

Copyright

by

Eileen Susan Fitzpatrick

2009

**The Report committee for Eileen Susan Fitzpatrick
Certifies that this is the approved version of the following report:**

**“First, Let’s Make a Brainstorming”: French EFL Learners’ Use and
Awareness of Anglicisms**

**APPROVED BY
SUPERVISING COMMITTEE:**

Supervisor:

Catherine Léger

Elaine Horwitz

**“First, Let’s Make a Brainstorming”: French EFL Learners’ Use and
Awareness of Anglicisms**

by

Eileen Susan Fitzpatrick, B.A.

Report

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Austin
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

Master of Arts

The University of Texas at Austin
December 2009

Acknowledgements

I am grateful to many people who helped me complete this report. The advice of my supervisor Catherine Léger has been invaluable, and she has been a constant source of support throughout the completion of the research and the study. I would like to thank her for taking on this project and for pushing me to a high level of professionalism in its completion. I would also like to thank my reader and department head Elaine Horwitz for her interest and support throughout my studies at The University of Texas at Austin.

To those friends who listened to my ramblings as the project took form and moved toward completion, especially Anna Lauzon and Laurel MacKenzie, I would like to say thank you for your input, patience, and support. I would also like to thank all of my teacher participants, including Jennifer Wagner, Connie Haham, and Laura Gardiner for their contributions both in the questionnaires and in past conversations.

This report would of course not have happened without the inspiration provided by my students, both past and current, who continue to make charming mistakes with anglicisms. I would like to thank them also for leading me to decide to continue teaching and for driving my interest in second language acquisition and linguistics.

Finally, to my parents, thank you for enduring the unending travels that allowed this study to take place, for encouraging me to take on graduate studies, for making me study French as a child, and for your encouragement during the research and writing process. You have been instrumental to my intellectual curiosity and to this project in countless ways.

December 2009

“First, Let’s Make a Brainstorming”: French EFL Learners’ Use and Awareness of Anglicisms

by

Eileen Susan Fitzpatrick, M.A.

The University of Texas at Austin, 2009

Supervisor: Catherine Léger

Many French EFL (English as a foreign language) learners may be aware of the origin of anglicisms (loanwords from English) and may thus attempt to use these words in English. However, changes in meaning, phonology, and syntax, etc., during the integration of a loanword into the borrowing language create the potential for error in such efforts.

This report reviews relevant research and theory on language transfer, vocabulary knowledge, metacognition, and lexical borrowing as factors that bear light on this type of transfer. It then presents two studies, one with French EFL learners and one with EFL teachers in France. Results suggest that anglicisms do cause errors in the English of French learners, that learners are generally aware of anglicisms and of the possible difference in meaning between the French and the English words, and, finally, that this awareness does not necessarily lead to correct usage of such words.

Table of Contents

List of Tables	viii
List of Figures.....	ix
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER 2 THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	4
Vocabulary Knowledge	4
Lexical Transfer.....	9
The Effect of Language Similarity on Transfer.....	15
Metacognition and Language Awareness	16
Anglicisms: Borrowing from English to French	21
CHAPTER 3 EXPERIMENTAL STUDY	28
Student Study.....	29
Recognition and Definition of Anglicisms	30
Knowledge of Five Provided Anglicisms.....	33
Anglicisms Provided by Students	38
Awareness of Differences between French Loans and Original English Forms	40
Teacher Study	43
Student Problems with Anglicisms.....	45
Student Awareness of Anglicisms	45
Classroom Techniques for Raising Awareness	46
CHAPTER 4 CONCLUSIONS	48

APPENDICES	52
Appendix A Student Questionnaire	52
Appendix B Teacher Questionnaire.....	54
Appendix C Student Data	55
References	65
Vita	70

List of Tables

Table 1:	Examples of Changes that Occur during the Integration of Anglicisms	26
Table 2:	Answers to “What do these words have in common?”	31
Table 3:	Student Responses Using the Five Given Words (<i>parking, barman, design, shampooing, string</i>).....	36
Table 4:	Anglicisms Provided by Subjects	38
Table 5:	Errors per Group Divided by Awareness of Problems with Anglicisms	43
Table 6:	Teacher Participant Information	44

List of Figures

Figure 1:	Ringbom (1987): Dimensions of Word Knowledge.....	5
-----------	---	---

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

Mutual borrowing among the French and English languages has a long history. Given the current dominance of English as an international business and scientific language, more and more French students study English as their primary second language in middle school and high school. Thus, many French learners of English as a foreign language (EFL) begin their English studies with a stock of anglicisms (loanwords from English, e.g., *parking* “parking lot”, *pressing* “dry cleaner”, *tennisman* “tennis player”) already built into their vocabulary as native speakers of French. Transfer research on false cognates¹ (Lemhofer, Dijkstra, & Michel, 2004; Odlin, 1989) and different forms of positive transfer would lead to the tempting assumption that knowledge of loanwords would be a useful tool in learning the language from which they originate. However, once borrowed from the original language, loanwords typically undergo some degree of integration; that is, the borrowing language adapts them to its system (phonological, morphological, syntactic levels, etc.). Sounds and spellings as well as certain grammatical rules in the borrowing language may differ from the original language. For instance, a borrowed word (such as *parking* “parking lot”) may change from a verb to a noun; indeed, in French, *parking* is only used as a noun. All of these changes in borrowed words may actually make them incomprehensible to a speaker of the original language.

¹ This definition differs from the common definition adopted in linguistics, wherein false cognates are words that appear to be related in historical origin but are not (e.g., English *much* and Spanish *mucho* “very,” “much”). In this report, words that are similar in form but that differ in meaning are referred to as false cognates, in accordance with foreign language teaching literature, regardless of whether or not they have a common historical origin. Most false cognates, in the sense adopted in this study, are in fact related by a common historical origin.

Students may thus believe that the loanword that they know and use in their native language both exists and is used equivalently in the target language. For French EFL learners, this assumption may be strengthened by a general knowledge that there are many anglicisms in French. Research on learners' assumptions of similarity and difference between native and target language has shown that learners may assume similarity with or without evidence in the language to which they have been exposed (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008; Kellerman, 1983). Because of their potential awareness of the origin of anglicisms, French EFL learners are at risk of excessive transfer from their native language in using loanwords in their language of origin, or the target language, that is, English.

This study aims to assess the knowledge of anglicisms of French learners of English and to shed light on the factors influencing this knowledge. First, in chapter 2 (Theoretical Background), this report will review known factors and processes in vocabulary learning in a foreign language. Transfer research will also provide clues to explain this phenomenon, especially research on cognates and other potentially deceptive forms. In addition, research on language awareness shows potential for assessing students' assumptions and for helping them to be more attentive to language rules and the processes of change in the integration of loanwords. Finally, the presence of English loanwords in French will be briefly discussed and examples from research that show the potentially deceptive nature of anglicisms for French students of English will be provided.

Chapter 3 (Experimental Study) will present the methods, data, and results of two different studies. In the aim of investigating this specific transfer phenomenon, we conducted a study that investigated French university students' ability to correctly identify and use anglicisms in the target language (that is, English). The study also investigated students' experiences with anglicisms in learning English. The study aimed to answer the questions shown in (1).

- (1) a) Do French students make mistakes in using loanwords of English origin in their target language (English)? In other words, do they assume complete equivalence for the word in English and French, that is, that the word has the same meanings, the same syntactical constraints, is used with the same frequency, etc.?
- b) Are French students aware of the origin of common anglicisms in French?
- c) i) Do students have a sense of the potential for error in using such words in their language of origin/the target language? ii) If so, does this help them to use such words correctly?

In addition, in the further aim of finding ways to raise students' language awareness of anglicisms and the differing properties they have in the borrowing and the original language, several teachers of EFL in France were questioned about their experiences with French learners and any problems they had encountered with anglicisms. Teachers were also asked what specific techniques, if any, they had used to help students learn about the differences between a loanword in its borrowing language and in its original language.

CHAPTER 2: THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Vocabulary Knowledge

Nation (2001) succinctly explained the complexity of vocabulary learning in a second language: “Words are not isolated units of language, but fit into many interlocking systems and levels. Because of this, there are many things to know about any particular word and there are many degrees of knowing” (p. 23). In terms of Nation’s assertion that knowing a word involves knowledge of “many things,” research on vocabulary knowledge in a second language has made several distinctions about what it means to know a word. Some authors have compartmentalized knowledge of a word into knowledge of certain features of that word. For instance, Ringbom (1987) emphasized that word knowledge is not a question of simply knowing the word or not; a learner may have some knowledge of a word but it may be partial and incomplete. Ringbom has posited that word knowledge is best viewed as a continuum of six dimensions: a) accessibility, b) morphophonology, c) syntax, d) semantics, e) collocations, and f) associations. In this conception of word knowledge, there is a possible range of knowledge within each dimension. To take collocation (words with which the word can or must occur) as an example, a learner might know that *bank* collocates with *money* and *investment* but might be unaware that it also collocates with *river*; he might know that one *commits a crime* but not that one also *commits suicide*. Ringbom’s dimensions of word knowledge are illustrated in Figure 1.







	Access- ibility	Morpho- phonology	Syntax	Semantics	Collocations	Associations
Native speaker	Can access the word in all contexts.	Knows all derivations (several forms) of the word.	Knows all syntactic constraints of the word.	Knows all meanings.	Is familiar with all multiword combinations in which the word is usually found.	Knows most or all concepts with which the word is associated.
						
Beginner	Can access the word in one context.	Knows only one form of the word.	Knows no syntactic constraints of the word.	Has a vague idea of meaning.	Has no knowledge of the word's collocations.	Knows few or no concepts with which the word is associated.

Figure 1. Ringbom (1987): Dimensions of Word Knowledge

In Ringbom's (1987) framework, an educated native speaker's knowledge is "near the very top of the continuum for each dimension" (p. 36). A language learner's knowledge of a word can thus vary in each dimension, depending on how well he knows the word.

Nation (2001) also divides word knowledge into three categories: a) form, b) meaning, and c) use (p. 27). Knowledge of the form of a word includes knowledge of its pronunciation, its spelling, and the parts composing the word (i.e. morphemes). Knowledge of the meaning of a word involves not only knowledge of the concepts associated with the word but also knowledge of related concepts, synonyms, associations, and of the appropriate form to use for an intended meaning. Finally, knowledge of the use of a word involves knowledge of the words with which the word can or must occur (i.e. collocations), register (i.e. formal or informal contexts in which the word is typically used), frequency (e.g., that *ask* is used more frequently than *request*), and grammatical function (e.g., that *question* can be used as both a verb and a noun). Many of Nation's (2001) categories of word knowledge overlap with the dimensions in Ringbom's (1987)

model. For instance, both authors included knowledge of collocations, associations (i.e. related concepts), and derivations (i.e. word forms and parts) in their models.

Nation (2001), in the passage cited above, also alluded to “many degrees of knowing.” With respect to this point, an important distinction in the literature is that between vocabulary depth and vocabulary breadth (see, e.g., Haastrup & Henriksen, 2000; Henriksen, 1999; Qian, 1999, 2002; Vermeer, 2001; Wesche & Paribakht, 1996). Breadth of vocabulary knowledge generally describes the number of words a learner knows, and tests of breadth of vocabulary knowledge usually involve large samples of words and simple tasks, such as asking the learner to mark which words on a checklist he knows. As for depth of vocabulary knowledge, Read (2004), in his review of research on vocabulary knowledge, provided the following definition: “how well particular words are known” (p. 211). He noted three patterns in discussions of vocabulary depth. Depth of knowledge has been investigated in terms of: a) a learner’s having precise knowledge of the meaning(s) of a word as opposed to a “limited, vague idea” of the word (p. 211); b) a learner’s knowledge of the semantic, orthographic, phonological, morphological, syntactic, collocational, and pragmatic characteristics of a word (somewhat in line with Ringbom’s (1987) and Nation’s (2001) models); and c) a learner’s incorporation of a word into his mental lexicon, including connections with related and previously known words. Assessments of depth of vocabulary knowledge thus involve small samples of words and more complex tasks (e.g., elicitation of definitions, self-report of degrees of knowledge, tests of word associations, etc.) to verify exactly how much a learner knows about a word.

Haastrup and Henriksen (2000) elaborated on the concept of depth of knowledge and defined it as “the knowledge of a word’s different relations to other words in the lexicon” (p. 222). These relations include: a) antonymy, b) synonymy, c) degree restrictions (which the authors grouped under paradigmatic relations, or words of the same grammatical category which can be substituted for each other, e.g., *happy*, *content*, *sad*), and d) collocational restrictions (which the authors grouped under syntagmatic relations, or words related to each other because of their possible combinations, e.g., *fast* + *car* = *fast car*). Haastrup and Henriksen’s (2000) study adopted a network building perspective, whose premise is that vocabulary learning is a process of building connections between words. The authors drew from second language acquisition theories such as that of Ellis (1994). Ellis suggested that the process of learning a second language includes a) noticing characteristics in input, b) comparing (i.e. determining the differences between the input and the learner’s own output), and c) integrating new knowledge into the learner’s language system. Haastrup and Henriksen (2000) thus considered that, in order to learn a new word, the learner must notice features of its use in input, then (most importantly) compare it with words that are already known, and finally integrate new knowledge of the word into his language system.

Research using vocabulary knowledge scales (VKS) attempts to measure depth of vocabulary knowledge. Wesche and Paribakht (1996) designed a scale that evaluates knowledge based on both self-report and performance in order to investigate self-assessment of knowledge and demonstrated knowledge. Wesche and Paribakht’s scale includes five different ratings, as shown in (1).

- (1)
 - I. The word is not familiar at all.
 - II. The word is familiar but its meaning is not known.
 - III. A correct synonym or translation is given.
 - IV. The word is used with semantic appropriateness in a sentence.
 - V. The word is used with semantic appropriateness and grammatical accuracy in a sentence. (Wesche & Paribakht, 1996, Figure 2)

The ratings are based on responses to the following options, as shown in (2).

