HERMES

Journal of Language and Communication in Business

No. 65 – 2025

Published by the School of Communication and Culture, Aarhus University

ISSN: 1903-1785

HERMES
Journal of Language and Communication in Business

*Pavla Zubková / **Jan Lazar

Linguistic Preservation in the Digital Age: Anglicisms in French and Quebec IT Terminology – A Survey of IT Students

Abstract

This study explores the prevalence and integration of Anglicisms in French and Quebec IT terminology, analysing the tension between global linguistic influences and local preservation efforts. Through a two-phase survey involving 68 French-speaking computer science students, the research assesses participants' familiarity with official French IT terms recommended by *FranceTerme* and their preferences compared to English alternatives. Key terms, including *courriel* (*email*), *hameçonnage* (*phishing*), and *vignette active* (*widget*), are examined alongside their Quebec-coined counterparts to highlight regional linguistic variations. The findings reveal significant challenges in the adoption of French equivalents, largely stemming from the comparative appeal and communicative efficiency of English terms. However, successful integration of terms like *télécharger* (*download*) and *pare-feu* (*firewall*) underscores the importance of conceptual clarity and cultural resonance. This study provides valuable insights into the effectiveness of linguistic policies in maintaining linguistic identity within a rapidly evolving field. It calls for collaborative approaches to terminology standardisation across Francophone regions to balance linguistic preservation and practical communication, ensuring that official policies are evaluated not only in terms of linguistic outcomes but also their practical relevance in rapidly evolving fields.

Key words:

Study Anglicisms, French Language Policy, Information Technology Terminology, Terminological Planning, Survey-Based Research

1. Introduction

In the digital age, the influence of English extends far beyond its native borders, permeating the lexicons of languages across the globe. This linguistic influence is especially evident in the field of Information Technology (IT), where English terms frequently dominate the technical vocabulary used in both professional and everyday contexts. The widespread adoption of Anglicisms—loanwords from English—raises important questions about the balance between communicative efficiency and the preservation of linguistic diversity. For languages such as French, this phenomenon presents both challenges and opportunities: the need to maintain linguistic integrity while adapting to the evolving demands of global technological discourse. By examining the integration of English IT terminology into French, this article explores broader implications of English as a global *lingua franca* and sets the stage for a more detailed analysis of how globalisation interacts with national language policy and user preferences. This tension between the global spread of English and linguistic preservation is especially visible in the reception of Anglicisms, whose status in French varies according to ideological, institutional, and pragmatic factors.

* *Pavla Zuboková*
University of Ostrava /
VŠB-TU Ostrava
pavla75@gmail.com

** *Jan Lazar*
University of Ostrava /
University of Opole
jan.lazar@osu.cz

Crystal (2012), in *English as a Global Language*, describes how English has infiltrated various linguistic spheres through its dominance in business, technology, science, and media. He explains that English now functions as the primary medium of international communication in many domains, significantly shaping vocabulary and communication practices. This pervasive influence often results in the coexistence—or outright replacement—of native terms by English ones. According to Crystal, this phenomenon is the result of a convergence of historical, cultural, and economic factors that have elevated English to its current global status.

The concept of *Anglicism* (in French: *anglicisme*) is far from neutral. As numerous scholars have noted, the term has long been subject to ideological framing shaped by sociolinguistic, political, and historical contexts (Lamontagne, 1996; Bouchard, 2002). From its re-emergence in France in the 18th century—already associated with a *norme sociale de non-acceptabilité* (*social norm of non-acceptability*)—to the prescriptive discourses of 19th-century Quebec, the *anglicisme* has often symbolised a perceived threat to linguistic identity. In Quebec in particular, it has come to represent the linguistic face of Anglo-Saxon cultural domination, at times labelled a *calamité lexicophage* (*lexicophagous calamity*) or even a *danger mortel* (*mortal danger*) for the French language (Maillet, 2016).

To grasp the scope of this phenomenon, it is helpful to define what constitutes an Anglicism. An Anglicism is generally understood as any lexical element originating from or conveyed by the English language, regardless of its level of integration or historical depth in French. Contemporary dictionaries offer concise definitions: *Le Petit Robert* defines an *anglicisme* simply as 'a borrowing from English' (Le Robert, n.d.), while the *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française* specifies that the word, attested since the 18th century, designates 'a form borrowed from English, especially one perceived as contrary to French usage' (Rey, 2010). *Larousse* distinguishes three meanings: (1) an idiom specific to English (e.g. *How do you do?*); (2) a lexical or syntactic borrowing; and (3) a syntactic calque that mimics English structures in French (Larousse, n.d.).

