose the general use of French but, more specifically, to oppose the use of foreign terms or expressions in French.

This law did not prove to be very effective, in part because the fines imposed on anyone breaking the law were so minimal (Nelms-Reyes 1996: 298; Fagyal, Kibbee and Jenkins 2006: 178) and also because very few prosecutions were actually made (Grigg 1997: 372). Due to its lack of success, the Toubon law was passed on 4 August 1994.¹⁰ This law makes the use of French mandatory (but not exclusive) in five domains: education, commerce, the audio-visual media, the workplace, and public meetings such as colloquia and conferences, and its purpose is “to guarantee the right of citizens to use their language in certain circumstances of their daily lives”.¹¹ It states that French is the language of instruction, work, trade and exchanges and of the public services (article 1) and that French must be used in the naming, presentation, instructions for use, description and warranties of all goods, products or services and also for all written, spoken, radio or television advertisements (article 2). All signs posted or announcements made in public or on public transport must also be in French (article 3). All contracts in the public services must be drawn up in French, and may not contain any foreign terms or expressions if there exists an equivalent official French term (article 5). The law also ostensibly shows a change of strategy in the fight against English, by attempting to counteract the dominance of English not through traditional defensive measures but instead by actively promoting a policy of multilingualism: it states that public bodies, when providing translations, must use at least two other languages (article 4). For example, the SNCF must use at least two languages when providing translations for travellers and so, similarly, must government ministries and agencies, when providing translations of their websites. In reality, however, not much has changed, and the spread of French abroad and its promotion as an international language are still the main aims of the law (Oakes 2001: 161), which really seeks to bolster France’s position in the world. These laws show clearly that the official attitude towards English in France is highly negative; the laws are attempting to ensure that English terms are used as rarely as possible and that French continues to be used in as many domains as possible in France.

¹⁰ Legifrance, “Loi n° 94-665 du 4 août 1994 relative à l’emploi de la langue française” (01/2014), <<http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000349929&fastPos=1&fastReqId=268042532&categorieLien=cid&oldAction=rechTexte>>

¹¹ DGLFLF, “Circulaire du 19 mars 1996 concernant l’application de la loi n° 94-665 du 4 août 1994 relative à l’emploi de la langue française” (01/2014), <<http://www.dglf.culture.gouv.fr/droit/circ-fr.htm>>

2.2 Terminology commissions in France

A further significant official act of language planning in France was the creation of the terminology commissions, aimed at ensuring that technical vocabulary has a French origin and uses French native terms as far as possible (Ager 1999: 115), that is, aimed at finding French alternatives to Anglo-American terms. The first official terminology commissions, originally called the “commissions ministérielles de terminologie” (CMT) were established in the early 1970s, with more than ten CMT created within different ministries between 1970 and 1972. Although these published a number of new terms between 1973 and 1978, their output later diminished (Depecker 2001: 25). However, the creation of the *Commissariat général de la langue française* in February 1984 led to a new wave of activity and, in that year, numerous terminology decrees appeared in the *Journal officiel* and continued to appear regularly after this time (Depecker 2001: 26). In the period up to 1994, the commissions published over 4000 terms in the *Journal officiel*.¹²

The aim of these terminology commissions is fairly clear: to replace foreign borrowings in French. For example, the *Decree no. 72-19 of 7 January 1972 relating to the enrichment of the French language*¹³ states in Article 2 that the aims of the terminology commissions are “to establish an inventory of the gaps in French vocabulary in a given sector”¹⁴ and “to suggest the terms needed either to denote a new reality or to replace undesirable loanwords from foreign languages”.¹⁵ In later decrees, explicit references to foreign languages are either removed or toned down. For example, in *Decree no. 83-243 of 25 March 1983*¹⁶ and *Decree no. 86-439 of 11 March 1986*,¹⁷ there is no reference to foreign loanwords; instead emphasis is placed on creating new terms to fill lexical gaps. Although the reference to foreign languages is reintroduced in *Decree no. 96-602 of 3 July 1996*,¹⁸ this is more neutral than in earlier decrees; the term “loanword” is not used, instead it is stated in Article 7 that one of the aims of the commissions is to “collect, analyse and propose the terms and expressions that

¹² DGLFLF, “L’enrichissement de la langue française” 01/2014), http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dglf/terminologie/termino_enrichissement.htm

¹³ *Décret n° 72-19 du 7 janvier 1972 relatif à l’enrichissement de la langue française*

¹⁴ “d’établir pour un secteur déterminé un inventaire des lacunes du vocabulaire français”

¹⁵ “de proposer les termes nécessaires soit pour désigner une réalité nouvelle soit pour remplacer des emprunts indésirables aux langues étrangères”

¹⁶ *Décret n° 83-243 du 25 mars 1983*

¹⁷ *Décret n° 86-439 du 11 mars 1986*

¹⁸ *Décret n° 96-602 du 3 juillet 1996*

are needed, particularly those equivalent to new terms and expressions appearing in foreign languages”.¹⁹ The specialised terminology commissions relate in general to highly technical terminology in very specialised domains. The *Commission générale de terminologie* was also created in 1986 to deal with terms in general usage, and the decree creating this commission refers directly to foreign expressions: “The general commission has as its objective the creation of an inventory of foreign terms or expressions in common usage which require Gallicization”²⁰ (cf. Article 8 of *Decree no. 86-439 of 11 March 1986*).

The fact that foreign terms need to be “Gallicized” supports the idea that the aim of the commissions is not to create new terms to fill lexical gaps or name new concepts, but to remove foreign borrowings from the French language (which have already filled these gaps and named these concepts) and replace them with French terms. Furthermore, although English is not referred to explicitly in any of the decrees, the lists of terms created during this period are almost exclusively Anglicisms (cf. Depecker 2001), which demonstrates clearly that the “foreign terms and expressions” referred to are in fact English ones and that the aim of commissions is not to replace foreign terms in general but in fact to replace Anglicisms. The terminology commissions therefore appear to mirror the negative attitude towards the use of English in French displayed by the linguistic legislation. We can see that, at the official level at least, the perception from abroad that French attitudes towards English are very negative is certainly true. That this is the case is amply reinforced by other studies of language policy in France (cf. for example Ager 1990, 1999; Chansou 2003; Gordon 1978).