- (2)
 - I. I don't remember having seen this word before.
 - II. I have seen this word before but I don't know what it means.
 - III. I have seen this word before and I think it means _____ (synonym or translation).
 - IV. I know this word. It means _____ (synonym or translation).
 - V. I can use this word in a sentence. e.g.: _____ (if you do this section, please also do section IV). (Wesche & Paribakht, 1996, Figure 1)

In Wesche and Paribakht's (1996) study, self-report and demonstrated knowledge were highly correlated; that is, if a test-taker selected option IV "I know this word," the definition he provided was usually correct.

Waring (2002) reviewed vocabulary knowledge scales, among them Wesche and Paribakht's (1996), and suggested that they implicate the idea that vocabulary development can be represented along a continuum, where learning more about a word moves the learner along the continuum. Waring (2002) also discussed several shortcomings of the Wesche-Paribakht (1996) VKS. For instance, level II ("I have seen this word before but I don't know what it means") cannot be verified (Waring, 2002). Also, according to Waring (2002), the way in which the Wesche-Paribakht (1996) VKS calculates scores poses problems in that the scores do not demonstrate if there is knowledge gain. The VKS calculates scores by averaging the 1-5 scores on a number of words. According to Waring (2002), this method can produce relatively meaningless

scores. In other words, two test-takers might perform quite differently on all items, yet the average of their item scores might produce similar or even equivalent final scores. For example one test-taker might score a 3 on all items, where the other might have a range of scores from 1 to 5; this might yield the same overall average of scores for significantly different performances. Finally, Waring (2002) suggested that a VKS-type of test may be biased toward learners with greater linguistic awareness or greater declarative knowledge (i.e. the knowledge necessary to describe a grammar rule or to define a word). He concluded that a fundamental problem with the use of vocabulary knowledge scales is that the researchers who use them are typically investigating specific stages of vocabulary acquisition. Wesche and Paribakht (1996), for instance, were interested in the acquisition of new adjectives by young learners. Waring (2002) suggested that research using vocabulary knowledge scales would benefit the field more if its goal was to report knowledge by the test-takers rather than to set certain development stages, whose existence is still uncertain.

Lexical Transfer

The influence in language learning of one's native tongue or another known language on the target language, here called "transfer," has been extensively studied (see, e.g., Gass & Selinker, 1983; Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008; Odlin, 1989; Ringbom, 1987; Vildomec, 1963). The study of transfer has origins in contrastive analysis, which assumed that all language-learning difficulties were due to transfer, and has seen great changes in focus over the past decades. Researchers have discovered that transfer is a

complex, dynamic phenomenon whose source is not always clear. Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008) described several phases of research on transfer, beginning with a phase (phase 1) in which transfer was the explanation for certain processes in second language acquisition, rather than a process in itself that needed explaining. Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008) have suggested that this type of research dominated until a shift in the 1960s. Research at this point (phase 2) began to focus on identifying transfer, its sources and causes, and the contexts where it occurs (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008, p. 7). Finally, Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008) proposed the development of a third phase (phase 3) in transfer research, which investigates the “mental constructs and processes through which CLI [cross-linguistic influence] operates” (p. 7). According to Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008), though elements of this phase were present in earlier research, these interests have grown over the past decade. Throughout all of these phases, research established certain distinctions in types, directions, and areas of transfer. First, transfer can take many forms beyond errors; learners can overuse and underuse certain forms and structures (see, e.g., Schachter, 1974). Second, transfer can also be multidirectional; it can occur, for example, from the first language to the second, from the second language to the third, or from the second language to the first (see, e.g., Cenoz, Hufeisen, & Jessner, 2001; Ringbom, 1978b). Finally, transfer can also occur in different linguistic areas, such as phonology, semantics, or pragmatics.

Lexical transfer, specifically, has been shown to occur commonly in two ways: formal lexical transfer and semantic lexical transfer (see, e.g., Ringbom, 1987, 2001). Formal lexical transfer consists of, for example, using false cognates, or words in two

languages that share form but not meaning. Formal lexical transfer also takes the form of simply using a word from the first or another known language that does not exist in the target language. This type of transfer also includes using a new word that is a combination of two or more words from different languages; Jarvis & Pavlenko (2008) cited the example of *clothethers*, from English *clothes* and Swedish *klader* “clothes,” from Ringbom (1987). Semantic lexical transfer, on the other hand, comprises errors such as using an existing word (such as English *language*) in the second language but with the meaning from the first language (French *langue* “language” and “tongue”). Finally, semantic lexical transfer also includes creating and using a compound word formed according to the rules of the first language (Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008) gave the example from Ringbom’s (2001) study in which a Swedish learner of English produced *youngman* for *bachelor* according to Swedish derivation rules, where *ungkarl* (*ung* “young” and *karl* “man”) means *bachelor* (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008, p. 75).

Specific types of lexical transfer have been noted in research. Hall’s (2002) research, among other studies (Herwig, 2001; Lemhofer, Dijkstra, & Michel, 2004; Van Hell & Dijkstra, 2002), investigated and reviewed the “cognate effect” for learners whose second language is typologically related to their first. Cognates are words that share form, and usually, but not necessarily, also some aspect of meaning, in more than one language. In foreign language teaching, “false cognate” typically refers to a word in the target language that is similar in form, but not meaning, to a word in the native language, and that can thus mislead learners. Words can be cognates to differing degrees. Words that share form and all meanings (e.g., French *fruit* and English *fruit*) are referred to as “true

cognates.” Cognates can also share partial meaning (e.g., Spanish *intoxicado* “intoxicated,” “sick” and English *intoxicated*) or can be indirect (e.g., French *librairie* “bookstore” and English *library*). Finally, words can share form and meaning but not certain other restrictions, such as the absence/presence and choice of a preposition (e.g., English *look for* and French *chercher* ϕ) or frequency of use (Odlin, 1989, p. 79). True cognates, and to an extent indirect cognates (e.g., French *librairie* “bookstore,” which would probably help a learner to remember that a *librairie* is a building filled with books), can be helpful to the language student; on the other hand, false cognates, and true cognates where syntactical constraints or frequency differ, can cause problems for learners. Odlin (1989) acknowledged and elaborated on the effects of cognates. On the one hand, if a learner’s first language (L1) and second language (L2) share many cognates, this can be beneficial to the learner. Such learners can recognize more words in a text, for instance, and then focus on understanding new, more difficult words (Odlin, 1989). Ard and Homburg (1983) found that, of Spanish- and Arabic-speaking learners of English, the Spanish learners performed considerably better on a vocabulary test, even on items where there was no similarity between the English and the Spanish words; Spanish and English share many cognates, whereas Arabic and English share very few. On the other hand, false cognates, as Odlin (1989) put it, “seem to be as reliable signals” to learners as true cognates but lead them astray (p. 78). Similarly, true cognates that do not share certain grammatical restrictions are also pitfalls for learners. Furthermore, learners may even have difficulty both in taking advantage of true cognates (through difficulty recognizing them) and in avoiding the use of false cognates (Limper, 1932; Malabonga et

al., 2008). Nation (2001) pointed out that studying cognates and loanwords in class may be helpful to learners when they have difficulty recognizing them on their own, such as when loanwords have changed dramatically over the years and have been completely integrated into the borrowing language (p. 280). For instance, *redingote* “fitted coat” retains its similarity to English *riding coat* in meaning, but it is almost completely integrated into French such that most native speakers are unaware of its origin.

Recent research has also explored learners’ assumptions about cognates. Hall (2002) has proposed a “parasitic model” of vocabulary development. Learners, he has suggested, immediately upon recognizing a form in the target language that is similar to one in their native or another known language, connect that form with its counterpart in the native (or another known) language. This connection is automatic, regardless of whether the form in the target language shares other features, such as meaning or syntactic behavior, with the form in the native language. As Hall explains, “Instead of constructing an entirely new knowledge store for the L2, learners utilize the store they have already in place. Instead of duplicating information ... they list it only once and attach new L2 forms to existing representations” (p. 76). Hall et al. (2009) investigated learners’ assumptions about the syntactic frame of new L3 words based on their L1 or their L2. The study employed the syntactic frames of reflexivity and preposition. In Spanish, German, and French, many words that refer to actions performed on one’s own self are reflexive (e.g., Fr.: *Elle s’est lavée les mains*, Lit.: “She washed herself the hands”), whereas in English, they are not (*She washed her hands*). Likewise, preposition choice often varies from one language to another; in English, one thanks someone *for*

doing something, while in French, one thanks someone *of (de)* doing something. Participants in the study were native Spanish speakers with a high level of proficiency in English, tested either on German or French words. Results showed that the learners preferred the syntactic frame of the typologically closer language; that is, the Spanish students presented with French words would choose the English frame (e.g., not reflexive, or *She washed her hands*) for a verb that was a French-English cognate, and the Spanish frame (e.g., reflexive, Sp.: *Ella se lavó las manos*, Lit.: “She washed herself the hands”) for a verb that was a French-Spanish cognate.

Laufer (1989) and Laufer and Yano (2001) have investigated learners’ awareness of their knowledge about similar L1-L2 forms. The similar forms in these studies, which are termed words with “deceptive transparency,” included cognates and “synforms,” that is, words that resemble each other but have no other relationship (e.g., *available/valuable*, *conceal/cancel*). In reading comprehension tasks, the researchers asked learners to identify words they did not know and then to translate certain cognates or synforms that they thought they knew. Results demonstrated that, when words were deceptively transparent, learners assumed that they knew these words while in fact they did not. Laufer-Dvorkin (1991) also explained some of the difficulties presented by cognates, among them learning word frequency (for instance, French students of English who often prefer *search for* to *look for* due to French *chercher*) and register restrictions; Laufer-Dvorkin (1991) gave the example of Spanish students who favor *approximately* over *about* because of the higher frequency in Spanish of *aproximadamente* (p. 14). Laufer-Dvorkin (1991) identified false cognates as an area of special difficulty for

learners in terms of recognition of words and subsequent connection to meaning (p. 15). However, even true cognates can be overused by a learner who is unaware of these types of constraints, such as frequency and register.

The Effect of Language Similarity on Transfer

The learner's perception of similarity between his native (or another known) language and the target language can play a role in lexical transfer. Ringbom's well-known studies (Ringbom, 1978b, 1983) involved Swedish learners of L2 English and Finnish learners of L2 Swedish and L3 English. The Finnish learners showed more transfer from Swedish than from Finnish. Ringbom (1978) concluded that formal transfer can be caused by learners' assumptions about the similarities between languages (Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2008, p. 77). Specifically, the Finnish students assumed, at some level, greater similarity between English and Swedish than between English and Finnish, and this determined to a large extent the source of transfer.

Jarvis and Pavlenko (2008) noted that a learner's sense of similarity between two languages can be divided into two types, perceived similarity and assumed similarity. In a situation of perceived similarity, the learner judges that an encountered form or structure in the target language is similar to that of the first language. In other words, the learner perceives some type of evidence for similarity between the languages in the target language itself. In a situation of assumed similarity, the learner simply assumes that a form or structure is the same between languages, regardless of actual encounters with the

form or structure in the target language and regardless of whether such a form or structure even exists in the target language (p. 179).

Kellerman (1983) termed a learner's sense of similarity between the source language and the target language "psychotypology" and claimed that it acts as a "constrainer or a trigger of transfer" (p. 113). Kellerman (1983) suggested that L1-L2 similarity is "capitalized on by learners as a result of a relatively immediate opportunity to identify cognate forms and structures across the two languages" (p. 114). He further suggested that this influence can be helpful or detrimental to the learner. According to Kellerman (1983), specific errors due to language similarity are more persistent than other errors.

Metacognition and Language Awareness

Research on metacognition and language awareness explores the way people think about learning in general and learning languages in particular. The concept of metacognition evolved from perspectives on learning. Research does not provide precise definitions for "metacognition," but Paris and Winograd (1990) narrowed it down to two ideas from the research: "(a) knowledge about cognitive states and processes and (b) control or executive aspects of metacognition" (p. 17). Metacognitive skills include self-appraisal (accurately judging how well one has understood) and self-management (abilities such as planning, using strategies, monitoring progress, and revising plans if needed) (Paris & Winograd, 1990, pp. 17-18).

More specifically, in second language acquisition research, metacognition studies have focused on learner strategies and beliefs about learning languages. Wenden (1998), in her review of metacognition in second language acquisition, identified three types of metacognitive knowledge: a) person knowledge, or “human factors,” that affect learning, such as shortcomings in memory or language ability, b) task knowledge, such as ideas about the purpose of a task and how to complete it, and c) strategic knowledge, or knowledge of what strategies are and how to use them. Strategic knowledge has been widely studied in language learning through methods such as retrospective interviews and questionnaires (Wenden, 1998, pp. 518-519). A second area of research on metacognition in second language acquisition is learner beliefs about language learning. Horwitz’s (1988) Beliefs about Language Learning Inventory (BALLI) assesses learners’ opinions in four areas: a) how languages are learned, b) the ease or difficulty of learning languages, c) personal aptitude, and d) learning strategies. The BALLI does not seek to score answers right or wrong but rather to explore students’ “conceptions of language learning” (Horwitz, 1988, p. 284).

Several second language acquisition studies on vocabulary learning have reported on learners’ judgments of what they know. Laufer (1989) asked students to identify unknown words in a reading passage and then to translate certain words that they had not identified as unknown. She found that learners have a tendency to overestimate their knowledge about words. Vocabulary knowledge scales (e.g., Wesche & Paribakht, 1996) also compare self-report with demonstrated knowledge, first asking the learner to provide

a judgment of his knowledge and then verifying that knowledge by asking him to write definitions or sentences.