These definitions are instructive not only for what they include, but also for how they frame Anglicisms—whether as neutral borrowings or as linguistic intrusions—thereby revealing the underlying ideological positions of the institutions that produce them. This interpretive ambiguity becomes even more apparent when contrasted with theoretical approaches, such as those of Pergnier or Rey-Debove and Gagnon, who emphasise the sociolinguistic context in which such terms are introduced, evaluated, and potentially naturalised.

From a more nuanced theoretical angle, Pergnier (1989, p. 19) defines an Anglicism as 'an English word or phrase that occasionally appears in a French utterance,' underlining its marked foreignness even within a French-speaking context. Rey-Debove and Gagnon (1990, p. 7) observe that such terms are often introduced with italics, quotation marks, or editorial commentary before becoming fully naturalised through repeated use—*weekend*, *business*, and *email* being typical examples.

According to Lamontagne (1996, p. 22), the term was first recorded in 1652 in Du Gard's translation of Milton's *Eikonoklastes*, later defined in Guy Miège's *Great French Dictionary* (1687) as 'an expression proper to the English.' It was then institutionalised lexicographically by the *Dictionnaire universel français et latin* (Trévoux, 1704) and included in the *Dictionnaire de l'Académie française* (1798), which refined the definition in its 1835 edition as *une façon de parler particulière à la langue anglaise* ('a way of speaking particular to the English language').

Scholars such as Théoret (1994) and Labelle (2017) underline a persistent duality in the treatment of Anglicisms: on the one hand, as neutral linguistic borrowings—a natural feature of language evolution—and on the other, as marked or problematic usages when French equivalents exist. This dichotomy is reinforced by dictionaries and institutions, notably *Le Petit Robert*, which reserves the

label *anglicisme* for unnecessary or stylistically inferior terms, distinguishing them from *mots anglais* (English words) considered fully integrated. As a result, Anglicisms are not merely lexical items but cultural symbols—often interpreted through metaphors of war, illness, or moral decline (Bouchard, 2002).

As Candel and Humbley (2017) argue, the classification and evaluation of Anglicisms frequently reflect ideological positions more than objective linguistic criteria. This study acknowledges that complexity by distinguishing between unmarked English-derived terms and those subject to official substitution efforts, particularly within the framework of institutional language planning in France and Quebec.

In the field of Information Technology (IT), the dominance of English becomes particularly evident. García and García-Sánchez (2020) demonstrate the substantial incorporation of English-derived terms into the professional lexicon of five European languages—French, German, Italian, Portuguese, and Spanish. They observe that 'English has gained a dominant position, as many of the terms used daily are in English. Different studies carried out in multiple countries have provided evidence of this fact' (García & García-Sánchez, 2020, p. 142).

French linguist Lazarev (2017) further explores the historical and linguistic mechanisms behind this trend in the French context. He contends that the number of English loanwords is bound to increase, given the crucial role that this vocabulary plays in modern communication (p. 187).

Expanding on these findings, Kim (2017) conducted a comprehensive doctoral study evaluating terminological planning in France, Quebec, Belgium, and Switzerland. Her research highlights the ongoing tension between official promotion of French terminology and actual usage patterns in professional and digital contexts. Although France and Quebec are often presented as models of governmental language intervention, Kim's results show that institutional efforts frequently fall short—especially in the IT sector. She attributes this to a disconnect between top-down planning and the spontaneous evolution of language within user communities. Her study underlines the limited impact of databases like *FranceTerme* when proposed terms fail to align with speakers' communicative habits.

More recently, Léopold (2017) conducted a diachronic analysis of lexical innovations in *Le Petit Larousse Illustré* and *Le Petit Robert*, comparing data from the early twentieth century to the past twenty-five years. Her results reveal a consistent increase in the share of Anglicisms, currently averaging between 20% and 25% of new entries per year. While this trend reflects shifting usage patterns rather than a weakening of linguistic integrity, her categorised inventory confirms that the most affected domains are information technology, marketing, sport, and popular culture.