3 Individual attitudes towards English in France

Although it may be true that, at the official level, attitudes towards English are very negative, it is not clear whether these attitudes are replicated at the level of individual members of the speech community in France. Individual attitudes towards English in France need not necessarily correspond to those at the official level. Although certain scholars have attempted to address this question, studies remain relatively rare. Oakes (2001) in his investigation of the role language has played, and continues to play, in the construction of national identity in France and Sweden, attempted to test whether there are any discrepancies

¹⁹ “recueillir, analyser et proposer les termes et expressions nécessaires, notamment ceux équivalents à des termes et expressions nouveaux apparaissant dans les langues étrangères”

²⁰ “La commission générale a pour mission d’établir, dans le domaine du langage courant, un inventaire des termes ou expressions étrangers dont la francisation est requise”

1 between the grassroots and official levels in this regard. He found that the
 2 majority of respondents had positive attitudes towards English and did not
 3 perceive it as a threat; in fact, a majority claimed that it was not important that
 4 French be kept as pure as possible from foreign loan words. In terms of attitudes
 5 towards English, then, there was quite a significant level of divergence between
 6 grassroots and official circles (Oakes 2001: 175–226). Although Oakes only tested
 7 187 younger speakers (secondary school students) and it is not, therefore, clear
 8 whether this split can be generalised to the wider population in France, this
 9 is nonetheless an interesting result and demonstrates that it is important to
 10 distinguish between attitudes at the official level and attitudes of the speech
 11 community more generally. Many studies on language policy or on language
 12 and national identity do not take the wider speech community into account.

13 Ager (1999: 110–11) discusses the results from a SOFRES²¹ poll of representa-
 14 tive citizens in March 1994 on the image of French. This poll showed that the
 15 French general public does not display any major levels of insecurity about its
 16 language. Almost as many respondents felt that using American and English
 17 words and expressions is positive (42%) as did not (44%). As many felt that the
 18 use of American terms is shocking (49%) as held the opposite opinion (49%). If
 19 anything, the use of English terms was viewed positively: far more respondents
 20 chose positive terms to describe the use of English terms in everyday life than
 21 negative ones (41% of respondents found the use of English terms “modern”,
 22 30% “useful”, 19% “amusing”, compared to 16% who found it “snobbish”, 14%
 23 “annoying” and 6% “stupid”). As Ager states, these results demonstrate that it is
 24 unlikely that most members of the speech community in France are anywhere
 25 near as concerned by feelings of insecurity as the elite, and their general attitude
 26 towards Americanisms is much more practical than the idealistic and generalised
 27 dislike felt by that same elite. Members of the French speech community generally
 28 seem prepared to adopt Americanisms if they feel they are useful, and have no
 29 specific dislike of the English language (Ager 1999: 111). These results appear to
 30 coincide with Oakes’ survey above, and reinforce the idea that institutionalized
 31 attitudes towards the national language do not necessarily coincide with those
 32 of the general population. Finally, Flaitz’s (1988) volume on French perceptions
 33 of English as a world language shows that the attitudes of French people both
 34 towards English in general, and towards the influence of English on the French
 35 language more specifically, are more positive than official activity or pronounce-
 36 ments may lead us to believe. Other studies on the knowledge French speakers
 37 display of terminology commission replacement terms have shown that they

39 ²¹ *Société française d’études par sondages* [French Society of Survey Studies]
 40

are on the whole unaware of these terms, and more likely to use the English equivalents (cf. Cartier 1977; Fugger 1980, 1983; Guilford 1997). Although this is not necessarily reflective of a positive attitude towards Anglicisms (it would be possible for someone to have an aversion to Anglicisms as a matter of principle but to use them for practical reasons, for example), it does appear to reinforce Oakes' and Flaitz's studies. These studies, however, are now somewhat dated, and since their publication, the use of the Internet – and with this, the use of the English language – has become more and more prevalent, not just in France, but throughout the world. It may be that this has led to increased fears for the French language, or, equally, as more speakers become familiar with English, it may be that the attitudes outlined above, where speakers feel that English poses no great threat to French, have become even stronger. It was with this in mind, and within the framework of a larger study of linguistic purism in France, that we designed two empirical studies to examine speaker attitudes in France towards the English language and the use of Anglicisms in French: an online questionnaire provides a quantitative analysis of speaker attitudes and an interview study develops the examination of these attitudes in more detail to provide a qualitative analysis. Only those aspects of these two studies that are relevant to the question of attitudes to English in France are discussed here.

3.1 Individual attitudes towards English in France: questionnaire study

Data on attitudes to Anglicisms in France were gathered using an anonymous, online questionnaire. Of the various survey methods available for this type of study, an online questionnaire was chosen because it allows data to be collected from a large number of respondents simultaneously, and therefore requires fewer financial or temporal resources than distributing questionnaires in paper format or conducting interviews with a similar number of respondents. It also means that data can be gathered in a very uniform manner, as each person responds to exactly the same questions; and it allows anonymity, which increases the chances of collecting data that actually reflect respondents' true beliefs and attitudes. The social desirability bias, which refers to the tendency for respondents to respond to questions in a way that makes them appear more prestigious (Baker 1992: 18) is likely to be far less significant in an anonymous questionnaire than it may be in face-to-face interviews.

The questionnaire used a direct approach; respondents were overtly asked to report their attitudes. Questionnaire respondents included personal contacts

at universities and companies across France; members of academic departments, social groups and sports groups at schools and universities; members of trade unions and professional associations; and members of retiree associations. Although participants in a study of this type are essentially self-selecting and may therefore not reflect the attitudes of the French speech community as a whole, the large number of respondents may mitigate against this.

The results of the study were analysed quantitatively, combining descriptive statistics with tests for statistical significance, where these were deemed appropriate. The descriptive statistics mainly provide overall frequencies and percentages, and the test for statistical significance used is a contingency chi-square test, which gives a measure of the likelihood of the results observed being due to chance, or due to the effect of the independent variables investigated. These were used to test the effect of independent variables, such as age and level of education, on the data. As is standard in the social sciences, a p value of less than 0.05 is regarded as significant.