Second language acquisition researchers have also formulated various proposals about the role of explicit linguistic knowledge in language learning. Among these is Krashen's (1981) claim that linguistic knowledge, or explicit learning of grammar, is useless in second language learning, though it can serve other purposes. Krashen stated that second language "acquisition" took place exclusively through implicit learning. Explicit knowledge is knowledge of which one is aware and which one can thus verbalize. Explicit learning is the intentional, conscious processing of input in order to determine regularities and rules; by contrast, implicit learning is unconscious (Hulstijn, 2005, pp. 130-131). According to Krashen, explicit learning (which he termed simply "learning") produces the "learned system," which plays a different role from the "acquired system" in language production (Krashen, 1981, p. 2). Krashen suggested that explicit learning and the learned system help a learner only when he has not yet actually acquired the language. According to Krashen's (1981) theory, the learned system acts as a "Monitor" in cases where the learner needs to adjust the output of the acquired system, and the Monitor is only available when the learner knows the rule and has the time and the concentration to think about form.

More recently, advocates of the focus-on-form approach, unsatisfied with the results of purely communicative pedagogies, which emphasized exposure to and use of language without attention to structures, investigated how and when explicit linguistic knowledge can be taught and used, and how teaching can bring learners' attention to

language forms. Focus on form, as Long (1991) summarized, “overtly draws students’ attention to linguistic elements as they arise incidentally in lessons whose overriding focus is on meaning or communication” (pp. 45-46).

Research on metalinguistic ability has also examined the connection between metalinguistic reflection and proficiency. Simard and Wong (2004) and Simard, French, and Fortier (2007) investigated the connection between metalinguistic journal use and improvement on a grammar/vocabulary test in beginning French-speaking EFL students. Though students showed progress between pre- and post-tests, there was no direct connection between scores on the tests and verbalizations in the journals. Simard, French, and Fortier (2007) contended, however, that the journals might still have helped the learners to notice more elements from the input and to better understand language. The authors suggested that close-ended questions, rather than open-ended writing, might better identify connections between students’ metalinguistic reflections and their gains in proficiency.

Self-correction is another area that falls in the domain of metacognition. Golonka (2006), for instance, found a connection between more frequent self-correction and more successful learning for students in Russian study abroad experiences. Using the Oral Proficiency Interview (OPI), Golonka (2006) measured individuals’ gains in proficiency after study abroad programs in Saint Petersburg and Moscow. She found that learners passed to the advanced level on the OPI according to five predictors, including self-corrected errors and sentence repair.

Since the 1980s, the areas of second language materials design and teaching have

also explored the concept of language awareness. Language awareness is connected to the concept of metalinguistic reflection in that, according to Simard and Wong (2004), reflection “is considered by some to be the observable product of awareness” (pp. 97-98). Carter (2003) defined language awareness itself as “the development in learners of an enhanced consciousness of and sensitivity to the forms and functions of language” (p. 64). In teaching, language awareness differs greatly from more traditional grammar practice and drills. It encourages hypothesizing and generalizing based on evidence in the language. Language awareness activities do not include explicit explanation of grammar rules; instead, learners are required to generate their own rules based on the language that they encounter. Along those lines, Bolitho et al. (2003) defined language awareness as “an internal, gradual realization of the realities of language use” on the part of the learner (p. 252). Bolitho (2003), referring to Lewis’ (1993) “observe-hypothesize-experiment” model, presented the language awareness approach in opposition to a traditional “present-practice-produce” approach. In the end, a language-aware learner is better at noticing the gap between his own production in the target language and the production of a proficient language user (Bolitho et al., 2003), which in turn makes him readier to acquire features of the language.

In practice, a language awareness approach deviates from the single-sentence or single-response as teaching unit and focuses on longer texts or language data (Bolitho, 2003; Carter, 2003). Bolitho (2003) suggested using language data, including learners’ beliefs about the language, as the inspiration for language awareness tasks in the classroom. The use of journals (e.g., Simard, French, & Fortier, 2007) has also been

investigated as a way of promoting language awareness. Finally, language awareness activities also call for emotional and motivational engagement on the part of the learner and aim to help students learn to appreciate new cultures and their different assumptions, social structures, and expectations.

Anglicisms: Borrowing from English to French

As Gottlieb (2005) put it, “anglicisms are signs of language contact” (p. 161). And, contact between English and French is not new. Levitt (1980) explained:

English has exerted a strong lexical influence on French, particularly since the eighteenth century. ... While English influence in the eighteenth century was exerted largely through books, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries this influence has been greatly reinforced by news agencies, the press, industry, trade, science, the cinema, sports and travel. (pp. 63-64)

Gottlieb (2005) traced significant borrowing from English by other languages back to the beginnings of the British Empire and on into the current dominance of Hollywood-based media. English today also has the prestige of being a *lingua franca*, which Gottlieb (2005) deemed “perhaps the strongest unifying factor among the world’s languages” (p. 161). However, Gottlieb (2005) maintained that borrowing is not the product of “some Anglo-American mental imperialism” (p. 162); rather, the borrowing language interacts “voluntarily” with the source language (p. 162). Once borrowed, a word (or grammatical structure) takes on a life of its own, producing what Gottlieb likened to “half-sisters and -brothers” of the words in the original mother tongue (p. 162). Since borrowed words

(including anglicisms) can change to adapt to the structure of the borrowing language, they are thus not always comprehensible to native speakers of the source language (e.g., *pressing* “dry cleaner”).

Sources and causes for borrowing are varied. Gottlieb (2005) distinguished between direct language contact and indirect language contact and contended that the early influence of English on other European languages was largely through face-to-face interactions (direct contact), while its influence today is mostly from “cultural artifacts,” such as song lyrics, television shows, literature, and advertising (p. 161). Gottlieb (2005) placed this transition from direct to indirect contact in the 1940s and claimed that, since then, “most anglicisms have resulted from impersonal contacts. In fact, they are introduced in target languages—directly or via intermediary languages—through literature and the mass media” (p. 175). As for the causes of borrowing, Pratt (1986) contrasted linguistic causes with extralinguistic causes. According to this author, linguistic causes include the necessity of a word for a new concept (such as new technology) and the invention of new elements for word formation, such as new affixes (e.g., *-ing* in French, as in *parking*). Extralinguistic causes include social motivations, such as a wish to seem “modern, up-to-date, well-off, well-traveled” (Pratt, 1986, p. 361), business and political needs (jargon used in those fields), and material gain through, for example, advertising.

Both Gottlieb (2005) and Picone (1996) provided definitions for anglicisms. Gottlieb (2005) defined an anglicism in the following manner: “Any individual or systemic language feature adapted or adopted from English, or inspired or boosted by

English models, used in intralingual communication in a language other than English” (p. 163). Gottlieb (2005) claimed that integration into the borrowing language was not, in fact, a process that occurred with all anglicisms. Integration of a loanword includes such processes as change in spelling (e.g., *chat* becomes *tchat*), change in pronunciation, change in syntactical constraints or grammatical category (e.g., *parking* “parking lot” becomes a noun and takes an article (e.g., *a*, *the*)). Usually, once a word is well integrated, not only is it not always recognizable to speakers of the original language, but it is also not generally recognized as a loanword by native speakers of the borrowing language. However, according to Gottlieb (2005), though borrowings may change “in pronunciation, spelling, and meaning, etc.,” not all anglicisms are “digest[ed] and integrat[ed]” (p. 163); they are sometimes simply “adopted” from the source language.

Picone’s (1996) definition of “anglicism” stems from the concept of neologisms. Speaking specifically of French, Picone (1996) noted that anglicisms may be difficult to identify in some cases (e.g., *station-service* where the components are French; however, English word order requires *service station*, that is, two consecutive elements, while French requires a connector, i.e. *station de service*) (p. 1). He defined a neologism as “any new word, morpheme or locution and any new meaning for a preexistent word, morpheme or locution that appears in a language” (p. 3). Thus, according to Picone (1996), any borrowing from English would satisfy this definition and would constitute an anglicism and a neologism. Furthermore, his definition encompasses distinctions between integral borrowing (a new word for a new concept, such as *télévision* “television”), semantic borrowing (a new meaning for an existing word, e.g., *réaliser*, which until

recently in French only meant “to complete” but now is sometimes used to mean “to realize,” “to become aware”), and structural borrowing (imitation in French of English morphosyntax, such as *tomber en amour*, Lit.: “fall in love”).

Gottlieb (2005) made further distinctions among anglicisms according to their level of acceptability in the borrowing language. First, he described “integrated items” as items that are “not intuitively identified as English loans” (p. 168). George (1976) pointed out likewise that many frequently-used anglicisms in French are “not recognized as such at all,” giving the examples of *club*, *film*, and *standard* (p. 7). Gottlieb’s other types of anglicisms are “naturalised items (identified as English loans and commonly accepted),” “implants (English-sounding, accepted by certain user groups only),” and “interfering items (often slipshod solutions, including mistranslations)” (p. 168). In English, a “naturalised” loanword might be, for example, *cul-de-sac*, which is generally recognized as French and widely accepted in English usage. For implants, Gottlieb gave the example of the Danish word *hoenge ud* “hang out.” For interfering items, Gottlieb suggested *militoere barakker* “military barracks,” where the correct word is *kaserner* (p. 168). Finally, Gottlieb pointed out that anglicisms are not always actually borrowed from English but are sometimes “coined in the domestic culture” (p. 166); a case in point is German *Dressman* “male model.” Anglicisms may also be imported from a third language.

Picone (1996) and certain other authors (Grigg, 1997; Guilford, 2002; Thogmartin, 1984) have elaborated on the changes to well-known English loanwords as they have been integrated into French. Picone (1996) identified seven different types of

borrowing: a) integral borrowing, b) semantic borrowing, c) structural borrowing (see *tomber en amour* discussed above), d) pseudo-anglicism (“a neologism of French confection but composed of English constituents”), e) hybrid (combining “elements of English with French, Latin or Greek”), f) graphological borrowing, and g) phonological borrowing (pp. 4-7). A sample of Picone’s (1996) examples of each type is provided in (3).

- (3)
- a) integral borrowing: *scanneur*, *week-end*
 - b) integral borrowing: *scanner*, *week-end*
 - c) semantic borrowing: *adopter un profil bas* (from English *adopt a low profile*)
 - d) structural borrowing: *tour-opérateur* (from English *tour operator*, inverting normal French word order)
 - e) pseudo-anglicism: *tennisman* “tennis player”
 - f) hybrid: *top-niveau* “top quality”
 - g) graphological borrowing: *Moderne Hôtel* where French rules require *Moderne Hôtel*; also, *minijean’s* for a type of jeans
 - h) phonological borrowing: [ŋ] in the *-ing* suffix, borrowed from English

Thogmartin (1984), Grigg (1997), and Guilford (2002) have all established categories of specific common types of changes during integration of a borrowed word, with significant overlap in each list. Table 1 shows the authors’ lists along with several examples of each type that they provided.

Table 1: Examples of Changes that Occur during the Integration of Anglicisms

Thogmartin (1984)	Grigg (1997)	Guilford (2002)	Examples given
Spelling change	Adapted spelling		<i>biftek</i> <i>scanneur</i>
Grammatical change	Conversion of grammatical class	Change in syntax (-ing, gender, grammatical category, apostrophe, word order, etc.)	<i>design</i> : English noun, French adjective <i>faire fitness</i> <i>un parking</i> “parking lot” <i>blue jean’s</i>
Suffix <i>-man</i>			
Suffix <i>-ing</i>			<i>shampooing</i> “shampoo” <i>camping</i> “campground”
Pseudo-English compound	Hybrid	Hybrid	<i>auto-stop</i> “hitchhiking” <i>en live</i> <i>top modèle</i>
Truncation	Abbreviation	Abbreviation	<i>basket</i> “tennis shoe,” “sneaker” <i>foot</i> “football,” “soccer” <i>string</i> “g-string” <i>sweat</i> “sweatshirt”
New meaning or narrowing of meaning	Shift in meaning	Meaning change: New meaning, restriction of meaning, expansion of meaning, or semantic borrowing	<i>cake</i> “fruitcake” <i>dealer</i> “to deal drugs” <i>réaliser</i> (semantic borrowing)
	Translated expression		<i>nettoyage ethnique</i> “ethnic cleansing”
	Distortion	False anglicism	<i>lifté</i> “a type of tennis swing” <i>planning</i>
		Derivation	<i>rockeuse</i>
		Change in register	
		Change in pronunciation	<i>McDonald</i> <i>hamburger</i>

Thogmartin (1984), Grigg (1997), and Guilford (2002) used different terms and groupings for certain types of anglicisms; however, many of the categories are essentially the same. Guilford’s (2002) list outlined categories of anglicisms with the goal of capitalizing on the types of changes that occur in loanword integration when teaching, in order to build language awareness for French-speaking students learning English as a

foreign language. He described certain changes (hybrid, abbreviation, derivation) as changes due to “lexical creativity” (p. 96) and suggested that teachers of English as a foreign language to French students should take advantage of this creativity.

Finally, a few studies have identified learners’ errors due to loanwords. Kobayashi (1992) asked native and non-native teachers of English to Japanese learners to identify errors in learners’ writing. Results showed that the non-native speakers did not correct errors in loanword use. For instance, one learner used the loanword *master* in its Japanese sense, to refer to the owner of a bar. Another learner incorrectly used the loanword *manners* (Japanese orthography *manaa*), which in Japanese refers to “morally appropriate behavior” (p. 101). While the native speakers always corrected these mistakes, only a small minority of Kobayashi’s non-native speakers noticed them. Also, Tenjoh-Okwen (1978) counted errors due to false cognates in compositions by francophone learners of English in Cameroon. Among these were several errors in loanword use, for example *radio-speakers* (French *speakers de la radio*), *car* “coach,” “bus,” *surprise-partie* “dancing party,” and *dancings* “ballrooms,” “dancing.”