This lexical concentration in the IT field forms the backdrop for the present survey, which aims to assess whether native French-speaking students—already familiar with common English IT terms—can identify or reproduce the official French equivalents. In other words, it examines whether comprehension of English terminology correlates with lexical competence in French, particularly regarding terms endorsed by institutions such as *FranceTerme* or the OQLF. This line of inquiry is essential for evaluating the practical efficacy of language policy in a domain where English is overwhelmingly dominant. We hypothesise that, despite a degree of familiarity with official equivalents, IT students will continue to prefer Anglicisms due to their conciseness, global recognisability, and widespread use in professional and educational contexts. The aim is thus to measure the practical reach of French language planning in the IT sector and to identify the sociolinguistic factors that contribute to the persistence of English-derived terminology.

2. Linguistic and Functional Motivations Behind the Use of English Terms in IT

Among the main drivers of Anglicisms in French is the efficiency of English terms, which often provide more concise alternatives to their longer French equivalents. For example, the English term *hotspot* is significantly more succinct than *zone d'accès sans fil*, just as *chatbot* is shorter and more widely used than *agent conversationnel*. Similarly, terms like *weekend* (*fin de semaine*), *email* (*courrier électronique*), and *baby-sitter* (*gardienne d'enfants*) are favoured over their French counterparts due to their brevity and familiarity. The near-universal adoption of *selfie* in popular culture, replacing *autoportrait*, exemplifies this trend. These examples highlight how the linguistic economy of English often outweighs the formal recommendations of French language bodies, emphasising the practical appeal of shorter and globally recognised terms.

Kim (2017, pp. 293–298) supports this observation through quantitative data on the **brevity** factor, showing a clear correlation between short forms and usage preference. In France, terms ranked as shortest in number of letters and syllables systematically received the highest coefficient of implantation (CI).[1] By contrast, in Quebec, while this trend also exists, the difference is less pronounced—short terms remain influential, but medium-length terms also show relatively high adoption rates. The evidence points to brevity as a key driver of uptake, especially in settings that privilege efficiency and cross-lingual familiarity over prescriptive norms.

Another, and in some cases more decisive, barrier to the adoption of French equivalents is their potential lack of **specificity** compared to the precision of English terms. For example, *arrosage* has been proposed as a French equivalent for *spam* (*unsolicited digital communication, typically email*). However, whereas *spam* is monosemic and immediately associated with unwanted messages, *arrosage* suffers from polysemy, traditionally referring to watering or irrigation, and is used in various specialised domains. This broader semantic scope makes the term less intuitive and potentially ambiguous in a digital context. In contrast, Canadian French has introduced *pourriel*—a portmanteau of *courriel* (*email*) and *poubelle* (*trash*)—which more precisely and effectively conveys the idea of *spam* as unwanted and discarded messages, enhancing both its clarity and precision. These cases illustrate that, in certain contexts, resorting to an Anglicism may prove more practical and effective for specialists, even when it runs counter to the recommendations of language planning authorities.

A similar case is cited by Dury (2012, p. 6), who discusses the official recognition of the medical term *lissage* in the context of cosmetic surgery. This French equivalent was never adopted by specialists, who found it insufficiently technical and instead replaced it with the English term *lifting*. Here again, the preference for the Anglicism stems from its clarity and precision. Similarly, Kim (2017, pp. 290–291) observes that, in both France and Québec, IT terms that are monosemic within their specialised context tend to achieve better adoption than those whose meanings are more diffuse.

Before terminological choices reach widespread acceptance, their success often hinges on how **transparent** or **motivated** they appear to users. A term is considered motivated when its morphological components clearly relate to the concept it denotes, thereby aiding comprehension and memorability. As Dubuc (2002, p. 36) notes, a term is regarded as motivated when the semes it contains evoke the notion it designates. However, this ideal of semantic transparency does not always align with actual usage preferences. In the field of IT, where speed, efficiency, and international communication are key, users often gravitate toward terms that are familiar, compact, or already integrated

[1] The *coefficient of implantation* (*CI*) is a metric used by the *Office québécois de la langue française* to measure the degree to which an official French term has been adopted in actual usage, expressed as a percentage based on frequency data from various corpora.

into digital discourse—regardless of whether they are semantically intuitive. Because motivation is closely linked to semantic transparency, it is a key criterion in effective terminology. As Sager (2000, p. 55) observes, terminological choices are guided by the desire to designate objects of knowledge as precisely and economically as possible.