3.1.1 Social characteristics of questionnaire respondents

The questionnaire received several hundred responses, but in order to be retained, respondents had to be monolingual French speakers, be of French nationality and be resident in France. This left a total of 401 respondents. In terms of the social characteristics of the respondents, a slightly greater proportion was female (59%) than male (41%). The questionnaire included three age groups: a younger group, aged from 15 to 24; a middle group aged between 25 and 64; and an older group aged over 65. These correspond roughly to the three stages, which Ager (1990: 113) claims are linguistically relevant: “the period of schooling; the period of economic activity; and the period of retirement”. The greatest number of respondents (68%) were aged between 25 and 64, which is to be expected, given that this group has the greatest age span. 21% of respondents were aged between 15 and 24 and 11% were over 65. Although these may look like relatively small percentages, the relatively high number of respondents means that the numbers involved are more than adequate for comparative and statistical purposes.²² The questionnaire also included three education groups: Level 1, lower than school-leaving certificate; Level 2, school-leaving certificate; Level 3, third-level education. The majority of respondents had Level 3 education (83%), 10% had Level 2 education and 7% Level 1. It is likely that this is

²² In all cases where a chi-square test was used, each cell had more than 5 respondents.

due to the online nature of the questionnaire; it may be that more highly educated speakers are more likely to be in jobs which provide access to a computer and the Internet, for example. Where results are displayed using graphs, these graphs are proportional representations, allowing the different tendencies of each group to be clearly displayed. The variation in numbers just discussed must naturally lead us towards caution in interpreting these graphs. However, the statistical tests applied using the statistical package SPSS take uneven distributions into account and correct for these, which allows us to clearly determine which results are significant.

3.1.2 Questionnaire design

The questionnaire outlined here was part of a broader study examining linguistic purism in France and Quebec, which was composed of six parts. Sections from four of these parts are discussed here (sections from parts IIa, III, IV and V).²³ Part IIa of the questionnaire was designed to investigate attitudes to the use of Anglicisms in French by investigating whether, given a choice, respondents would choose to use an unassimilated loanword or its French replacement and, if they chose the replacement, whether they would choose an assimilated loanword or a calque. It additionally investigated how likely respondents were to choose a terminology commission term (in each case, the calque was also a terminology commission term). The sentences displayed in Figure 1 were shown on the screen, each with a gap and a choice of three terms to fill this gap: an unassimilated loanword (e.g. *web page*); an assimilated loanword (e.g. *page web*); or a calque (e.g. *page sur la toile*). We would expect respondents choosing mainly unassimilated loanwords to display a positive attitude towards English loanwords, those choosing assimilated loanwords to display a slightly less positive attitude, and those choosing mainly calques to display a more negative attitude. For each sentence in this section, one term out of the three was also a term recommended by the French terminology commissions (highlighted in italics in Figure 1).²⁴ As terminology commission terms are generally created to replace an existing Anglicism, we can assume that choosing one of these displays a more negative attitude towards Anglicisms. This exercise also allows us

²³ Part I elicited information on social characteristics, and part IIb measured respondents' attitudes to 'correctness' in French and to terminology commission replacement terms.

²⁴ Sentences 1 and 2 are excluded from the analysis of terms chosen because neither contains an assimilated loanword. Sentence 10 is excluded from the analysis of terminology commission terms chosen.

Vous trouverez ci-dessous plusieurs phrases à trou. Pour chaque phrase, vous avez un choix de trois termes pour remplir la phrase. Veuillez choisir le terme que vous utiliseriez en parlant avec un ami.

1. Internet Explorer, Firefox et Google Chrome sont tous des _____.

- ☐ browsers
- ☐ logiciels de navigation
- ☐ navigateurs

2. On utilise le terme _____ pour désigner un logiciel qui a pour fonction de faire respecter la politique de sécurité d'un réseau.

- ☐ barrière de sécurité
- ☐ firewall
- ☐ pare feu

3. On utilise souvent le langage HTML pour créer une _____.

- ☐ page sur la toile
- ☐ page web
- ☐ web page

4. J'ai acheté un _____ pour transformer mes vieilles photos en images numériques et les mettre sur CD-Rom.

- ☐ scanner
- ☐ numériseur
- ☐ scanneur

5. Je serais perdu sans mon _____ pour sauvegarder les données importantes comme les rendez-vous et les adresses.

- ☐ organisateur
- ☐ agenda électronique
- ☐ organiser

6. Le _____ est responsable de la gestion et de la maintenance du site web.²⁵

- ☐ webmestre
- ☐ administrateur de site
- ☐ webmaster

7. Je vais lui envoyer un _____ tout de suite.

- ☐ courriel
- ☐ Email / mail
- ☐ mél

8. Mon nouvel ordinateur a une _____ intégrée.

- ☐ cybercaméra
- ☐ webcaméra
- ☐ webcam

9. Mon _____ est une espèce de journal public ou j'écris tout ce qui me vient à l'esprit.

- ☐ blog
- ☐ bloc-notes
- ☐ blogue

10. Malgré la crise, les _____ continuent à recevoir des bonus.

- ☐ traders
- ☐ opérateurs de marché
- ☐ traders

Figure 1: Part IIa of the questionnaire

²⁵ Note that the use of the masculine article *le* here may have caused some respondents to avoid choosing *administrateur de site*, which would normally use the form *l'*. Although the results for this sentence reinforce the general trend shown for the other sentences (with respondents being less likely in general to choose calques), we have omitted this sentence from the results.

to see how widely terminology commission terms are accepted in France. If respondents choose mainly terminology commission terms in this exercise, it would suggest that these are widely known and accepted in France, which may suggest that speakers reflect the official attitudes towards English discussed above.²⁶

Part III of the questionnaire examined respondents' general attitudes towards learning English. This can be viewed as a separate issue to attitudes towards Anglicisms in French, as it may be the case that a speaker has a positive attitude towards studying the English language, but dislikes using Anglicisms in French. This section contained a number of statements about the English language, and for each of these respondents could choose from a five-point scale ranging from *agree totally* to *disagree totally*. The sentences discussed in the present work are as follows:

- Knowledge of English is important²⁷
- Children should start learning English at primary school

Part IV of the questionnaire included two questions aimed at examining respondents' attitudes towards the threat posed to the French language by English. As above, respondents could choose from a five-point scale ranging from *agree totally* to *disagree totally*:

- Laws are needed to protect the French language
- The increasing use of English will lead to the marginalisation of the French language in the future, even in France

Part V aimed to examine respondents' attitudes towards the use of Anglicisms in French. It included two statements (for which respondents could choose from the same five-point scale above) as follows:

- I notice a lot of Anglicisms in French
- The French language needs Anglicisms

It then included a question where, for each area listed, respondents could choose from one of three responses (*necessary*, *indifferent*, *superfluous*):

²⁶ Of course, respondents' stated behaviour may not reflect their actual behaviour, but to attempt to account for this, they were asked to choose the term they would use when speaking to a friend. This was to encourage them to report the term they would use spontaneously.