CHAPTER 3: EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

In the following sections, data from two studies will be presented. The first study investigated the knowledge of and ability to use anglicisms of French-speaking learners of English at the university level. After explaining the methods, we will present and discuss the subjects' ability to recognize and define anglicisms, their knowledge of five given anglicisms, and a list of anglicisms provided by the subjects. Lastly, we will discuss the subjects' awareness of the possibility of error in using anglicisms in English and subjects' knowledge of potential changes in the process of integrating an anglicism into French.

The second study investigated teachers' experiences with anglicism use and error in their classes. After presenting the participants, we will discuss their answers regarding their impressions of student problems with anglicisms in the classroom and student awareness of anglicisms, as well as classroom techniques the participants had used in order to improve language awareness on the topic of anglicisms.

Student and teacher questionnaires are reproduced in Appendices A and B, respectively. Student data is reproduced in Appendix C, including students' uses of the five given anglicisms in English, definitions of anglicisms, a complete list of the anglicisms provided by subjects along with the English definitions and sentences provided by the subjects, and students' opinions about the usefulness of anglicisms in learning English.

Student Study

To investigate French EFL learners' knowledge of anglicisms in French and in the original English, we conducted a small study that aimed to answer the questions in (1).

- (1) a) Do French students make mistakes in using loanwords of English origin in their target language (English)? In other words, do they assume complete equivalence for the word in English and French, that is, that the word has the same meanings, the same syntactical constraints, is used with the same frequency, etc.?
- b) Are French students aware of the origin of common anglicisms in French?
- c) i) Do students have a sense of the potential for error in using such words in their language of origin/the target language? ii) If so, does this help them to use such words correctly?

Students who participated in the study were 26 native French-speaking students at an engineering school in Poitiers, France. Ages ranged from 21 to 23 years. All had been studying English for between 9 and 13 years (mean=11.3 years) and continued studying English as a requirement of their engineering degree. Participation in the study was voluntary and took approximately one hour during one of the students' regular English classes.

The study consisted of a questionnaire in two parts.² In part 1, subjects were shown a list of French words of English origin and were asked to determine what these

² Answers in the appendices and elsewhere are reproduced exactly as provided by the subjects, that is, without correction for spelling or grammar mistakes.

words had in common. They were then asked to use each word in a sentence in English (“Can you use these words in a sentence in English?”). In part 2, learners were asked to define an anglicism and to give five examples of anglicisms of their own selection (“Write the first five anglicisms which come to your mind.”). They were then asked to define each word in French and in English and to use each word in a sentence in French and in English. Finally, learners were asked whether or not they found anglicisms useful in learning English and whether or not they had ever encountered problems using anglicisms in English.

RECOGNITION AND DEFINITION OF ANGLICISMS

In part 1 of the study, subjects were presented with five anglicisms and asked what the words had in common, with the aim of determining the subjects’ ability to recognize anglicisms. Of the 26 subjects, 16 recognized that the five given words (*parking*, *barman*, *design*, *shampooing*, and *string*) were of English origin, were English words, or were used both in French and in English (see Table 2 for answers). One student noted that they were “false friends,” or words in two or more languages that look similar but do not have the same meaning.

Table 2: Answers to “What do these words have in common?”

Answers in French	Translations³
<i>Mots utilisés dans la langue française.</i>	Words used in the French language.
<i>Ils ont tous un “n.” Ils sont tous d’origine anglaise. Tous les mots font moins de 11 lettres. Ce sont tous des substantifs. Ils sont tous masculins.</i>	They all have an “n.” They are all of English origin. All the words have less than 11 letters. They are all nouns. They are all masculine.
<i>Ce sont des mots qui existent à la fois dans la langue française et dans la langue anglaise.</i>	They are words that exist at the same time in the French language and in the English language.
<i>Ce sont des anglicismes (mots anglais qui sont devenus communs en français).</i>	They are anglicisms (English words that have become common in French).
<i>On utilise les mêmes en français.</i>	We use the same words in French.
<i>Ce sont tous des mots provenant de la langue anglaise et s’utilisant dans le langage courant français.</i>	They are all words that come from the English language and that are used in French in daily life.
<i>Ils peuvent tous être utilisés en français alors qu’ils viennent de [xxx].</i>	They can all be used in French even though they come from [xxx].
<i>Ce sont des mots utilisés couramment en français alors que ce sont des mots anglophones.</i>	They are words used commonly in French even though they are anglophone words.
<i>Ils sont utilisés aussi bien en français qu’en anglais.</i>	They are used equally in French and in English.
<i>Ces mots font parti de la langue française, les français les emploient couramment.</i>	These words are part of the French language, French people use them commonly.
<i>Ces mot sont utilisés dans le langage courant en français bien qu’ils soient d’origine anglaise.</i>	These words are used commonly in the French language even though they are of English origin.
<i>Ces mots font partis de la langue française.</i>	These words are part of the French language.
<i>Utilisés en français comme en anglais.</i>	Used in French as in English.
<i>Ce sont des mots anglais utilisés dans la langue française.</i>	They are English words used in the French language.
<i>Ils viennent de l’anglais. La racine est anglaise.</i>	They come from English. The root is English.
<i>Ce sont des noms. Ils sont utilisés couramment dans la langue française.</i>	They are nouns. They are used commonly in the French language.
<i>Ces mots sont utiliser en français mais on une origine anglaise.</i>	These words are used in French but have an English origin.
<i>Ce sont tous des noms communs.</i>	They are all common nouns.
<i>Ce sont des mots employés aussi bien en anglais qu’en français. Ce sont des faux-amis. C’est du “franglais.”</i>	They are words used equally in English and in French. They are false friends. They are “franglais.”
<i>Ce sont des noms communs.</i>	They are common nouns.
<i>Il finissent tous avec le son n ou ng.</i>	They all end with the sound <i>n</i> or <i>ng</i> .
<i>Ces mots ont une racine anglaise mais sont utilisés en français.</i>	These words have an English root but are used in French.
<i>Il y a un n dedans.</i>	They have an <i>n</i> .
<i>Ils sont d’origine anglophone.</i>	They are of anglophone origin.
<i>Ce sont des mots anglais couramment utilisés en français.</i>	They are English words used commonly in French.

³ French answers were translated by the author.

In part 2 of the study, subjects gave definitions of anglicisms. Almost all of the subjects demonstrated general knowledge of anglicisms. Seven of the 26 subjects noted that anglicisms often or always do not have the same meaning in French as in English. Examples of typical definitions given by the subjects are given in (2).

- (2)
- a) *C'est un mot anglais utilisé dans le langage français courant.* [It is an English word used commonly in the French language.]
 - b) *C'est un mot français qui prévient de la langue anglaise mais qui veut pas forcément dire la même chose.* [It is a French word that comes from the English language but which does not necessarily mean the same thing.]

Of the subjects who remarked on differences between an anglicism and its English counterpart, one characterized an anglicism as a “mot anglais francisé” [Frenchified English word] and one commented that an anglicism can “be modified or lose its initial meaning.” On the other hand, one student defined an anglicism as “a word that comes from English and that has the same meaning as in English.” Finally, one student defined anglicisms as semantic borrowings, in his words, “the incorrect translation of an English word into French because it looks very much like a French word.” In brief, students generally defined anglicisms as words that came from English, with a number of students noting that the words do not have the same meaning in English. Subjects’ conceptions of anglicisms were thus different from both technical definitions cited in chapter 3. Gottlieb’s (2005) technical definition took care to include “features ... adopted from English” (p. 163) rather than simply words, and Picone’s (1996) definition likewise

included “any new word, morpheme or locution and any new meaning for a preexistent word” (p. 3). In this sense, subjects’ definitions were incomplete.

In terms of recognition and definition of anglicisms, therefore, subjects were by and large aware that the five given words were anglicisms, and also generally believed that an anglicism was a word that came from English. A significant number of subjects observed, however, that anglicisms can have a different meaning in French than in English.

KNOWLEDGE OF FIVE PROVIDED ANGLICISMS

As stated above, in part 1 of the questionnaire, students were asked if they could use five given anglicisms (*parking* “parking lot,” *barman* “barman (U.K.),” “bartender (U.S.),” *design* “modern or edgy in aesthetic,” *shampooing* “shampoo,” and *string* “thong” (underwear)) in a sentence in English. The second word, *barman*, has the same meaning and syntactic constraints in French and in English, though in English its use is generally restricted to Commonwealth countries. One can say in French, as in English, *J’ai commandé une bière auprès du barman*, “I ordered a beer from the barman.” The other four words have different syntactical constraints or meanings in English. This question was therefore purposefully worded so that students could respond simply “no” if they deemed the word unacceptable in English, that is, if they judged that the word could not be used as such in an English sentence.

Four of the five words (*parking*, *design*, *shampooing*, and *string*) are all used differently in French than in English. The word *parking* in English usually refers to the activity of parking a car. In this instance, it is a verb, used in a context such as “I’m

parking the car right now.” It may also refer to non-delimited space in which cars can be parked. In this case, it is an uncountable noun, usually used in a context such as “I couldn’t find any parking downtown.” Crucially, in English, it does not refer to a countable noun (e.g., **a parking*). In French, however, the word *parking* refers to delimited areas (slots) where vehicles can be parked (e.g., a parking lot or parking garage). It thus is preceded by an article and might be used in a context such as *Pouvez-vous me dire s’il y a un parking dans le quartier?* (“Can you tell me if there is a parking lot in the neighborhood?”).

The word *design* is used in French in two ways: as an adjective to describe something that is aesthetically modern or edgy (e.g., *Ce nouveau bâtiment est vraiment design*, “This new building is very modern-looking”), and as a noun to refer to the planning and form of a newly developed object or environment (e.g., *Cette société s’occupe du design de la nouvelle école*, “This company is undertaking the design of the new school”). In English, *design* is used only as a noun and as a verb, never as an adjective. As a noun, it has a meaning similar to its counterpart in French, that is, the planning and form of a newly developed object or environment (e.g., *The design of a computer operating system with windows was revolutionary*). As a verb, it describes the act of developing a new object or environment (e.g., *We hired this artist to design the cover of the book*).

Shampooing in French translates to “shampoo” in English. One might say, for example, *J’ai besoin de trouver un nouveau shampooing* (“I need to find a new shampoo”). In contrast, in English, the word *shampooing* only acts as a verb describing

the action of using shampoo (e.g., *I was shampooing my hair when the lights went out*). Finally, a *string* in French is a thong-style undergarment, derived from *G-string*. In English, *string* refers to a length of material twisted together to form a thin length, often usually used to make knots or to tie objects together.

Table 3 gives an overview of the subjects' uses of these given words in sentences, that is, the number of students a) who used each word correctly, b) who used each word incorrectly, that is, according to its usage in French, c) who simply responded "no," and d) who made mistakes with the word that were unrelated to the word's use in French (labeled "Other Mistakes"), along with typical examples in each category.

Table 3: Student Responses Using the Five Given Words (*parking, barman, design, shampooing, string*)

Words	Correct Use	Incorrect Use	“No”	Other Mistakes
<i>Parking</i>	8 “I’m parking my car.”	13 “There is a parking in front of the building.”	3	2 “My car is parking so far.”
<i>Barman</i>	20 “The barman is making a cocktail.”	0	6	0
<i>Design</i>	24 “I like the design of this car.” “The man designs a new building.”	1 “My new flat is very design.”	1	0
<i>Shampooing</i>	6 “I was shampooing my dog.”	13 “Is there a shampooing in the bathroom?” “Could you give me some shampooing? I forgot mine.”	7	0
<i>String⁴</i>	15 “A sentence is a string of words.” “I broke the A string on my Fender Stratocaster.”	4 “My girlfriend loves wearing strings.”	2	4 (Vocabulary errors) “To climb, you can use a string.”

Students made the most mistakes with *parking* and *shampooing*, with 13 of them assuming that each word was used in English with the same meaning and syntactic constraints as in French. For *parking*, subjects made the mistake of using *parking* as a countable noun, e.g., *My car is in the parking*, where in English this sense is served by the expression *parking lot*. For *shampooing*, subjects made the mistake of using *shampooing* in the sense of the English word *shampoo*, e.g., *Is there shampooing in the bathroom?*. *Design*, on the other hand, was used by students with a high rate of success. Only one error was noted (*My new flat is very design.*), and only one student responded

that the word could not be used in English. Students have likely encountered this word in authentic English more often than the other words because of their engineering specialization. *String* was also used with a higher rate of success than *parking* and *shampooing*, with only four students making errors according to its use in French (e.g., *I never wear strings*.). Other errors with *string* were due to confusion with words with very similar meanings, such as *wire* (*She can walk on string*.), *leash* (*I need to put a string around my dog because it becomes nervous when it see [sic] others dogs*.), and *rope* (e.g., *To climb, you can use a string*.). For *barman*, students were generally aware that its meaning was the same in English as in French, with 20 of the subjects using the word correctly, none using it incorrectly, and six responding that the word could not be used in English.

In summary, the two anglicisms with *-ing* suffixes (*parking*, *shampooing*) posed the greatest problems for students. Subjects used *design*, a word commonly used in the discipline of engineering, overwhelmingly accurately. For *string*, only four students committed errors that could be construed as transfer from the word's use in French. Finally, subjects demonstrated competence in using *barman*, although the “no” response from six students suggests that even anglicisms that have equivalent meanings in English can cause confusion for learners.

⁴ One answer (“I would like to buy a string”) was omitted because it was unclear from the sentence what meaning the student intended.

ANGLICISMS PROVIDED BY STUDENTS

In part 2 of the questionnaire, subjects were asked to provide five anglicisms of their own choice. Table 4 shows a comprehensive list of the words that the subjects provided.