Calques, understood as literal translations modelled on foreign syntagmatic structures, are frequently used to preserve a degree of semantic transparency while aligning with native morphological norms. Many contemporary terms are formed in this way, particularly from English and especially in scientific and technical domains. Chansou (1984, p. 282) defines a *calque* as an exact reproduction of a foreign model, a translation readily assimilated into the receiving language that facilitates international communication. Di Spaldro et al. (2010, p. 164) discuss the technoscientific *calque*, a literal morphological *calque* patterned on nominal syntagms, as in *nuage*/*cloud*. In practice, widely accepted examples include *pare-feu*/*firewall*, *logiciel espion*/*spyware*, *logiciel malveillant*/*malware*, *réseau social*/*social network*, *intelligence artificielle*/*artificial intelligence*, *apprentissage automatique*/*machine learning*, and *centre de données*/*data centre*.

By contrast, *mémoire tampon*/*buffer* is attested in technical usage but its transparency is limited, since *tampon* is polysemous, and many practitioners retain *buffer* in code, UI labels, or documentation, particularly in internationalised workflows. Likewise, while *informatique en nuage*/*cloud computing* is serviceable, it reads as less idiomatic than *cloud computing* and, in decontextualised mentions, can evoke the everyday idiom *être dans les nuages*/*to have one's head in the clouds*, which may introduce unintended associations.

Kim (2017, pp. 288–289) conducted a comparative analysis to assess how semantic transparency—the degree to which a term is morphologically motivated and self-explanatory[2]—affects its likelihood of adoption. She classified terms as totally motivated, partially motivated, or unmotivated, noting that in France, less transparent terms were more widely adopted. In specialised communication, she notes that transparent, clearly motivated terms offer an undeniable advantage, as they allow users to grasp the concept more readily. This clarity can facilitate integration into professional usage, particularly when combined with institutional promotion and consistent exposure.

A further dimension of effective terminology is **systemicity**, a concept described by Kocourek (2001, p. 322), which refers to the extent to which a term fits coherently within a structured network of related concepts. It reflects a term's position within the broader conceptual system of a specialised field. Rondeau (1984, p. 19) observes that the *meaning* (*signifié*) of a term is defined in relation to a network of other meanings within the same specialised domain. Rather than existing in isolation, a well-formed term reflects its integration into a broader conceptual system. As such, terminological creation should not be arbitrary: it must follow a rational and organised approach, respecting the internal logic of the field.

Because terms draw meaning from their place in a conceptual network, systemicity bears directly on the acceptance of French IT designations. In computer networking, for instance, the concept of *client* (a machine that requests services) only makes full sense within a system that also includes *server* (which provides services) and *peer* (an equal entity in a peer-to-peer network). These terms define one another relationally, illustrating how systemicity enhances precision and facilitates

[2] While *motivation* and *transparency* are not strictly synonymous, they are closely related in terminology studies. According to Quirion (2004, p. 195), as cited by Kim (2017, p. 221), transparency can be considered "the ease with which the motivation of a term is perceived." This perspective allows motivation to serve as a practical measure of transparency in terminological evaluation.

comprehension. Preserving such networks of meaning tends to make terminology not only more intuitive for specialists but also more readily adopted and standardised. This is precisely the kind of network effect anticipated when lexical organisation mirrors conceptual structure (Faber & L'Homme 2014, p. 144).

However, in some cases, French equivalents may struggle to replicate this systemic clarity, either due to fragmentation (multiple competing terms) or a lack of established oppositions. This may further explain the appeal of certain English terms, whose meaning is reinforced through consistent relational use across contexts. Thus, systemicity reinforces many of the functional motivations explored in this chapter—clarity, coherence, economy, and familiarity—by anchoring terms within a conceptually structured domain.

Another factor that complicates the adoption of official French IT terminology is the phenomenon of **terminological concurrence**—the coexistence of multiple French equivalents for a single English term. As Kim (2017, pp. 265–274) points out, this lexical plurality can hinder standardisation and reduce the effectiveness of institutional recommendations. In her comparative analysis, Kim demonstrates that most concepts in France are associated with two or three competing terms, while in Québec, some concepts may have as many as five alternatives.

Our analysis confirms this disparity. We observed that *FranceTerme* typically recommends only one, or at most two, French equivalents for any given English IT term. In contrast, Québec's *Grand dictionnaire terminologique* (GDT) often proposes two to seven alternatives. For example, the English term *chatbot* corresponds in *FranceTerme* primarily to *dialogueur* (n.m.), with *agent de dialogue* listed as a synonym (*Journal officiel de la République française*, 2018). Meanwhile, the GDT suggests multiple preferred terms, including *agent conversationnel*, *agent de dialogue*, and *dialogueur*, and notes *robot conversationnel* as a context-specific variant. Although such lexical richness reflects the dynamism of terminological evolution, it may reduce clarity and complicate efforts at unifying institutional terminology.