²⁷ All parts of the questionnaire have been translated into English here, but the original questionnaire was in French.

1 – What do you think of the use of Anglicisms in the following domains?

- 2 ○ Spoken language
- 3 ○ Technical / specialised language
- 4 ○ Product packaging
- 5 ○ Advertisements
- 6 ○ Television / radio

7

8 The questions in parts III, IV and V were deliberately placed after part II so
 9 that responses to them would not affect respondents' answers to the task in part
 10 II. After finishing part II, respondents had to click a "Continue" button to move
 11 into part III and could not later return. As the questions in parts III, IV and
 12 V were intended to gauge the level of self-reported attitudes of respondents,
 13 the results of these are examined first before confirming whether or not the
 14 self-reports match the behaviour in the exercise in part IIa.

15

16 3.1.3 Questionnaire results: parts III–V

17

18 The results for part III of the questionnaire display a clearly positive attitude
 19 towards learning English. The majority of respondents (98%) agreed with the
 20 first statement that it is important to know English (77% agreed totally and 21%
 21 agreed partially). The majority (86%) also agreed with the second statement that
 22 children should learn English from primary school level (57% agreed totally and
 23 29% agreed partially). Knowledge of English is clearly seen as important and
 24 necessary to these French respondents.

25 The results for part IV of the questionnaire are less clear-cut but they show
 26 that respondents do not feel overwhelmingly threatened by the English lan-
 27 guage. Less than half of respondents (46%) agreed with the statement that the
 28 French language needs laws to protect it (13% totally and 33% partially), 25%
 29 were undecided and 29% disagreed (21% partially and 8% totally). A majority
 30 of respondents (60%) disagreed with the statement that the French language
 31 is in danger of being marginalized (36% partially and 24% totally), 13% were
 32 undecided and 27% agreed (6% fully, 21% partially). This statement reflects a
 33 fear that is often employed in France as an argument for the necessity of linguistic
 34 legislation (indeed, the stated aim of both the Bas-Lauriol and Toubon laws to
 35 "guarantee the right of citizens to use their language in certain circumstances
 36 of their daily lives" reflects the fear that the use of French in these "circum-
 37 stances" is threatened)²⁸ and it is therefore interesting that barely more than a

38

39 ²⁸ DGLFLF, "Circulaire du 19 mars 1996 concernant l'application de la loi n° 94-665 du 4 août
 40 1994 relative à l'emploi de la langue française" (01/2014), <<http://www.dglf.culture.gouv.fr/droit/circ-fr.htm>>

quarter of the French respondents agree with this statement. Clearly, they do not reflect official concerns in this regard.

The results for part V are slightly less positive towards English. The majority of respondents (88%) agreed with the first statement that they notice a lot of Anglicisms in French (30% fully, 58% partially). Although this does not necessarily indicate a negative attitude towards Anglicisms (respondents may notice a lot of Anglicisms without having an issue with this), a majority of respondents were either undecided about whether or not the French language needs Anglicisms (30%) or disagreed with this statement (33%, of which 27% disagreed partially and 6% disagreed fully). Only 37% of respondents agreed that French needs Anglicisms (31% partially and 6% fully). The results for the final statement show that attitudes to English are not necessarily clear-cut, and that various nuances can be at play. This statement was intended to investigate whether or not the domain in which an Anglicism is found can play a role in its acceptability. For the five different domains listed, respondents were asked to indicate whether they found the use of Anglicisms in each of these domains necessary or superfluous or whether they were indifferent to the use of Anglicisms in these domains. The results displayed in Figure 2 show very clearly that Anglicisms used in specialised or technical domains are much more acceptable than those

Figure 2: Acceptability of Anglicisms

used in other domains; the majority of respondents (74%) found Anglicisms in specialised/technical domains “necessary”, whereas the majority found Anglicisms “superfluous” on product packaging (68%), in advertisements (69%) and on the television or radio (61%). Anglicisms in spoken language were considered slightly more acceptable than those used on packaging, in advertisements or on the television and radio (33% of respondents found them “necessary” in spoken language). There is a strong correlation between the domain in which an Anglicism is used and its acceptability to respondents, with a chi-square test returning a value of $p \leq 0.001$. These results demonstrate that the issue of attitudes towards Anglicisms is not necessarily clear-cut. Respondents can have a strongly negative attitude towards Anglicisms in general domains, whilst remaining positive towards those used in specialised or technical domains.

The questionnaire also provided respondents with the opportunity to enter comments at will, with no stipulation about what those comments should contain (a text box was provided with the heading “General comments”). Only 40 respondents out of the 401 left comments, but some of these usefully highlight the nuanced nature of this question. For example, respondent 349 states that:

My responses about Anglicisms may appear contradictory and this is normal. In some cases the use of Anglicisms is absolutely justified and logical. Some ideas, concepts, have no equivalent in French and to express them, you have to use English. The most basic example can be found in technical domains. On the other hand, I completely deplore the unwarranted use of Anglicisms in everyday circumstances. You sometimes get the impression that people are using English words or expressions in their conversation just to make themselves look important [...] The use of such terms weakens the French language and devalues the English language.²⁹

Similarly, respondent 238 states that:

I think this is a complex question. When you work in a company, you use a lot of English terms or Anglicisms. I think this is sometimes necessary, particularly for new concepts or technical terms. But these words often have an equivalent in French and it is a shame not to use them.³⁰

29 Mes réponses sur les Anglicismes peuvent paraître contradictoires et c’est normal. Dans certains cas l’usage d’Anglicismes est tout à fait justifié et logique. Certaines idées, concepts, n’ont pas d’équivalent en français, et pour les exprimer, il faut passer par l’anglais. L’exemple le plus basique se trouve dans les domaines techniques. Par contre, je déplore totalement l’usage injustifié d’Anglicismes au quotidien. Cet usage donne parfois l’impression que les personnes placent des mots ou des phrases anglaises dans leur conversation uniquement pour se donner de la valeur. [...] L’usage de tels termes affaiblit le français et galvaude l’anglais.