Table 4: Anglicisms Provided by Subjects⁵

after	coca light	keptchup [<i>sic</i>]	short (2)
backstage	confident ≠ <i>confident</i>	kicker	show
barbecue (2)	cool (5)	kidnapping	skateboard (2)
barman	cowboy	lady	slide
basé sur	cracking	leader	slow (2)
basket (2) ⁶	downloading	mail	snowboard
baskets (2)	fast food/fast-food (2)	manager	sport
beefsteak	firewall	marketing	star
bluetooth	flashback	PC (Personal	stop
bowling	foot	Computer) (3)	stress
brainstorming (2)	football (6)	phrase ≠ <i>phrase</i>	sympathise ≠
building	frag	pinball	<i>sympathiser</i>
bus (2)	GI	podcasting	t-shirt/tee shirt
business (2)	halloween	portable	teaser
CD (compact disk) (2)	hamburger (6)	potatoes	to attend ≠ <i>attendre</i>
channel	hand-ball	puzzle	to chat
cheerleader	headshot (HS)	reforming	travelling
chewing-gum (4)	hit	running	WC
chips (5)	hot dog	rush	week end (12)
coach	jogging	sandwich (2)	windows
coaching		serial killer	

Certain mistakes were common among students. Of the four students who chose *chewing-gum*, all of them used it incorrectly (e.g., *I have a chewing-gum stuck under my shoe*). Individual students also made mistakes with *short* (*It's worm [sic], so I am wearing a short*, whereas English requires the plural *shorts*), *brainstorming* (*First, let's make a brainstorming*, whereas in English *brainstorming* is used either as an adjective,

⁵ Subjects were asked to provide five anglicisms each. Several students provided fewer than five.

e.g., *a brainstorming session*, or a verb, e.g., *We were brainstorming for ideas*), *coaching* (*The Bulls have won thanks to an amazing coaching*, whereas in English *coaching* is only used as a verb or a gerund, e.g. *I enjoy teaching but my real love is coaching*, or, *I've been coaching her on her tennis serve*), *slow* (*Do you want to dance a slow with me?*, whereas in English *slow* is an adjective, and the equivalent for the French term would be *slow dance*), *fast food* (*If you often eat in a fast food, you will become fat*, whereas in English *fast food* is either a type of food or an adjective that describes a type of restaurant, but not, as in French, the restaurant itself), and *basket* (*I want to play basket*, where the French term has been truncated from *basketball*, and the word *basket* in English means the object used for carrying). Two students made the mistake of retaining a hyphen from French where there is none in English (*I am going to Nice this week-end* and *Zidane is a great foot-ball player*). Some uses were more ambiguous, such as *I've had a wonderful flashback about my last holydays [sic]*, *I entered the channel* (*channel* “a chat room”), and *Be careful, I will kill you with a headshot*, where *headshot* is equivalent in English and French in gaming vocabulary. In these instances it was difficult to tell whether students were aware that other meanings of these words were by far the more common in English; *flashback* typically describes a literary device, and *channel* refers commonly either to a television channel or to a channel of water; likewise, *headshot* most commonly refers to a professional photo typically used by actors and performers.

⁶ *Basket* and *baskets* are included as two separate entries because their meanings in French are different. *Basket* typically refers to the sport of basketball, while *baskets* are running shoes.

Students were also asked to provide definitions for their chosen words. They incorrectly assumed French-English equivalence in their definitions in only five instances out of 119 total definitions. These incorrect definitions were for *portable*⁷, *brainstorming*, *mail*, *fast-food*, and *flashback*. With other words, such as *channel* and *headshot*, it was unclear whether students were aware that other, more common, meanings for the word existed in English. In addition, one student stated that he did not know the English definition for his chosen anglicisms (*brainstorming*, which in French is a type of meeting, and *travelling*, which in French is a tracking shot in cinematic recording).

AWARENESS OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN FRENCH LOANS AND ORIGINAL ENGLISH FORMS

Finally, students were asked whether they found anglicisms to be useful in learning English and whether anglicisms had ever caused them to make mistakes in their English. To the first question, subjects rarely answered simply yes or no; answers often suggested that anglicisms could both be useful and lead to confusion.⁸ As far as affirmative answers, 12 students answered either that anglicisms were useful (including one who responded, “It depends”), that they sometimes helped in recognizing words or understanding conversations, or that they were useful specifically when the English-French meanings were the same. Only six of these subjects answered yes without referring to exceptions (false friends) or the possibility for confusion in certain instances.

⁷ *Portable* differs from the other anglicisms in this report in that, although it appeared in French under the influence of English and in place of French *portatif*, it obeys French rules of word formation and is officially accepted in French.

Eleven students stated outright that anglicisms were not useful. Among these, two said they were not useful because French speakers usually forget the origin of such words. Two students referred specifically to the potential for “false friends” and for errors. Between both open-ended questions, 12 subjects observed that the meaning of the English word was not always the same as its French counterpart. Finally, to the second question concerning the possibility of mistakes caused by anglicisms, 12 subjects answered that anglicisms had caused them problems, with answers ranging from “Sometimes,” “Slight confusion,” and “Possibly,” to “Obviously!”

In answering the second open-ended question (“Have you encountered difficulties or problems using anglicisms in an English class or in other environments where you’ve spoken English?”), the subjects also stated several ways in which French borrowings from English can differ from their English counterpart. One student observed that “the most common words of English origin are not used in the same context at all in the two languages.” Another remarked that anglicisms could cause errors because “the conjugation and the grammar are different between the two languages.” Another stated that “the problem is that the evolution in each language is different. The same word can mean the opposite thing when it is used in another country.”

In spite of these surprisingly astute observations, this awareness did not generally carry over into usage and knowledge of specific words. Table 5 shows the number of errors in *parking*, *design*, *shampooing*, and *string* (eliminating *barman* because of its

⁸ Data showing all of the answers and their translations (grouped according to subjects who found anglicisms useful, subjects who found them both useful and problematic, subjects who found them either

equivalent usage in English and in French) and defining and using self-selected words by subjects who demonstrated in their open-ended responses that they were to some degree aware of the complications caused by anglicisms (group 1) and by subjects who did not (group 2). Awareness was determined through answers to both open-ended questions; that is, a student might not have given a particularly astute response to the first open-ended question, “Do you think anglicisms are helpful as you learn English,” but may have shown awareness of differences between anglicisms and their English counterparts in the second question, “Have you ever encountered difficulties or problems using anglicisms in an English class or in other environments where you’ve spoken English?”. The tally came to 17 students in group 1 and 9 in group 2.

Having some awareness of changes in meaning or of the possibility of false friends seemed of some help to students in use and in definitions. Students in group 1 made an average of 0.882 errors (counted under “Incorrect Use” in Table 3) each with the four non-equivalent given words and 0.705 errors each with self-chosen words. Students in group 2 made, respectively, 1.667 and 1.111 errors each. Awareness appeared to improve usage both with the four non-equivalent given words and with self-selected words, with a greater difference in number of errors between group 1 and group 2 in the given words (0.882 and 1.667 respectively) than in the self-selected words (0.705 and 1.111 respectively). However, the only mistake made in using *design* was on the part of a student in group 1.

not useful or only problematic, and subjects who gave unclear responses) are available in Appendix C.

Table 5: Errors per Group Divided by Awareness of Problems with Anglicisms

	Errors in Four Non-equivalent Given Words	Errors in Self-Selected Words
Group 1: Subjects who recognized the potential for difference/error/false friends (17)	<i>Parking</i> 6	Use 8
	<i>Design</i> 1	Meaning 4
	<i>Shampooing</i> 7	
	<i>String</i> 1	
	Total 15	Total 12
	0.882 errors per student	0.705 errors per student
Group 2: Subjects who did not (9)	<i>Parking</i> 7	Use 7
	<i>Design</i> 0	Meaning 3
	<i>Shampooing</i> 5	
	<i>String</i> 3	
	Total 15	Total 10
	1.667 errors per student	1.111 errors per student

These results of the student study showed that the subjects did indeed make errors in using anglicisms in their language of origin, that subjects were generally aware of the potential for difference in meaning between French and English, and that awareness did make some difference in promoting correct usage of such words in English.

Teacher Study

In order to further investigate the effect of anglicisms on the learning experience of French EFL students, we designed a questionnaire to explore teachers' experiences with students in the classroom. The questionnaire asked subjects to briefly estimate or summarize their students' problems with anglicisms in the classroom, their students' awareness of the origin of anglicisms, and to describe any techniques they had used in the classroom to raise awareness of the complexities of anglicisms.

Four teachers of EFL in France completed the questionnaire. All were female and native speakers of English. Two were American, one was Australian, and one was English. Table 6 provides information about their experiences teaching EFL to French speakers and their educational background.

Table 6: Teacher Participant Information

Subject⁹	Years teaching EFL to French speakers	Location where English was taught	Ages taught	University degrees and areas	Other languages taught
Connie	35	Paris	Adults	BA Spanish MA FLE	(Unofficially) French and Spanish
Jennifer	3	Southeastern France	University students; junior high and high school students	BA French, Linguistics, and International Studies MA Linguistics with Cert. in Teaching ESL	(Tutoring) French and German
Emily	2	Western France	Elementary students; university students	BJ/BA English and French MEd Graduate Cert. in TESOL	French, Spanish (briefly)
Laura	5	Northern France	Junior high and high school students; university students	BA Honors French and Italian	None

⁹ With the exception of Emily, which is a pseudonym, teachers' real first names are used with consent.

STUDENT PROBLEMS WITH ANGLICISMS

All four teachers reported students' using anglicisms incorrectly in their English. Jennifer reported these issues as occurring "too often" and Emily reported similarly that they happened "constantly." Both Jennifer and Connie reported that such instances might be confusing for a teacher. Jennifer suggested that for an anglophone teacher less familiar with such anglicisms in French, "these mistakes could cause confusion, i.e. an American would probably think *dressing* refers to a dresser and not a walk-in closet." Connie compared problems with anglicisms to problems with other Latin-root false friends (such as *duplex* (her example)) and confusion due to English-American dialect differences.

STUDENT AWARENESS OF ANGLICISMS

All four teachers also had the impression that their students were generally aware of the origin of anglicisms in French. According to Jennifer, who commented that she thought her students would be especially aware that words ending in *-ing* come from English:

It does seem like they know which words come from English (or at least appear to...) and so they use those words when trying to form sentences in English. ... I don't think they've understood the concept of meaning change in word borrowings between languages.

Emily had the same impression from her students: "For many of the words, I believe they do know, especially with the *-ing* suffixes." Connie attributed knowledge of these word origins to the extra attention the French government pays to language, stating:

In France they are very aware because the government has made such a fuss over one new anglicism after another. I'm noticing that younger journalists and the younger generation in general are much more comfortable in English than their elders. They are using expressions now that I was taught 40 years ago never to use, e.g., *en charge de* ([Eng.:] "in charge of") instead of *responsable pour*, or *drastic* (in the dictionary they still say *draconien* or *radical*). There are many more that one hears in the media regularly.

Laura agreed with the other teachers, observing that "I think they assume that that's how we say it in English. I think that most of them are aware that they have an English origin." She noted, however, that she has "had some younger [junior high] students thinking that they are French words."

All teachers had taught in different environments to different student demographics, including mostly junior high and high school students, university students (language and pharmacy/medical), and adults working for private companies. All of these groups are slightly different from the student subjects in our study.

CLASSROOM TECHNIQUES FOR RAISING AWARENESS

Teachers also reported specific and general work they had done on anglicisms or false friends in the classroom. Laura reported that, although she has "never actually done a lesson on false friends... they often come up while teaching so I make sure students know what they mean (or more importantly, what they don't mean!)" Connie reported that she maintains and hands out lists of such problematic vocabulary to "serve as

reference for students or a starting point for discussion” and to “get students to move towards self-correction for each problem as it arises.”

Both Emily and Jennifer described specific lessons that focused on awareness of changes in anglicisms. Emily explained that she had been “tired of reading their work which they believed to be English but really was a mish-mash of these borrowed words” which they “either ‘translated’ back into English” or in certain cases simply used the loanword according to its use in French. Emily thus “did a brainstorming session [where] we made a list together about words that are the same in both languages and words that are not really English.” Jennifer put together a computer exercise which first showed students several anglicisms with their real equivalents in English and then showed anglicisms in sentences for the students to evaluate as correct or incorrect.

CHAPTER 4: CONCLUSIONS

Chapter 1 of this report described the phenomenon at hand and introduced the research questions. Chapter 2 elaborated on previous research on factors relevant to this problem, including vocabulary knowledge, transfer, metacognition, and lexical borrowing. Research on vocabulary knowledge has provided different perspectives for discussing vocabulary knowledge, in terms of depth and breadth, and in terms of networking between first and second language systems, and has also provided innovational techniques for evaluating vocabulary knowledge, such as through the use of vocabulary knowledge scales. Decades of research on transfer between two or several known languages have detailed different types and directions of transfer, and different theories, such as the parasitic model (Hall, 2002), have been put forth for specific types of transfer due to, for example, false cognates. Research on metacognition and language awareness has investigated how learners think about learning and how instruction might increase language awareness in the goal of helping students notice and acquire language features. Finally, chapter 2 also reviewed definitions of anglicisms and the typical changes brought about during the integration of a loanword into the borrowing language.

Chapter 3 then presented the research questions and the methods and results of two studies. Results of the student study provided the following answers to the research questions in (1).

- (1) a) Do French students make mistakes in using loanwords of English origin in their target language (English)? In other words, do they assume complete

equivalence for the word in English and French, that is, that the word has the same meanings, the same syntactical constraints, is used with the same frequency, etc.?

Students generally made mistakes with anglicisms. Half of the students made errors with *parking* and *shampooing* based on the usage of the word in French. That is, they assumed equivalence in meaning and in syntactic constraints between French and English (see chapter 3: *Knowledge of Five Provided Anglicisms*).

(1) b) Are French students aware of the origin of common anglicisms in French?