In contrast, there are numerous IT terms frequently employed in Francophone contexts without officially recommended translations in the *FranceTerme* database, including *agentic* (*autonomous AI systems*), *augmented reality*, *bitmap* (*pixel-based image format*), *binary code*, *crash* (*software/hardware failure*), *datasheet* (*technical specification document*), *logic gate* (*digital circuit component*), *kernel* (*core of an operating system*), *machine code*, *metaverse* (*virtual interconnected worlds*), *overclocking* (*enhancing hardware performance*), *power supply*, *quantum computing*, *sandbox* (*secure testing environment*), *virtual memory*, *zero trust* (*security verification model*), and the verb *to scroll* (*to move digital content*). Although several of these terms do appear in Québec's *Grand dictionnaire terminologique (*GDT*)*, their absence from *FranceTerme* illustrates notable institutional differences: the GDT tends toward inclusivity and adaptability, often embracing multiple lexical alternatives, whereas *FranceTerme* prioritises succinctness, clarity, and uniformity.

This raises the broader question of necessity, one of the three criteria established by the *Commission d'enrichissement de la langue française* (French Commission for the Enrichment of the French Language, CELF) for introducing a new term. According to the *Délégation générale à la langue française et aux langues de France* (General Delegation for the French Language and the Languages of France, DGLFLF, 2018), the creation of a neologism should meet three conditions: (a) necessity – is a new term indispensable for designating the concept? (b) transparency – is it immediately associated with the reality or notion it denotes? and (c) good formation – does it respect the morphological and syntactic system of French? In the case of many English terms absent from *FranceTerme*, their high degree of international standardisation, technical specificity, and lack of confusion in professional contexts may lead decision-makers to conclude that creating a French equivalent is neither

urgent nor beneficial. In such cases, institutional restraint may be deliberate, reflecting a pragmatic balance between language preservation and functional communication needs in a globalised IT environment.

From the coexistence of multiple French equivalents for certain English IT terms to the complete absence of viable translations for others, the situation reflects the ongoing challenges of linguistic standardisation in a field characterised by rapid innovation and international communication. Despite sustained institutional efforts, English-derived terminology remains firmly embedded in both professional and everyday usage. To better understand the historical, economic, academic, and cultural dynamics that have fostered this persistent dominance, the next section provides a synthesis of the key factors that have established English as the lingua franca of Information Technology.

3. The Dominance of English in Information Technology: Historical, Economic, and Cultural Factors Driving the Adoption of Anglicisms in French and Other European Languages

The predominance of English in the field of Information Technology (IT) is the result of multiple converging factors—historical, economic, academic, and sociotechnical. This chapter outlines the key forces that have contributed to the establishment of English as the dominant language in IT. These include the early development of computing in English-speaking countries, the global influence of American technology companies, the central role of English in academic research and publishing, the dynamics of international business, the prevalence of English in the open-source community, and the use of English as the working language in technical standardisation protocols.

Factor 1: Historical Foundations The development of modern computing and information technology has deep roots in English-speaking countries, particularly the United States and the United Kingdom. Early pioneers and innovators in the field, such as those involved in the creation of the first computers and programming languages, predominantly spoke and wrote in English. Additionally, the Internet, a cornerstone of modern IT, was invented in the United States in the 1950s,[3] further solidifying English as the primary language of the digital world. Finally, the 1990s saw the widespread adoption of the World Wide Web, which revolutionised the way information was shared and accessed over the Internet.

Factor 2: Influence of American Big Technology Companies Major technology companies that have shaped the IT landscape, such as *IBM, Microsoft, Apple, Google,* and *Facebook*, are based in the United States. These companies set standards and produce documentation, software, and tools primarily in English, establishing it as the de facto language of the industry.