30 Je pense que c’est une question complexe. Quand on est en entreprise, on utilise beaucoup de termes anglais ou d’Anglicismes. Je pense que c’est parfois nécessaire, notamment pour les nouveaux concepts ou pour les termes techniques. Mais souvent, ces mots ont leur équivalent en français et il est dommage de ne pas les utiliser.

This shows how it is possible to hold positive attitudes to Anglicisms used in one domain, or for a particular reason (for example, filling a lexical gap) and negative attitudes towards those used in another domain.

3.1.4 Questionnaire results: parts III–V. Age and education.

There is also no apparent correlation between education or sex and attitudes in the results for parts III, IV and V. However, age does appear to play a role in parts IV and V. In part IV, respondents over 65 were more likely to agree that laws are needed to protect the French language and that the French language is in danger of becoming marginalized due to the increasing use of English; however, chi-square tests on these data do not return any significant results. In part V, the middle age group was the most likely to agree that the French language needs Anglicisms, and the older age group was the most likely to disagree that this was the case. A chi-square test shows a significant correlation between age and the reaction to this statement ($p \leq 0.01$); however, this is not a clear linear progression, with respondents becoming less likely to agree that French needs Anglicisms as age increases. Although the older group of respondents display the most negative attitude towards Anglicisms here, it is the middle age group rather than the younger one that displays the most positive attitude. It may be that respondents in the middle group are more likely to be confronted with Anglicisms in their sphere of work, and to therefore be more used to them. Results for the final statement, however, regarding the acceptability of Anglicisms in different domains of use, show a clear linear progression, with attitudes towards Anglicisms becoming more negative as age increases. Younger speakers were the most likely to find Anglicisms “necessary” and the least likely to find them “superfluous”. Chi square tests show a significant correlation between age and attitudes towards Anglicisms in spoken French ($p \leq 0.001$); on packaging ($p \leq 0.05$); in advertising ($p \leq 0.01$); and on the television or radio ($p \leq 0.01$). There is no significant correlation between age and attitudes towards Anglicisms in technical or specialized French, although this may be explained by the high proportion of respondents who agreed that Anglicisms are necessary in this domain.

3.1.5 Questionnaire results: part IIa

The results for part IIa of the questionnaire show a very clearly positive attitude towards Anglicisms, with respondents overwhelmingly more likely to choose

unassimilated loanwords (65% of terms chosen were unassimilated loanwords) than either assimilated loanwords (19%) or calques (16%). Given that the assimilated loanwords in question are still very clearly Anglicisms, this means that the vast majority of terms chosen (84%) were clearly English in origin, which would suggest that most respondents have no major issue with using Anglicisms in French. Respondents were also very unlikely to choose a terminology commission term; only 18% of terms chosen were terminology commission terms. This reinforces the results from parts III, IV and V which show that respondents display generally positive attitudes towards Anglicisms, and suggests that the majority of French speakers have no problem with using them, and also that terminology commission terms have not passed into widespread usage in France. Given the large sample size, these results allow us to say with some degree of confidence that the official attitudes towards English in France are not reflected by the general population.

3.2 Individual attitudes towards English in France: interview study

A guided interview study allowed us to further develop the examination of attitudes towards English at the individual level and to consider possible reasons for the attitudes revealed in the questionnaire results. The survey was carried out in Paris, France. It used both indirect and direct approaches. The indirect approach included a discussion which apparently related to educational methods of teaching French, when we were in fact examining attitudes towards Anglicisms. The direct approach involved asking specific questions about respondents' attitudes once the relevant topic had been raised. Interviews were conducted with 36 participants, and the sample population had a balanced distribution in terms of sex, age and education. The same three age groups as above were used (15–24, 25–64, 65+), based roughly on the three stages, which Ager (1990: 113) claims are linguistically relevant, discussed above in section 3.1.1. However, only two levels of education were used here: respondents with higher (third-level) education and those without higher education. This was mainly due to the lack of significant difference displayed between the education groups in the online questionnaire study. Upon analysis, sex was shown to display no significant results and it is therefore excluded from this discussion. This leaves the following distribution:

Table 1: Guided interview study: sample population distribution

		Number of respondents	Respondent identifier		
Age	Level of education				
15–24	+ higher education	6	FR008	FR027	FR029
			FR044	FR050	FR051
	– higher education	6	FR013	FR030	FR032
			FR036	FR037	FR038
25–64	+ higher education	6	FR001	FR003	FR004
			FR006	FR007	FR017
	– higher education	6	FR016	FR018	FR021
			FR031	FR035	FR042
65+	+ higher education	6	FR005	FR015	FR023
			FR025	FR026	FR033
	– higher education	6	FR002	FR009	FR010
			FR011	FR019	FR024
Total		36			

The results of the study were analysed both qualitatively and quantitatively. The quantitative analysis was mainly carried out using descriptive statistics, providing overall frequencies and percentages, although, where deemed appropriate, a chi-square test was used to test for statistical significance.³¹ Given the relatively small sample population size, we used the more stringent p value of less than 0.01 for significant results. When discussing individual comments, respondents are referred to by a unique number, as displayed in Table 1.³²

3.2.1 Attitudes towards Anglicisms: interview study

The majority of respondents (94%) stated that they use a lot of Anglicisms in French, and when asked directly about their opinion of Anglicisms in French, the majority of respondents (86%) also stated that they find them acceptable. Many respondents simply said that the use of Anglicisms does not bother them: FR002 “It doesn’t really bother me”; FR021 “It doesn’t bother me”; FR023 “It

³¹ As with the questionnaire study, in all cases where a chi-square test was used, each cell had more than 5 respondents.