The majority of the students were aware of the origin of anglicisms and were able to provide a definition for them. Sixteen of the 26 students recognized that the five provided words were either of English origin or were used in “both French and English” (see chapter 3: *Recognition and Definition of Anglicisms*).

(1) c) i) Do students have a sense of the potential for error in using such words in their language of origin/the target language? ii) If so, does this help them to use such words correctly?

i) Seventeen of the 26 subjects were aware in some way of the potential for error/change in words. This included awareness of the potential for mistakes and awareness of differences in meaning between a French word of English origin and its original English counterpart. Two students demonstrated awareness of other possible changes, namely, “context” and “conjugation and grammar” (see chapter 3: *Awareness of Differences between French Loans and Original English Forms*). ii) Awareness did not necessarily lead to correct use. By dividing the subjects into those subjects who were aware of the

possibility for error or the potential for change between a loanword and its English counterpart and those subjects who were not, we compared the number of errors in each group (see Table 5). The difference in the number of errors between the groups was significant (0.882 and 1.667 for the given words and 0.705 and 1.111 for self-selected words). However, it seems that the factor that helped students to use a word correctly was familiarity with the word. Only one student made an error with the word *design*, a word that these students are likely to have encountered frequently in their studies as future engineers.

As for the teacher study, all four teachers reported noticing students' problems with anglicisms and thought that students were not aware of the differences between a French word of English origin and its counterpart (the original form) in English. The teachers also provided ideas for raising awareness in students. Subjects in the student study showed a higher level of awareness of the differences between a word in French and its original form in English than the teachers reported; however, this awareness was mostly limited to changes in meaning. Students could likely benefit from greater awareness of other types of changes, such as changes in pronunciation, frequency, context, and syntactic constraints. Awareness of the changes in anglicisms as they are integrated into the borrowing language seems a promising tool for students. However, the results also suggest that awareness alone is not sufficient to promote correct usage. Students apparently first use the words as they are used in their native language, with the same properties and meanings. For example, half of the subjects in this study used *parking* as a countable noun according to its use in French. Then, after recurring exposure

to the word in English, they appear to be able to learn new meanings and syntactic constraints. The subjects in this study used *design* correctly in a way they were likely to have encountered many times. This suggests that actual practice with these words is important, and, at the same time, that learning to use anglicisms correctly in their language of origin is much like other vocabulary learning: learners are building a network and learning more about each word (in terms of frequency of use, collocational restrictions, syntactic constraints, etc.) with more exposure and practice. The question of extra exposure to correct usage of certain anglicisms because of academic specialty (or some other type of expertise), however, was not built into this study, and further research would need to be conducted in order to demonstrate if this hypothesis is correct.

Further research with different language pairings is likely also to be fruitful, in order to determine whether the awareness and the frequency of errors found with these French students are similar with speakers and learners of other languages. Given the proliferation of anglicisms in many languages, research on awareness of anglicisms among speakers of these languages could be equally interesting. Finally, investigating the awareness of loanwords from languages other than English among learners of those languages (such as English-speaking learners of French) could reveal whether or not the current and growing dominance of English as an international language affects this type of transfer.

Appendices

Appendix A Student Questionnaire

Age :
Âge :

Age at which you started studying English:
Âge auquel vous avez commencé à étudier l'anglais :

Number of years you have studied English:
Nombre d'années d'études en anglais :

Part 1. *Partie 1*

Please look at the following words:
Regardez les mots suivants :

Parking
Barman
Design
Shampooing
String

These words have something in common. What do these words have in common?
Ces mots ont quelque chose en commun. Décrivez ce qu'ils ont en commun.

Can you use these words in a sentence in English?
Pourriez-vous les utiliser dans une phrase en anglais?

- 1)
- 2)
- 3)
- 4)
- 5)

Part 2. *Partie 2*

In your own words, what is an anglicism?
À votre avis, qu'est-ce qu'un anglicisme?

Write the first five anglicisms which come to your mind. Do not repeat the words above.
Écrivez ici les cinq premiers anglicismes qui vous viennent en tête. Ne répétez pas les mots ci-dessus.

What do these words mean when you use them in French?
Qu'est-ce que chacun de ces mots signifie en français?

- a)
- b)

- c)
- d)
- e)

Please use these in a sentence in French.

Utilisez chacun de ces mots dans une phrase du français.

- a)
- b)
- c)
- d)
- e)

Can you try to use them in a sentence in English?

Utilisez ces mots dans une phrase de l'anglais.

- a)
- b)
- c)
- d)
- e)

What do these words mean when you use them in English?

Qu'est-ce que chacun de ces mots signifie en anglais?

- a)
- b)
- c)
- d)
- e)

Do you think anglicisms are helpful to you as you learn English? If yes, in what way? If no, why not?

Est-ce que vous pensez que les anglicismes vous sont utiles dans l'apprentissage de l'anglais? Si oui, de quelle manière? Sinon, pourquoi?

Have you encountered difficulties or problems using anglicisms in an English class or in other environments where you've spoken English?

Est-ce que vous avez déjà rencontré des difficultés en utilisant des anglicismes dans un cours d'anglais ou dans d'autres contextes où vous vous êtes adressé en anglais?

If you wish to elaborate on any of your responses, provide explanations, or give general comments, please do so here. Comments are welcome.

Si vous souhaitez développer vos réponses, fournir des explications ou donner des commentaires, vous pouvez le faire ici. Vos commentaires seraient les bienvenus.

Appendix B Teacher Questionnaire

Your native language:

Years spent teaching English as a foreign language in France or elsewhere to French-speaking learners:

General location(s) where you taught EFL to these learners:

Do you have any university degrees? If yes, in what field(s)?

Have you ever taught any other foreign languages?

Have you ever taught English to learners of a different native language?

Have you ever noticed students trying to use anglicisms or making mistakes from anglicisms in English class? Can you give any examples?

Do you think your students are generally aware of the origin of many anglicisms? Can you give any examples?

Have you ever taught any of your students specifically about false cognates (words in two languages that share form but not meaning, e.g., *actuellement* “currently”) or even anglicisms? If yes, can you describe what you did?

If you have any other comments you would like to make, please feel free to do so.

Appendix C Student Data

Part 1: Can you use each word in a sentence in English?

<i>Parking</i>	<i>Barman</i>	<i>Design</i>	<i>Shampooing</i>	<i>String</i>
I've let my car in this parking.	Non	I like the design of this car.	Non	A sentence is a string of words.
I am parking my beautiful and customized car.	I ordered a gin tonic to the "barman".	I love these glasses' design.	?	Words are like strings of letters.
I'm parking my car.	The barman of the pub offered me a jug of beer.	I worked in the department of design studies all the last summer.	The color of the water was getting dark when I was shampooing my dog.	This part of the program code is called "string."
Can you park your car in the parking just right here?	The barman is sitting in the middle of the room.	Your car is well designed.	What is the shampooing you use?	Pull the string if you want to open the box.
My car is parking so far.	"Bar man! A beer please!"	My new flat is very design.	If you want to have nice hair, use this shampooing.	To climb, you can use a string.
I was parking my car when the bus hit me.	The barman didn't to do this job.	Design school's student are so lame.	I was shampooing my dog.	The dictator was pulling all the strings.
My car is in the parking.	This barman is very nice with his customers, more particularly with the girls.	This new car has a very good design.	Anne-Sophie has very beautiful hair, it's thank to her new shampooing.	The girls who practice strip-tease have a little string.
There is a parking in front of the building.	I have to speak to the barman in order to get free bier.	The design of this house is very hype.	Is there a shampooing in the bathroom?	It is not necessary to wear a string for being sexy.
I leave my car in a parking.	The barman give beers.	I design a new box.	I wash my hair by shampooing it.	A sentence is a string of words.
At this place, parking is prohibited.	He works as Barman.	The constructor designs this piece.	He is shampooing his hair.	They made a game with a string to know who was the best.
My car is in the parking.	The barman is nice.	This car is well-designed.	My bottle of shampooing is empty.	My girlfriend loves wearing strings.
I leave my car in a parking.	The barman gives me a coke.	The design of this room, is really beautiful.	I'm shampooing my hairs.	Sometimes, we use string for cooking.
My car is near the parking.	My brother is a barman.	This summer, I worked in a design office.	I want to buy a new shampooing.	The string is very long.
I am parking my car.	He used to be a barman.	We design cars for a big company.	She was shampooing her hair when the phone rang.	I broke the A string on my Fender Stratocaster.
I stopped my car	I asked the barman	The design of this	I use this	I never wear strings.

in a parking.	to give me a limonade.	building is really beautiful.	shampooing because after its use, my hair shine.	
Non (I parked in the Nelson's park lot)	Non	Oui: I love the design of this house.	Non (Could you give me some shampoo? I forgot mine.)	Oui- I used the red string.
Parking is forbidden here.	Non	The design of this car is fantastic.	Non	The string is quite thick.
Non	Non	This car has a good design	Non	I use a string to pack my bag.
There is no room for my car on the parking.	The barman looks like Batman.	The design of the classroom is ugly.	Actually you need a shampooing for your hairs.	My bow's string is broken.
The man is parking his car.	The barman serves a cup of tea.	The man designs a new building.	non.	non.
Where is the parking?	The barman is making a cocktail.	What do you think of this car's design?	Do you like the smell of this shampooing?	I would like to buy a string.
Let's go to the parking.	Ask the barman if you need to get something to drink.	I love the design of this car.	I need my hair shampooing.	I need to put a string around my dog because it becomes nervous when it see others dogs.
non	non	This house have been succedly design.	non	She can walk on string.
I'm parking.	A barman gives me a drink.	Non	I've got a new shampooing.	non.
My car is in a parking.	The barman is doing a cocktail.	I don't like the design of this house.	I have bought a new shampooing.	My neckless is made with 121 strings.
I can let my car in this (parking - > park) until 10 pm.	Non	This house has a beautiful design.	Non	The monkey climb at a string.

Part 2: Definitions of Anglicisms Provided by Subjects

Answers in French	Translation¹⁰
<i>Un mot utilisé dans la langue française à consonnance anglaise ou d'origine anglaise qui n'a pas forcément le même sens en langue anglaise ou qui est mal utilisé en français.</i>	A word used in the French language that sounds English or is of English origin that does not necessarily have the same meaning in the English language or is incorrectly used in French.
<i>C'est un mot (d'anglais d'origine) qui n'a pas forcément le même sens en anglais qu'en français mais qui est passé dans le langage.</i>	It is a word (of English origin) that does not necessarily have the same meaning in English as in French but which has become part of the language.
<i>C'est un mot anglais utilisé dans le langage français courant.</i>	It is an English word used commonly in the French language.
<i>C'est un mot français qui prévient de la langue</i>	It is a French word that comes from the English

¹⁰ French answers were translated by the author.

<i>anglaise mais qui veut pas forcément dire la même chose.</i>	language but which does not necessarily mean the same thing.
<i>Un mot devenu courant dans la langue française.</i>	A word that has become common in the French language.
<i>-Un mot utilisé en français, parfois même inappropriée. -Un mot français dont la racine est anglaise (mot anglais francisé).</i>	-A word used in French, sometimes even inappropriately. -A French word whose roots are English (a Frenchified English word)
<i>C'est un mot de la langue anglaise utilisé dans le langage français.</i>	It is a word from the English language used in French language.
<i>C'est un mot anglais utilisé en français dans un autre sens.</i>	It is an English word used in French with another meaning.
<i>C'est la mauvaise traduction d'un mot anglais en français car il ressemble énormément au mot français.</i>	It is the incorrect translation of an English word into French because it looks very much like a French word.
<i>Un mot qui est utilisé en français et en anglais.</i>	A word that is used in French and in English.
<i>Ce sont des mots anglais, utilisés dans la langue française courante.</i>	They are English words, used commonly in the French language.
<i>Un mot qui "n'existe" pas dans la langue anglaise, mot d'origine française, n'ayant aucun sens en anglais (ou différent)</i>	A word that doesn't "exist" in the English language, a word of French origin, having no meaning in English (or different)
<i>Il s'agit d'un mot utilisé en français qui vient de l'anglais.</i>	It is a word used in French that comes from English.
<i>Le fait d'utiliser un mot anglais directement en français</i>	The fact of using an English word directly in French.
<i>Mot d'origine anglo-saxonne utilisé dans d'autres langues.</i>	A word of anglo-saxon ¹¹ origin used in other languages.
<i>Un mot utilisé en français qui vient de l'anglais.</i>	A word used in French that comes from English.
<i>Utiliser un mot tiré de l'anglais dans une autre langue. Ce mot peut-être modifiée ou perdre son sens initial.</i>	Using a word pulled from English in another language. The word can be modified or can lose its original meaning.
<i>Un mot qui provient de l'anglais et qui a la même signification qu'en anglais</i>	A word that comes from English and that has the same meaning as in English.
<i>C'est un mot anglais utilisé en français sans être traduit</i>	It's an English word used in French without being translated.
<i>Un mot anglais passé dans la langue française.</i>	An English word that has become a part of the French language.
<i>C'est un mot directement emprunté à l'anglais et utilisé dans le langage français.</i>	It's a word loaned directly from English and used in French language.
<i>C'est un mot anglais qui est utilisé couramment dans le cadre d'une conversation en français.</i>	It's an English word used commonly in the context of a conversation in French.
<i>C'est un mot qui peut s'utiliser en français et en anglais, d'origine anglaise.</i>	It's a word that can be used in French and in English, of English origin.
<i>Un mot d'origine anglaise utilisé en français.</i>	A word of English origin used in French.
<i>Un anglicisme est un mot d'origine anglaise utilisé dans la langue française.</i>	An anglicism is a word of English origin used in the French language.
<i>Un mot utilisé en français mais qui vient de l'anglais.</i>	A word used in French but which comes from English.

¹¹ In French, *anglo-saxon* refers to English-speaking countries.