The term *Big Tech* appeared around 2013. The companies, including *Google*, *Amazon*, *Facebook*, and *Apple*, have grown to be major players in international business, society, and media. In addition to Internet search and digital advertising, Google has been spreading into mobile technologies, cloud computing, and artificial intelligence (AI). Google's impact is felt everywhere in the digital ecosystem since its Android operating system drives more than 70% of the mobile phones worldwide.[4] The "Mecca" of the whole ICT system is *Silicon Valley* in California, USA. Silicon Valley is renowned

[3] https://www.scienceandmediamuseum.org.uk/objects-and-stories/short-history-internet (10-8-2024)

[4] https://www.forbes.com/sites/jimosman/2024/06/30/big-techs-overpowering-influence-risks-to-markets-and-your-money/ (10-8-2024)

globally as the epicentre of technology and innovation, hosting many of the world's largest and most influential technology companies, startups, and research institutions.[5]

Factor 3: Academic and Research Dominance English serves as the primary language of instruction, scholarly publication, and international conferences within the global academic community. As Seidlhofer (2004, p. 211) notes, a lingua franca functions as a shared medium of communication between speakers of different native languages, and in contemporary academia this role is overwhelmingly fulfilled by English. This linguistic prevalence is not confined to informal settings but extends deeply into the formal arenas of academia and research. Many leading research institutions, universities, and academic publications, particularly in the field of IT, are based in English-speaking countries. This trend extends across a broad spectrum of academic disciplines. For instance, according to the QS World University Rankings, several of the world's top universities are located in the United States, such as the *Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT)*, *Stanford University*, *Harvard University*, *California Institute of Technology (Caltech)*, and *University of California, Berkeley*. Additionally, England and Canada contribute prominently to the academic landscape with institutions like the *University of Oxford*, *University of Cambridge*, *University of Toronto*, and *University of British Columbia*. These universities are renowned for their comprehensive research output and academic excellence, contributing significantly to the volume of publications in English. This pervasive use of English fundamentally influences the linguistic medium of scholarly communication, thereby perpetuating its dominance in academic literature globally. Such a concentration of top-tier educational and research institutions in English-speaking regions logically leads to the publication of texts predominantly in English, affecting not only IT but also other fields of study.

Moreover, the digital age has facilitated unprecedented levels of direct exposure to English through software, programming languages, manuals, and educational resources predominantly available in English. This exposure reinforces the use of English terms among French-speaking IT professionals and enthusiasts, making Anglicisms not only a matter of convenience but also of necessity in some contexts. The digital proliferation of English ensures that it continues to influence new generations of tech-savvy professionals globally, embedding Anglicisms more deeply into the fabric of international professional discourse.

Factor 4: Open Source and Community Contributions The open-source movement, which has been instrumental in IT development, primarily uses English for code documentation, community discussions, and project contributions. This is evident in how platforms like *GitHub*, *Stack Overflow*, and various developer forums operate largely in English, reinforcing its role as the common language.[6] The ubiquity of English in these collaborative environments not only facilitates global participation but also standardises the way knowledge and innovations are shared across borders. By using English, contributors from diverse linguistic backgrounds can engage more seamlessly, ensuring wider accessibility and influence of shared technologies.

Factor 5: Standardisation and Protocols Many technical standards, protocols, and specifications are developed and published by organisations such as the *Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF)*, *World Wide Web Consortium (W3C)*, and *International Organization for Standardization (ISO)*, which often use English as the working language. The use of English in these foundational documents ensures consistency and interoperability across different technologies and systems worldwide. This

[5] https://www.investopedia.com/terms/s/siliconvalley.asp (10-8-2024)
[6] https://www.hartford.edu/faculty-staff/faculty/fcld/_files/open%20source.pdf (10-8-2024)

reliance on a single language for technical standards not only simplifies global adoption but also reinforces English's role as the dominant language in IT and related fields.

Despite the global predominance of English in IT, the French language continues to benefit from structured institutional support aimed at preserving its integrity. In France—the historical cradle of the French language—Anglicisms are not simply accepted as part of linguistic evolution but are often treated as a challenge to cultural identity and national cohesion. This resistance raises a crucial question: to what extent can language planning mitigate the spontaneous adoption of English terms in such a dynamic domain? The following chapter explores how French institutions have responded to this challenge through coordinated terminology planning and policy initiatives.

4. Preserving French: Institutional Efforts Against Anglicisation

Despite the global dominance of English—particularly in IT, where it operates as the default medium of international communication—France stands out as a rare example of structured resistance to linguistic assimilation. Unlike many other languages that have largely accepted English borrowings without official opposition, French continues to mount a deliberate and coordinated response. Through active language policy and terminological planning, institutions such as *FranceTerme* and the *Office québécois de la langue française* (OQLF) promote French equivalents for English IT terms. These efforts reflect an enduring commitment to linguistic sovereignty and cultural identity in the face of pervasive Anglicisation. This chapter focuses primarily on France, which, as Del Pino Romero (2013) notes, along with Quebec, remains among the few regions actively working to counter this trend.