³² The numbers refer to the order in which participants were interviewed. They do not stop at 36, because more than 36 participants were interviewed overall; it was frequently impossible to know whether they would be suitable or not prior to interview and, in many cases, categories were duplicated, women in the middle age group with higher education proving particularly likely to volunteer to be interviewed, for example.

doesn't bother me hugely"; and FR038 "It doesn't bother me, I like it".³³ Others gave a reason for their positive attitude; for example, arguing that their use simply indicates an evolution of the language. FR030, FR044 and FR013 stated, respectively, "I think it is the evolution of the language"; "It is an evolution of the language"; "Well, languages evolve and that is good".³⁴ FR015 claimed that:

A living language is always strong enough to amalgamate external contributions [...] French has evolved over the course of centuries and I think this is natural, the language adapts. As long as it is living, it will adapt. Once it stops adapting it will die.³⁵

The idea that Anglicisms enrich the language was also popular: respondents FR011 and FR042 both stated that "It is enriching"³⁶ and FR042 that "It enriches the language".³⁷ Some respondents also referred to the fact that English is an international language as a reason for their positive attitude: FR019 "I am not against it because, well, English is the international language";³⁸ FR032 "I think it is quite good [...] seeing as English is now supposed to be everyone's second language".³⁹ Those respondents finding Anglicisms unacceptable generally used fairly moderate language to describe this. For example, FR005 felt that "There are currently too many English words in French [...] it is a pity because I think that the French language is rich enough"⁴⁰ and FR009 said "It is not that I am against using English words but [...] why not use words from the French language?".⁴¹

It is interesting that, when responding to this question, not all respondents displayed a clearly negative or positive attitude towards Anglicisms. In fact, 22% of respondents found the context in which Anglicisms are used or the actual

³³ FR002 "Ça me dérange pas trop"; FR021 "Moi ça me dérange pas"; FR023 "Ça me gêne pas énormément"; and FR038 "Moi ça me dérange pas, j'aime bien".

³⁴ "Je pense que c'est l'évolution de la langue"; "C'est une évolution de la langue"; "Bon les langues évoluent et c'est beau".

³⁵ Une langue vivante, elle est toujours assez forte pour amalgamer des apports extérieurs [...] le français, il a évolué au cours des siècles et je trouve que c'est normal, la langue s'adapte. Tant qu'elle est vivante, elle s'adapte. Une fois qu'elle s'adapte plus ça devient une langue morte.

³⁶ "C'est enrichissant"

³⁷ "Ça enrichit la langue"

³⁸ "Je suis pas contre parce que, bon, l'anglais est la langue internationale"

³⁹ "Je trouve ça plutôt bien [...] vu que l'anglais maintenant est censé être la deuxième langue à tous"

⁴⁰ "Il y a trop de mots anglais dans le français actuellement [...] c'est dommage parce que je trouve que la langue française est assez riche"

⁴¹ "C'est pas que je suis contre l'utilisation des mots anglais mais [...] pourquoi ne pas utiliser les mots de la langue française ?"

term in question to have an important effect on their attitudes. This finding reflects the results from the questionnaire study which indicate that the attitudes that speakers hold towards Anglicisms are nuanced. For example, several respondents had a positive attitude towards Anglicisms that “fill lexical gaps” and a negative attitude towards those that do not: FR017 “I don’t like English words that replace existing French words”;⁴² FR003 “If the word exists in French, it shocks me a little, but if it is associated with new concepts [...] if there is no French equivalent that exists, it doesn’t shock me”;⁴³ FR050 “If it is to express something for which there is no equivalent in French, it is an asset. On the other hand, if you use a word which has an equivalent in French, it doesn’t add anything”.⁴⁴ For others, the fact that a particular Anglicism was used frequently or encoded in the dictionary made it more acceptable: FR010 “[I use] ‘weekend’, words like that [...] that are in the dictionary”;⁴⁵ FR005 “It has become widely accepted to use ‘weekend’, it doesn’t bother me”;⁴⁶ FR006 “Words which have become part of the everyday language don’t shock me; for me there is no problem with saying ‘internet’ or ‘weekend’, they are words which come from English but belong to French now”.⁴⁷

Participants were also asked more specifically whether, when both a French term and an Anglicism which is a synonym for that term exist, they would rather use the French term or the Anglicism. 25% of participants stated that they would prefer to use the French term and 25% that they would prefer to use the Anglicism, but 50% of respondents said that it depends on the context or word in question. For example, it can depend on whether the context is formal or informal, or on whether you are using written or spoken French and, equally, it can depend on the length of time an Anglicism has been in the French language and on how frequently it is used. FR016 claimed that “It depends on the word. I won’t Gallicize the word ‘weekend’, I won’t say ‘we are going away for the ‘end of the week’ holiday’, I will say ‘we are going away for the weekend’”;⁴⁸ and

⁴² “Je n’aime pas les mots anglais qui remplacent des mots français existants”

⁴³ “Quand le mot existe en français, ça me choque un peu, mais quand c’est associé à des nouveaux concepts [...] il y a aucun équivalent en français qui existe, ça me choque pas”

⁴⁴ “Si c’est pour exprimer quelque chose dont on n’a pas d’équivalence en français, c’est une richesse. En revanche, si on utilise un mot finalement dont on a l’équivalence en français, ça n’apporte rien”

⁴⁵ “[J]’utilise] «weekend», des mots comme ça [...] qui sont dans le dictionnaire”

⁴⁶ “C’est tellement entré dans le mœurs, «weekend», ça me dérange pas”

⁴⁷ “Des mots qui sont installés dans le langage courant, ça me choque pas ; pour moi c’est aucun problème de dire «internet» enfin «weekend», c’est des mots qui viennent de l’anglais mais aujourd’hui appartiennent à la langue française”

⁴⁸ “Ça dépend du mot. Le mot «weekend» je vais pas le franciser, je vais pas dire «nous allons partir en congé fin de semaine», je vais dire «on part en weekend»”

FR018 that “I would be more inclined to say ‘fashion’ than ‘mode’ because it is well established, it is used and there we are, [...] people would give me strange looks if I said ‘mode’ I think”.⁴⁹ The fact that an Anglicism is well established in the language was often given as a reason for choosing to use it. FR031 said “I would say ‘parking’ because it has existed for a long time in our language, it has entered the dictionary, and therefore we can use it”.⁵⁰ Inclusion of an Anglicism in the dictionary clearly confers upon it a status that gives speakers the confidence to use it more freely.

3.2.2 Attitudes towards Anglicisms: Interview study. Age and education

In general, the older the respondents, the more likely they were to find Anglicisms unacceptable. As shown in Figure 3, whereas 100% of younger respondents found Anglicisms positive, only 83% of respondents in the middle age group did and this was reduced to 75% of older respondents.