Part 2: Subject-Selected Anglicisms, English Sentences and Meanings

1	<i>sandwich</i>	<i>basé sur</i>	<i>kicker</i>	<i>business</i>	no answer
	I've eaten a sandwich	This film is based on a true story.	no answer	I've earned a lot of money thanks to my new business	no answer
	même sens qu'en français French def. given: pain + garniture (même sens qu'en anglais)	"based on" en anglais a donné "basé sur" en français ce qui est incorrect	to kick=éjecter	même sens French def. given: commerce, travail, job	no answer
2	<i>rush</i>	<i>stress</i>	<i>channel</i>	<i>to chat</i>	no answer
	I rush this game.	I am stressed before my test.	I entered the channel.	I chat on the internet.	no answer
	<i>Rush</i> is close to <i>hurry</i> , it means to do something quickly.	<i>to stress</i> means to be under pressure	a kind of room where people can chat on the internet	<i>to chat</i> means to talk with other people	no answer
3	<i>Week-end</i>	<i>Football</i>	<i>Flashback</i>	<i>Sandwich</i>	<i>Hit</i>
	Last weekend, my boss forced me to stay at work.	The football game during the superbowl is so long!	I've had a wonderful flashback about my last holidays.	I bought sandwich with chicken and olives. I've never ate something as good as it.	I offently hit my sister.
	par opposition aux workdays	"football américain" (équivalent en anglais: soccer)	retour en arrière	identique au français French def. given: pain coupé en deux garni de nourriture	frapper
4	<i>week end</i>	<i>pinball</i>	<i>sport</i>	<i>coach</i>	<i>bus</i>
	What do you plan to do this week end?	I have done pinball when I was young.	Do you do any sport?	What is the name of your coach?	Did you catch the bus?
	la même chose qu'en français French def. given: fin de semaine	la même chose qu'en français French def. given: jeu de tire	la même chose qu'en français French def. given: exercice physique	la même chose qu'en français French def. given: sorte d'entraîneur	la même chose qu'en français French def. given: moyen de transport collectif
5	<i>chips</i>	<i>WC</i>	<i>leader</i>	<i>basket</i>	<i>cool</i>
	English are found of fish and chips.	You can't use this WC, it's broke.	This man is the leader of the X company.	You can put your dirty clothes in this basket.	My ice cream is so cool.
	frite	toilets	celui qui dirige	panier	froid
6	<i>stop</i>	<i>downloading</i>	<i>podcasting</i>	<i>business</i>	<i>kidnapping</i>

	Stop it right now!	Downloading is wrong, right?	I'm podcasting this show, but was it really good?	His business make him quite difficult to meet.	Kidnapping is experiencing a great improvement.
	Arrête, ne continue pas.	Téléchargement, télécharger	Baladodiffusion, baladodiffuser (cf définition française)	Fait d'être très occupé/même définition qu'en français également	Enlèvement d'enfants
7	<i>reforming</i>	<i>cracking</i>	<i>coaching</i>	<i>fast food</i>	<i>running</i>
	The petroleum must access to the reforming unit.	In order to have fuel, cracking is necessary.	The Bulls have won thanks to an amazing coaching.	If you often eat in a fast food, you will become fat.	Where is John? He is running.
	la même chose qu'en français French def. given: procédé utilisé en pétrochimie servant à aromatiser et isomériser des chaînes carbonées	la même chose qu'en français French def. given: procédé utilisé en pétrochimie servant à casser ou raccourcir des chaînes carbonées	l'action d'entraîner	la restauration rapide type McDo	l'action de courir
8	<i>cool</i>	<i>beefsteak</i>	<i>football</i>	<i>building</i>	<i>GI</i>
	This film is very cool!	Shall I have another beefsteak with my french fries?	American football is not linked to the soccer.	I dream to reach New York with its big buildings.	Even if GI's are strong, there are far away from their house.
	quelque chose de bien	ça doit être de la viande	utilisé pour le football américain je pense	je pense que ce mot désigne un grand immeuble, comme skyscraper en anglais	ce sont les soldats américains
9	<i>to attend</i> ≠attendre	<i>chips</i>	<i>phrase</i> ≠ phrase	<i>sympathise</i> ≠ sympathiser	<i>confident</i> ≠ confident
	I attend to a meeting every day.	Je fais cuire des chips.	I like this phrase in this article.	I sympathise his pain.	I feel confident in myself.
	no answer	no answer	no answer	no answer	no answer
10	<i>chips</i>	<i>basket</i>	<i>football</i>	<i>hamburger</i>	<i>cheerleader</i>
	Yesterday he eat a fish and chips.	The hole of the basket is big.	Danny Manning is a star of football.	You can buy a hamburger in McDonalds.	no answer
	des frites	un panier	sport: football américain	un sandwich	un pompom girl
11	<i>headshot (HS)</i>	<i>hamburger</i>	<i>fast-food</i>	<i>windows</i>	<i>baskets</i>
	Be careful, I will kill you with a headshot.	Which hamburger do you want?	What is your favourite fast-food: Quick or Mcdonald's?	Can you open the windows, please?	Put the paper in the basket
	même sens qu'en	même sens qu'en	fast-food: même	une fenêtre	un panier

	français French def. given: vocabulaire utilisé lors de jeux en réseau pour désigner la mort d'un joueur par un tri en pleine tête	français French def. given: plat typique de certains restaurants	sens qu'en français French def. given: lieu de restauration rapide		
12	<i>football</i>	<i>cool</i>	<i>PC</i>	<i>slide</i>	<i>portable</i>
	Most of the american teenager play football	This guy seems to be cool.	Can you check if the PC is turn off?	Move to the other slide, please.	I see a film on my portable.
	football=football américain	cool=funny	PC=personnal computer	slide:	portable: ordinateur portable
13	<i>weekend</i>	<i>barbecue</i>	<i>PC</i>	<i>hot dog</i>	<i>baskets</i>
	This weekend, I will go to Nantes.	The barbecue can be dangerous.	My PC is in my bedroom.	This hot dog is very hot!	I want to play basket.
	weekend: fin de semaine	barbecue: dispositif de cuisson	PC: ordinateur	Hot dog: sandwich	Basket: jeux de balle
14	<i>barbecue</i>	<i>hamburger</i>	<i>teaser</i>	<i>frag</i>	<i>weekend</i>
	I put the meat on the barbecue.	This hamburger was awesome!	Have you seen this teaser?	I only made 3 frags in the last game.	On last weekend, I visited my sister in St-Maurice- des-Noues.
	Used to cook meat	sandwich with meat, bread, salad, tomatoes, cheese...	very short extract from a movie	one kill in video games	the two last days of a week
15	<i>Puzzle</i>	<i>week-end</i>	<i>football</i>	<i>no answer</i>	<i>no answer</i>
	My dog broke the puzzle that I began yesterday.	It is the week-end, I can awake at 10a.m.	If you like the football, you could go to the stadium one day.		
	La même signification qu'en français? French def. given: jeu où il faut assembler des pièces les unes avec autres pour représenter une image.	La fin de la semaine.	La même signification qu'en français. French def. given: jeu de ballon en équipe	no answer	no answer
16	<i>snowboard</i>	<i>jogging</i>	<i>chewing-gum</i>	<i>marketing</i>	<i>week-end</i>
	Do you have some skis or a snowboard?	I was jogging when I met Alice.	Who wants a chewing-gum?	I am studying International marketing at UT.	I am going to Nice this week-end.

	planche de surf sur la neige	sport où l'on court.	Bonbon qui se mâche.	Moyen ou stratégie pour vendre un produit ou un service.	fin de semaine
17	<i>brainstorming</i>	<i>firewall</i>	<i>chewing-gum</i>	<i>travelling</i>	<i>serial killer</i>
	Je ne sais pas l'utiliser.	You should install a firewall on your laptop.	May I have a chewing gum?	Travelling is my dream	Have you heard of this serial killer?
	Je ne sais pas	pare-feu (pareil qu'en français)	pareil qu'en français French def. given: "pâte à mâches"	Je ne sais pas si c'est utilisé en anglais dans ce sens	Tueur en série
18	<i>week-end</i>	<i>bluetooth</i>	<i>manager</i>	<i>slow</i>	<i>halloween</i>
	I go to Paris this week-end.	My laptop has bluetooth.	The boss employed a manager.	Do you want to dance a slow with me?	At the Halloween party I'll wear a vampire suit.
	Fin de la semaine	système d'échange d'informations	personne qui dirige un groupe	style de musique lent	fête le soir du 31 octobre
19	<i>PC (Personal Computer)</i>	<i>cool</i>	<i>t-shirt</i>	<i>chewing-gum</i>	<i>short</i>
	My new PC is a warmachine!	Hey, that's cool stuff!	I want to buy a new t-shirt.	I have a chewing-gum stuck under my shoe.	This lunch was very short.
	Personal Computer	frais, mais aussi sympa, génial,...	c'est un vêtement	comme en français c'est une pâte à mâcher	court
20	<i>skateboard</i>	<i>lady</i>	<i>mail</i>	<i>CD: compact disc</i>	<i>cowboy</i>
	How much cost this skateboard?	Lady Diana died under Alma's bridge.	I sent you mail yesterday evening.	The last CD of M was very interesting.	Terence Hill play a cowboy in his last film.
	la même chose qu'en français French def. given: planche à roulette	ce mot est placé devant le nom d'une dame	mail: Il signifie la même chose qu'en français et est issu du vocabulaire internet. French def. given: courriel	CD a la même signification qu'en français. French def. given: disque compact	fermier de taureau
21	<i>week end</i>	<i>brainstorming</i>	<i>CD (compact disk)</i>	<i>cool</i>	<i>bus</i>
	What have you done during the week-end?	First, let's make a brainstorming.	Do you have the new Red Hot Chili Peppers' CD?	It's cool for you, this is a good news.	London's bus are red.
	Il a le même sens qu'en français. French def. given: C'est la fin de la semaine, souvent réservée	brainstorming: Il a le même sens qu'en français. French def. given: C'est un résumé des	Il a le même sens qu'en français. French def. given: C'est un disque qui peut être audio ou	Il a le même sens qu'en français. French def. given: C'est quelque chose qui est agréable.	Il a le même sens qu'en français. French def. given: C'est un véhicule de transport en

	au repos des travailleurs	principales idées venant à l'esprit lorsque l'on évoque un sujet.	vidéo.		commun
22	<i>week-end</i>	<i>chewing-gum</i>	<i>barman</i>	<i>backstage</i>	<i>skateboard</i>
	This week-end I'll go to Paris.	Can you give me a chewing-gum please?	The barman is taking a order.	/	I need to buy a new skateboard: I broke it.
	cf précédemment French def. given: la fin de semaine	cf précédemment French def. given: gomme à mâcher	barman: cf précédemment French def. given: un garçon de café	cf précédemment French def. given: arrièresalle ou coulisse	cf précédemment French def. given: une planche sur roulette
23	<i>chips</i>	<i>coca light</i>	<i>show</i>	<i>week end</i>	<i>slow</i>
	I want a fish and chips.	This ball is really light.	Hurry up the TV show is beginning	I'm going to Australia this week-end.	Slow down, it's dangerous here.
	frites	légé ou lumière	spectacle	fin de semaine	doucement
24	<i>tee shirt</i>	<i>week end</i>	<i>hamburger</i>	<i>star</i>	<i>bowling</i>
	I'm wearing a tee shirt.	I'm on weekend.	I'm eating a hamburger.	Madonna is a star.	I like playing bowling.
	no answer	même définition qu'en français French def. given: fin de semaine	même définition qu'en français French def. given: sandwich	personne célèbre ou étoile	même définition qu'en français French def. given: jeu de lancer de boules
25	<i>keptchup</i>	<i>week end</i>	<i>football</i>	<i>short</i>	<i>after</i>
	I am eating my chips with keptchup.	I am going in Corse this week end.	I am playing football tonight.	It's worm, so I am wearing a short.	What are you doing after the party?
	keptchup	week end	soccer	court	après
26	<i>Hamburger</i>	<i>potatoes</i>	<i>chips</i>	<i>foot</i>	<i>Hand-ball</i>
	I have ate 3 Hamburger.	There is not potatoes anymore.	Can you prepare me some chips?	My foot art injured, I've walked too much time.	Zidane is a great foot-ball player.
	sandwich avec viande	pomme de terre	des frites	?	les pieds

Part 2: Subjects' Impressions of the Usefulness of Anglicisms

Answers in French	Translation ¹²
Useful	
Oui ils sont utiles lorsqu'ils ont le même sens en anglais qu'en français. Dans le cas contraire il est difficile de ne pas les utiliser en anglais.	Yes they are useful when they have the same meaning in French as in English. In the opposite case it is difficult not to use them in English.
Oui, mot facile à retenir, permet d'avoir des repères	Yes, words that are easy to remember, allow you to get your bearings.

¹² French answers were translated by the author.