Historically, French has been guarded by institutions like the *Académie Française*, established in 1635 under the cardinal Richelieu's aegis. The Académie's mission has been to standardise and purify the French language. In contemporary times, this mission faces significant challenges, especially in the technological realm. Terms like *software*, *email*, and *hacker* have become commonplace in everyday French vocabulary, sometimes displacing or existing alongside native equivalents like *email/courriel*, *hacker/pirate informatique*, or *cloud computing/ informatique en nuage*.

> « En vue de favoriser l'enrichissement de la langue française, de développer son utilisation, notamment dans la vie économique, les travaux scientifiques et les activités techniques et juridiques, d'améliorer sa diffusion en proposant des termes et expressions nouveaux pouvant servir de référence, de contribuer au rayonnement de la francophonie et de promouvoir le plurilinguisme, il est créé une commission d'enrichissement de la langue française ».[7]
>
> (In order to promote the enrichment of the French language, develop its use, particularly in economic life, scientific work, and technical and legal activities, to improve its dissemination by proposing new terms and expressions that can serve as references, contribute to the influence of the Francophonie, and promote multilingualism, a commission for the enrichment of the French language has been established.)

Through *Decree No. 72-19 of 1972*, commissions were tasked with 'proposing necessary terms either to designate a new reality or to replace undesirable loan-words from foreign languages'.[8]

---

[7] https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/loda/id/JORFTEXT000000378502 (6-8-2024)

[8] Les grandes lignes du dispositif d'enrichissement de la langue française in « Références 2018 : l'enrichisse- ment de la langue Française » p. 3, available online on: https://www.culture.gouv.fr/Thematiques/langue-francaise-et-langues-de-france/Actualites/References-2018-l-enrichissement-de-la-langue-francaise (6-8-2024)

Since 1996, the *Commission d'enrichissement de la langue française* (CELF) has worked with specialists from nineteen sectors, including telecommunications and information technology, to develop and advocate for precise French alternatives to foreign terms, thereby limiting their usage. Notably, Anglicisms constitute the largest share of all new terms targeted by these institutional initiatives:

> « La Commission d'enrichissement peut être amenée à publier des recommandations à caractère large, concernant des notions peu spécialisées et pouvant relever de plusieurs domaines, dont l'usage se répand, **presque toujours en anglais**, alors qu'il existe déjà des équivalents français, souvent très courants ».[9]
>
> (The Commission for the Enrichment of the French Language may issue broad recommendations concerning concepts that are not highly specialised and may pertain to multiple fields. These concepts often become widespread, **almost always in English**, even though French equivalents already exist and are frequently very common.)

In collaboration with the *Académie française*, which has the final word on approval, the CELF coordinates the work of specialised Terminology Commissions attached to eleven ministries. The largest number of these commissions operates within the ministries of economy, finance, and industry, where most new terms are created, particularly in computing and electronics.

Once validated, the terms are published in the *Journal Officiel*[10] (the Official Journal), which thus serves as the official source of recommended terminology. On average, around three hundred entries are added annually. Since March 2008, all published terms have also been accessible through *FranceTerme*, the national terminology database. Currently containing approximately 8,000 entries, *FranceTerme* is organised thematically by field of specialisation, regularly updated, and provides a user-friendly interface as well as information on conferences and events related to contemporary French usage.

Candel and Humbley (2017) underscore the central role of *FranceTerme* in the institutional promotion of French equivalents to English borrowings. While acknowledging that the recommenddations from such platforms are non-binding, they emphasise its function as an official terminological resource used by public administrations and situate it within the broader framework of French linguistic planning led by institutions such as the DGLFLF and the *Académie française*. These bodies, they argue, act as strong defenders of the French language, although the effectiveness of their efforts ultimately depends on public uptake. In this context, *FranceTerme* represents the practical interface of these policies: a database of approximately 8,000 entries organised by fields of specialisation, regularly updated, and designed to provide accessible alternatives to foreign borrowings.

From the Edict of Villers-Cotterêts in 1539 to the present-day Loi Toubon, public authorities have repeatedly intervened to uphold French against the influence of foreign languages, particularly English. According to Schmidt (2003), these interventions include both semantic neologisms—assigning new meanings to existing French words—and formal neologisms created by adapting or 'Frenchifying' English terms. However, he critiques these measures as inconsistent and lacking transparency.