Chi-square tests show that these data are not statistically significant, but the trend can be seen again when we examine whether respondents would choose an Anglicism or its French synonym. Again, as respondents’ age increased, they were more likely to state that they would choose the French term, and also somewhat less likely to take context into account, as showed in Figure 4. They appear here to be more likely to display a strongly negative attitude towards Anglicisms, without exhibiting the nuanced approach taken by younger respondents, who are more likely not only to have more positive attitudes towards Anglicisms, but to take both context and the particular word itself into account. Again, this result is not statistically significant. Therefore, although it appears that older speakers are more likely than younger ones to hold negative attitudes towards Anglicisms, we cannot draw any firm conclusions here.

Slightly fewer respondents with higher education found Anglicisms acceptable (78%) than those without higher education (89%). Although this is not a statistically significant result, respondents with higher education were also more likely to choose to use a French term, less likely to use its English equivalent and less likely to take context or the type of word into account, as can be seen in Figure 5. A chi-square shows this to be a highly significant result ($p \leq 0.001$). The data therefore appear to show that respondents with a higher

⁴⁹ “Je dirais plus «fashion» que «mode» parce que c’est établi, c’est dit et voilà, [...] on me regarderait bizarrement si je disais «mode» je pense”

⁵⁰ “Je dirais «parking» par que ça existe depuis longtemps dans notre langue, c’est rentré dans le dictionnaire, et donc on peut l’utiliser”

17 **Figure 3:** Acceptability of Anglicisms (age)

37 **Figure 4:** Proportion of respondents choosing French term or Anglicism (age)

Figure 5: Acceptability of Anglicisms (education)

level of education are more likely to have a negative attitude towards Anglicisms, although given the lack of statistically significant results for education in the much larger questionnaire study, this result should be interpreted with some caution.

3.2.3 Perceived threat from English: Interview study

When asked whether they think the French language is threatened by English, the majority of respondents (78%) stated that they did not believe that English posed any threat to the French language. Only 11% felt that English posed any threat, and 11% remained unsure. Of those who felt that the English language posed a threat, they simply stated that the French language will borrow more and more English words in the future, but they did not use strongly negative language, display any fear for the continued use of the language or state that their culture was under attack. For example, FR004 stated “It [English] is already influencing it [French], because it has a new vocabulary, it is integrated into the French”⁵¹ and FR007 stated “We are going to integrate more and more

⁵¹ “Ça [l’anglais] l’influence déjà [le français], parce qu’il y a un nouveau vocabulaire, il est intégré en français”

English words into our language”.⁵² FR013 stated that although English might threaten certain domains of French, this may also be positive:

I think that we will always speak French, but on the other hand, in technical domains actually, English is used a lot, like in computer science [...] that’s technical and English is predominant. And that can indeed be harmful. [...] It can also be seen as an opening to Anglophone culture which is rich and interesting.⁵³

Only one respondent displayed an openly negative attitude in response to this question; FR009 stated “If the French start speaking only English, then the Queen might as well come and live in France, if she’s still alive”.⁵⁴

The majority felt no threat from English, however. FR029 sums up the situation rather neatly:

In France, citizens are not at all [...] worried about their language [...] French people live in a French environment so they don’t particularly worry about the future of their language. But I have the impression that our leaders do worry, and intellectuals also, because you often hear that French is threatened, in decline etc. [...] That seems exaggerated to me, it is true that French is in decline at an international level, but to say that this means it is threatened [...] after all it is not a language that is on the verge of extinction.⁵⁵

4 Conclusion

The results from the questionnaire and interview studies outlined above show that the question of attitudes towards Anglicisms in France is not a clear-cut choice between negative and positive. The context in which Anglicisms are used, and the individual words in question, can play an important role in

⁵² “de plus en plus on va intégrer des mots d’anglais dans notre langue”

⁵³ Je pense qu’on parlera toujours français, mais par contre, effectivement dans les domaines qui sont techniques, l’anglais est beaucoup utilisé, comme l’informatique [...] c’est technique et l’anglais est [...] prédominant. Voilà, et ça effectivement, ça peut être néfaste. [...] Ça peut être aussi une ouverture à la culture Anglophone qui est riche et intéressante.

⁵⁴ “si maintenant les français se mettent à ne parler qu’anglais, ben il vaut mieux à ce moment-là que, si elle est encore en vie, la Reine d’Angleterre vienne vivre en France”

⁵⁵ En France les citoyens sont pas du tout [...] soucieux de leur langue [...] les français passent leur vie dans un environnement français, francophone donc ils se soucient pas spécialement de l’avenir de leur langue. Mais nos dirigeants eux j’ai l’impression qu’ils s’en soucient, les intellectuels aussi parce qu’il est beaucoup question du fait que le français soit menacé, soit en recul etc. [...] Ça me paraît exagéré, c’est vrai que le français est en recul sur la scène internationale, de là à dire que le français est menacé [...] enfin on n’est pas non plus une langue en voie d’extinction.

respondents' attitudes. Where negative views occur, these are often highly nuanced, with speakers simultaneously displaying negative attitudes towards Anglicisms used in general domains and positive attitudes towards those used in specialised domains, for example. The results also show very clearly that, in spite of this nuance, the majority of respondents in both studies display a positive attitude both towards the English language in general and towards the use of Anglicisms in French. It is clearly demonstrated that the highly negative attitudes towards English and Anglicisms that are reflected in the language planning measures taken at the official level in France are not reflected by the majority of "ordinary" French speakers, or at least not by the several hundred speakers questioned during the course of this research. We must therefore query, firstly, the widely accepted assumption that French speakers are negative towards Anglicisms and, secondly, the validity of carrying out language planning in France, when it so clearly does not align with the behaviour and attitudes of the wider speech community. Indeed, the results of the current study would suggest that official language planning does not necessarily have any impact on the attitudes of the general language community. The results also highlight the need for the objective investigation of notions which are taken as 'given', to ascertain whether or not they are truly valid.