Oui, ils évitent de faire des contresens	Yes, they prevent misunderstandings.
Oui car ils permettent parfois d'avoir des mots en commun et donc de faciliter la compréhension.	Yes because they sometimes allow words in common and thus to facilitate comprehension.
Je pense que les anglicismes ne sont pas très bon pour le vocabulaire français mais ils peuvent être utile dans l'apprentissage de l'anglais car ils ont souvent le même sens.	I think that anglicisms are not very good for French vocabulary but they can be useful in learning English because they often have the same meaning.
Oui puisqu'on en apprend la signification en anglais. Par exemple, on sait que le <i>weekend</i> correspond aux 2 dernier jours de la semaine, en anglais comme en français.	Yes because we learn the meaning in English. For example, we know that the word <i>weekend</i> corresponds to the final two days of the week, in English as in French.
Useful and Problematic	
Parfois cela est utile mais il faut faire attention au nombreuse "faux amis" qu'il y a. C'est à dire que le mot est présent dans les deux langues mais n'a pas la même signification.	Sometimes this is useful but you have to be careful with the numerous "false friends" that exist. That is, the word can be present in two languages but it doesn't have the same meaning.
Les anglicismes sont utiles à mon avis dans certains cas mais on le désavantage d'être utiliser si souvent qu'on en oublie la signification en anglais et même la signification en français!! Par exemple le mot "cool" qui signifie frais en anglais est devenu en français l'expression d'un sentiment agréable.	Anglicisms are useful in my opinion in certain cases, but we have the disadvantage of using them so often that we forget the meaning in English and even the meaning in French! For example the word "cool" which means <i>cool</i> [in temperature] in English has become, in French, the expression of an agreeable sentiment.
Oui, parfois il permette d'apprendre certaines origines d'un mot, mais ils portent aussi souvent à confusion.	Yes, sometimes they allow you to learn the origins of a word, but they also often lead to confusion.
Ça dépend, le sens pouvant être différent entre l'anglais et le français, cela peut porter à confusion	It depends, since the meaning can be different between English and French, this can lead to confusion.
Les anglicismes peuvent aider à la compréhension mais ils nous induisent en erreur.	Anglicisms can help with comprehension but they bring about error.
C'est évident qu'ils sont pratique lorsqu'ils ne sont pas des faux-amis. Ils permettent lorsque vous parlez avec un anglais de vous faire peut-être comprendre en tentant de dire le même mot qu'en français.	It's obvious that they are useful when they are not false friends. They allow you, when you speak with someone English, possibly to make yourself understood by trying to say the same word as in French.
Not Useful or Problematic	
Ni utile, ni gênant. Les anglicismes sont trop peu nombreux pour former un ensemble suffisant de vocabulaire. Ils n'ont parfois pas exactement le même sens dans le deux langues et peuvent dans ce cas provoquer des erreurs, mais c'est rare.	Neither useful, nor bothersome. Anglicisms are too few to create sufficient vocabulary. They sometimes do not have exactly same meaning in the two languages and can, in this case, provoke errors, but this is rare.

Je ne pense pas qu'ils soient utilisés pour apprendre l'anglais, car on les utilise beaucoup en français et du coup on oublie complètement qu'ils viennent de l'anglais	I don't think they are very useful for learning English, because we use them a lot in French and we forget completely that they come from English.
Non car souvent, ça ne veut pas dire la même chose en anglais et en français.	No because often, it doesn't mean the same thing in English and in French.
Non il y en a peu dans la langue française et on oublie leur origine.	No there are very few in French and we forget their origin.
Certains mots ne veulent pas dire la même chose en français qu'en anglais, cela peut donc emmener à faire des erreurs.	Certain words do not mean the same thing in French as in English, this can lead to mistakes.
Non, car le plus souvent, ils nous trompent. Le problème est que l'évolution dans chacune des langues est différente. Un même mot peut vouloir dire l'opposé lorsqu'il est utilisé dans un autre pays.	No, because most often, they lead us astray. The problem is that the evolution in each language is different. The same word can mean the opposite when it is used in another country.
Non. Il y en a peu je pense, ça ne suffit pas pour aider dans l'apprentissage de l'anglais. Je pense qu'il est même dommage d'utiliser des mots anglais plutôt que français pour la langue française.	Non. There are few, I think, it is not enough to help in learning English. I think that it is too bad to use English words instead of French ones in the French language.
Lorsqu'un anglicisme n'a pas la même signification en anglais qu'en français, il semblerait que cela pose plus de problème d'utilisation ou de compréhension de ce type de mots.	If the anglicisms doesn't have the same meaning in English as in French, it would seem that this would pose a problem of usage or of understanding with this type of words.
Non.	No.
Non → l'utilisation de certains anglicismes en français diffère de la définition anglaise, ce qui provoque des confusions en anglais.	Non → the use of certain anglicisms in French differs from the English definition, which can provoke confusion in French.
Pas vraiment. Ça nous permet de connaître quelques mots mais pour tenir une conversation c'est pas pareil. De plus, les anglicismes ne veulent pas dire la même chose en anglais et en français.	Not really. It permits us to know certain words but to keep up a conversation it's not the same. What's more, anglicisms don't mean the same thing in English and in French.
Ils ne sont pas spécialement utiles; au contraire cela peut mener à des contresens.	They are not especially useful; on the contrary, they can lead to misunderstanding.
Unclear Response	
Pas spécialement, étant donné que ce sont des mots que l'on utilise couramment. Par contre, ceux qui ont un sens différent, du français et de l'anglais, peuvent être utilisés.	Not especially, given that these are words that we use commonly. On the other hand, those that have a different meaning, between French and English, can be used.
Oui, c'est utile afin de connaître la signification en anglais afin de ne pas l'employer dans le mauvais contexte lors d'une discussion en anglais	Yes, it's useful in order to know the meaning in English in order to not use the word in the wrong context in a discussion in English.

References

- Ard, J., & Homburg, T. (1983). Verification of language transfer. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Language Transfer in Language Learning* (pp. 157-176). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Bolitho, R. (2003). Materials for language awareness. In B. Tomlinson (Ed.), *Developing Materials for Language Teaching* (pp. 422-425). New York: Continuum.
- Bolitho, R., Carter, R., Hughes, R., Ivanic, C., Masuhara, H., & Tomlinson, B. (2003). Ten questions about language awareness. *ELT Journal*, 57(3), 251-259.
- Carter, R. (2003). Key concepts in ELT: Language awareness. *ELT Journal*, 57(1), 64-65.
- Cenoz, J., Hufeisen, B., & Jessner, U. (Eds.). (2001). *Cross-linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic Perspectives*. Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Ellis, R. (1994). A theory of instructed second language acquisition. In N. Ellis (Ed.), *Implicit and Explicit Learning of Languages* (pp. 79-114). London: Academic Press.
- Gass, S., & Selinker, L. (1983). *Language Transfer in Language Learning*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- George, K. E. M. (1976). Anglicisms in contemporary French I: Sociolinguistic aspects. *Modern Languages*, 57(1), 6-11.
- Golonka, E. (2006). Predictors revised: Linguistic knowledge and metalinguistic awareness in second language gain in Russian. *The Modern Language Journal*, 90(4), 496-505.
- Gottlieb, H. (2005). Anglicisms and translation. In G. Anderman & M. Rogers (Eds.), *In and Out of English: For Better, For Worse?* (pp. 161-184). Buffalo, NY: Multilingual Matters.
- Grigg, P. (1997). Toubon or not Toubon: The influence of the English language in contemporary France. *English Studies*, 4, 368-384.
- Guilford, J. (2002). Le "Loan English": Langue de ressources dans l'enseignement de l'anglais. *CILL*, 28(1-2), 85-103.

- Haastrup, K., & Henriksen, B. (2000). Vocabulary acquisition: Acquiring depth of knowledge through network building. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics*, 10(2), 221-240.
- Hall, C. J. (2002). The automatic cognate form assumption: Evidence for the parasitic model of vocabulary development. *International Review of Applied Linguistics*, 40(2), 69-87.
- Hall, C. J., Newbrand, D., Ecke, P., Sperr, U., Marchand, V., & Hayes, L. (2009). Learners' implicit assumptions about syntactic frames in new L3 words: The role of cognates, typological proximity, and L2 status. *Language Learning*, 59(1), 153-202.
- Henriksen, B. (1999). Three dimensions of vocabulary development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 21(2), 303-317.
- Herwig, A. (2001). Plurilingual lexical organisation: Evidence from lexical processing in L1-L2-L3-L4 translation. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 115-137). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Horwitz, E. (1988). The beliefs about language of beginning university foreign language students. *The Modern Language Journal*, 72(3), 283-294.
- Hulstijn, J. H. (2005). Theoretical and empirical issues in the study of implicit and explicit second-language learning. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition*, 27, 129-140.
- Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2008). *Crosslinguistic Influence in Language and Cognition*. New York: Routledge.
- Kellerman, E. (1983). Now you see it, now you don't. In S. Gass & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Language Transfer in Language Learning* (pp. 112-133). Rowley, MA: Newbury House.
- Kobayashi, T. (1992). Native and nonnative reactions to ESL compositions. *TESOL Quarterly*, 26(1), 81-112.
- Krashen, S. (1981). *Second Language Acquisition and Second Language Learning*. New York: Pergamon Press.
- Laufer, B. (1989). A factor of difficulty in vocabulary learning: deceptive transparency. *AILA Review*, 6, 10-20.

- Laufer, B., & Yano, Y. (2001). Understanding unfamiliar words in a text: Do L2 learners understand how much they don't understand? *Reading in a Foreign Language* 13, 549-566.
- Laufer-Dvorkin, B. (1991). *Similar Lexical Forms in Interlanguage*. Gunter Narr: Tübingen.
- Lemhofer, K., Dijkstra, T., & Michel, M. C. (2004). Three languages, one ECHO: Cognate effects in trilingual word recognition. *Language and Cognitive Processes*, 19(5), 585-611.
- Levitt, J. (1980). Semantic influences of English on Romance vocabulary. *Geolinguistics*, 6, 63-71.
- Lewis, M. (1993). *The Lexical Approach*. Hove: LTP.
- Limper, L. (1932). Student knowledge of some French-English cognates. *French Review*, 6, 37-49.
- Long, M. (1991). Focus on form: A design feature in language teaching methodology. In K. de Bot, R. Ginsberg, & C. Kramsch (Eds.), *Foreign Language Research in Cross-Cultural Perspective* (pp. 413-468). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Malabonga, V., Kenyon, D., Carlo, M., August, D., & Lougit, M. (2008). Development of a cognate awareness measure for Spanish-speaking language learners. *Language Testing*, 25(4), 495-519.
- Nation, I. S. P. (2001). *Learning Vocabulary in Another Language*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Odlin, T. (1989). *Language Transfer: Cross-linguistic Influence in Language Learning*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Paris, S. G., & Winograd, P. (1990). How metacognition can promote academic learning and instruction. In B. F. Jones & L. Idol (Eds.), *Dimensions of Thinking and Cognitive Instruction* (pp. 15-51). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Picone, M. (1996). *Anglicisms, Neologisms, and Dynamic French* (Vol. 18). Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Pratt, C. (1986). Anglicisms in contemporary European Spanish. In W. Viereck & W. Bald (Eds.), *English in Contact with Other Languages* (pp. 345-368). Budapest: Akademiai Kiado.

- Qian, D. (1999). Assessing the roles of depth and breath of vocabulary knowledge in reading comprehension. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 56(2), 282-307.
- Qian, D. (2002). Investigating the relationship between vocabulary knowledge and academic reading performance: An assessment perspective. *Language Learning*, 52(3), 513-536.
- Read, J. (2004). Plumbing the depths: How should the construct of vocabulary knowledge be defined? In P. Bogaards & B. Laufer (Eds.), *Vocabulary in a Second Language: Selection, Acquisition, and Testing*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Ringbom, H. (1978). What differences are there between Finns and Swedish-speaking Finns learning English? *Papers and Studies in Contrastive Linguistics*, 8, 133-145.
- Ringbom, H. (1978b). The influence of the mother tongue on the translation of lexical items. *Interlanguage Studies Bulletin*, 3, 80-101.
- Ringbom, H. (1983). Borrowing and lexical transfer. *Applied Linguistics*, 4, 207-212.
- Ringbom, H. (1987). *The Role of the First Language in Foreign Language Learning*. Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.
- Ringbom, H. (2001). Lexical transfer in L2 production. In J. Cenoz, B. Hufeisen, & U. Jessner (Eds.), *Cross-linguistic Influence in Third Language Acquisition: Psycholinguistic Perspectives* (pp. 59-68). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.
- Schachter, J. (1974). An error in error analysis. *Language Learning*, 24(2), 205-214.
- Simard, D., French, L., & Fortier, V. (2007). Elicited metalinguistic reflection and second language learning: Is there a link? *System*, 35(4), 509-522.
- Simard, D., & Wong, W. (2004). Language awareness and its multiple possibilities for the L2 classroom. *Foreign Language Annals*, 37(1), 96-110.
- Tenjoh-Okwen, T. (1978). Faux amis - A problematic area for Francophone learners of English. *TESL Talk*, 8(4), 39-46.
- Thogmartin, C. (1984). Some "English" words in French. *The French Review*, 57(4), 447-455.

- Van Hell, J., & Dijkstra, T. (2002). Foreign language knowledge can influence native language performance in exclusively native contexts. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 9, 780-789.
- Vermeer, A. (2001). Breadth and depth of vocabulary in relation to L1/L2 acquisition and frequency of input. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 22(2), 217-234.
- Vildomec, V. (1963). *Multilingualism*. Leyden: Sythoff.
- Waring, R. (2002). Scales of vocabulary knowledge in second language vocabulary assessment. Retrieved August 4, 2009, from <http://www1.harenet.ne.jp/~waring/papers/scales.htm>
- Wenden, A. L. (1998). Metacognitive knowledge and language learning. *Applied Linguistics*, 19(4), 515-537.
- Wesche, M. B., & Paribakht, T. S. (1996). Assessing second language vocabulary knowledge: Depth versus breadth. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, 53(1), 13-40.

VITA

Eileen Susan Fitzpatrick was born in State College, Pennsylvania, and is the daughter of Susan Colette Daubner and Paul F. Fitzpatrick. She graduated from A&M Consolidated High School in College Station, Texas, in 2002, and graduated cum laude with a Bachelor of Arts in English from Macalester College in 2006. She taught English in northeastern France for two years before entering the Graduate School at The University of Texas at Austin to earn her Master of Arts in Foreign Language Education. At The University of Texas at Austin, she collaborated on research that was presented at poster sessions at the Texas Foreign Language Education Conference and the American Association of Applied Linguistics Conference.

Permanent address: 134 Schreiner Place, San Antonio, TX 78212

This report was typed by the author.