References

- Adamson, Robin. 2007. *The defence of French: a language in crisis?* Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ager, Dennis. 1990. *Sociolinguistics and contemporary French*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Ager, Dennis. 1999. *Identity, insecurity and image: France and language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Baker, Colin. 1992. *Attitudes and language*. Avon, England: Multilingual Matters.
- Bogaards, Paul. 2008. *On ne parle pas franglais: la langue française face à l'anglais*. Bruxelles: De Boeck Duculot.
- Cartier, Alice. 1977. Connaissance et usage d'Anglicismes par les Français de Paris. *La Linguistique* 13 (2). 55–84.
- Chansou, Michel. 2003. *L'aménagement lexical en France pendant la période contemporaine, 1950–1994 : étude de sociolexicologie*. Paris: Champion.
- Depecker, Loïc. 2001. *L'invention de la langue: le choix des mots nouveaux*. Paris : Armand Colin-Larousse.
- Etiemble, René. 1964. *Parlez-vous franglais?* Paris: Gallimard.
- Fagyal, Zsuzsanna, Douglas Kibbee and Fred Jenkins. 2006. *French: A linguistic introduction*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Flaitz, Jeffra. 1988. *The ideology of English: French perceptions of English as a world language*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

- Fugger, Bernd. 1980. Les Français et les arrêtés ministériels. Étude sur l'impact de la loi linguistique dans l'est de la France. *La Banque des mots* 18. 157–170.
- Fugger, Bernd. 1983. Les Français et les arrêtés ministériels. Étude sur l'impact de la loi linguistique dans l'est de la France (II). *La Banque des mots* 25. 53–62.
- Gordon, David C. 1978. *The French language and national identity 1930–1975*, The Hague: Mouton.
- Grigg, Peter. 1997. Toubon or not Toubon: The influence of the English language in contemporary France. *English Studies* 78 (4). 368–384.
- Guilford, Jonathon. 1997. Les attitudes des jeunes français à propos des emprunts à l'anglais. *La Linguistique* 32 (2). 117–35.
- Judge, Anne. 2000. France: “One state, one nation, one language”? In Stephen Barbour and Cathie Carmichael (eds.), *Language and nationalism in Europe*, 44–82. Oxford: OUP.
- Lodge, R. Anthony. 1998. French is a logical language. In Laurie Bauer and Peter Trudgill (eds.), *Language myths*, 23–31. London: Penguin.
- Nelms-Reyes, Loretta. 1996. Deal-making on French terms: How France's legislative crusade to purge American terminology from French affects business transactions. *California Western International Law Journal* 26. 273–311.
- Oakes, Leigh. 2001. *Language and national identity: Comparing France and Sweden*. Amsterdam-Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Schiffman, Harold F. 1996. *Linguistic culture and language policy*. London; New York: Routledge.

Internet resources

- Délégation générale à la langue française et aux langues de France (DGLFLF). <<http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dglf/>> [accessed January 2014]
- Circulaire du 19 mars. 1996. concernant l'application de la loi n° 94-665 du 4 août 1994 relative à l'emploi de la langue française* <<http://www.dglf.culture.gouv.fr/droit/circ-fr.htm>> [accessed January 2014]
- Décision n° 94-345 du 29 juillet. 1994. du Conseil constitutionnel à propos de la loi relative à l'emploi de la langue française* <http://www.dglf.culture.gouv.fr/droit/dec_cons.htm> [accessed January 2014]
- Les institutions chargées de la langue française* <<http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dglf/lois/archives/histoire1.htm>> [accessed January 2014]
- Décret n° 66-203 du 31 mars. 1996. portant création d'un Haut Comité pour la défense et l'expansion de la langue française* <http://www.dglf.culture.gouv.fr/lois/archives/31_03_66.htm> [accessed January 2014]
- La coordination et le suivi de l'application de la loi* <<http://www.dglf.culture.gouv.fr/rapport/1999/coordination.html>> [accessed January 2014]
- L'enrichissement de la langue française* <http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dglf/terminologie/termino_enrichissement.htm> [accessed January 2014]
- Légifrance <<http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/>> [accessed January 2014]
- Décret no 72-19 du 7 janvier. 1972. relatif à l'enrichissement de la langue française* <http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do;jsessionid=C11F8AB20F510828C34DF2A5ECAC38EC.tpdjo17v_2?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000879206&categorieLien=id> [accessed January 2014]

1 *Décret no 83-243 du 25 mars. 1983. relatif à l'enrichissement de la langue française* <[http://](http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000683317)
2 www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000683317> [accessed January
3 2014]

4 *Décret no 86-439 du 11 mars. 1986. relatif à l'enrichissement de la langue française* <[http://](http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do;jsessionid=DBFC206998BBD1BBE-D65A44E43B134FC.tpdjo13v_3?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000884672&categorieLien=id)
5 [www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do;jsessionid=DBFC206998BBD1BBE-](http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do;jsessionid=DBFC206998BBD1BBE-D65A44E43B134FC.tpdjo13v_3?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000884672&categorieLien=id)
6 [D65A44E43B134FC.tpdjo13v_3?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000884672&categorieLien=id](http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do;jsessionid=DBFC206998BBD1BBE-D65A44E43B134FC.tpdjo13v_3?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000884672&categorieLien=id)> [ac-
7 cessed January 2014]

8 *Décret no 96-602 du 3 juillet. 1996. relatif à l'enrichissement de la langue française* <[http://](http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000378502&dateTexte=&categorieLien=id)
9 [www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000378502&dateTexte=&](http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000378502&dateTexte=&categorieLien=id)
10 [categorieLien=id](http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000378502&dateTexte=&categorieLien=id)> [accessed January 2014]

11 *Loi n° 75-1349 du 31 décembre. 1975. relatif à l'emploi de la langue française* <[http://www.](http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/jopdf/common/jo_pdf.jsp?numJO=0&dateJO=19760104&numTexte=&pageDebut=00189&pageFin)
12 [legifrance.gouv.fr/jopdf/common/jo_pdf.jsp?numJO=0&dateJO=19760104&numTexte=&](http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/jopdf/common/jo_pdf.jsp?numJO=0&dateJO=19760104&numTexte=&pageDebut=00189&pageFin)
13 [pageDebut=00189&pageFin](http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/jopdf/common/jo_pdf.jsp?numJO=0&dateJO=19760104&numTexte=&pageDebut=00189&pageFin)> [accessed January 2014]

14 *Loi n° 94-665 du 4 août. 1994. relative à l'emploi de la langue française* <[http://www.legifrance.](http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000349929&fastPos=1&fastReqId=268042532&categorieLien=cid&oldAction=rechTexte)
15 [gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000349929&fastPos=1&fastReqId=](http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000349929&fastPos=1&fastReqId=268042532&categorieLien=cid&oldAction=rechTexte)
16 [268042532&categorieLien=cid&oldAction=rechTexte](http://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/affichTexte.do?cidTexte=JORFTEXT000000349929&fastPos=1&fastReqId=268042532&categorieLien=cid&oldAction=rechTexte)> [accessed January 2014]