---

[9] Les grandes lignes du dispositif d'enrichissement de la langue française in « Références 2018 : l'enrichisse- ment de la langue Française » p. 7, available online on: https://www.culture.gouv.fr/Thematiques/langue-francaise-et-langues-de-france/Actualites/References-2018-l-enrichissement-de-la-langue-francaise (6-8-2024)

[10] https://www.journal-officiel.gouv.fr/pages/accueil/ (6-8-2024)

Many of the proposed terms are rejected by authoritative dictionaries such as *Le Petit Robert* or *Larousse*, highlighting a gap between institutional intentions and real-world applicability.

Fugger (1979) likewise demonstrates that official terminology decrees often have minimal impact on actual usage. His sociolinguistic study of speakers in eastern France revealed that the French public frequently disregards institutional coinages in favour of more intuitive or widely adopted alternatives, including Anglicisms. This disparity underscores a recurring tension between top-down terminological regulation and bottom-up lexical adoption.

These recurring tensions between state-imposed linguistic regulation and user-driven lexical choices set the stage for a comparison with Quebec's terminological strategies in the IT domain, where similar concerns are addressed within a different institutional framework. The struggle to balance linguistic tradition with the adoption of necessary Anglicisms remains complex, involving questions of identity, clarity, and functionality. The ongoing dialogue between purists and pragmatists—each advancing compelling arguments about the future of French in the digital age—illustrates the nuanced interplay of language as a living and evolving entity. The next chapter examines Quebec's approach to IT terminology, where French is likewise under pressure but where institutional responses follow a distinct model.

5. The Protection of the French Language in Canada and A Comparative Analysis of IT Terminology in France and Quebec

A similar, and even more rigorous, protective approach is evident only in Quebec, Canada, where French is also actively safeguarded (Elchacar, 2022). While this article primarily focuses on language policy and terminology planning in France, we have also chosen to include Quebec as a point of comparison due to the institutional strength of its linguistic regulation and the active role played by the *Office québécois de la langue française* (OQLF). In practice, many terms coined in Québec circulate back into continental French discourse, sometimes supplementing or even rivalling terms proposed by French institutions.

Lexical influence flows not only from France to Quebec, but often in the reverse direction as well. Many terms originally coined or popularised by the *Office québécois de la langue française*—such as *courriel* or *hameçonnage*—have gained traction in metropolitan France and are now listed in databases such as *FranceTerme* or referenced by the *Académie française*. This bidirectional influence suggests that, far from being a peripheral variety, Quebec French plays an active role in shaping contemporary French terminology.

In Quebec, the *Office québécois de la langue française* (OQLF) plays a critical role in promoting the use of French and preventing the incursion of English terms. This effort is supported by Bill 101, which mandates the use of French in public life, including education, government, and commercial activities. The OQLF develops French equivalents for English technical and scientific terms, ensuring that French remains the primary language in all aspects of society. As Fischman[11] (1991) notes, the OQLF's historical efforts to promote Quebec French reflect a broader language planning strategy aimed at preserving linguistic identity and resisting English's pervasive influence in North America. Thus, the protection of French in Quebec serves as a further example of how French-speaking regions systematically preserve their linguistic heritage against foreign influences, particularly from English.

[11] https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/3398/339829641002.pdf (5-8-2024)

The most similar database to *FranceTerme* (FT) is the *Grand dictionnaire terminologique* (GDT).[12] Managed by the OQLF, the GDT provides standardised French equivalents for technical and scientific terms, much like FT does in France. The GDT covers a wide range of fields, including technology, business, science, and more, and is aimed at promoting the use of French terms in professional and technical environments. The OQLF is tasked with ensuring that French remains the primary language in Quebec, and part of this mission is to create and promote French alternatives to foreign, particularly English, terminology. The GDT is a key resource in this effort, showcasing the importance of effective terminology management in maintaining linguistic standards. As Gouadec (2007, p. 231) highlights, terminology management plays a critical role in technical and professional domains, supporting the development and dissemination of codified terms that align with evolving linguistic and practical needs.

In this chapter, we briefly examine the differences between *FranceTerme* (FT) and the *Grand dictionnaire terminologique* (GDT) in their approach to providing French equivalents for English terms. This comparison sheds light on the regional variations in linguistic policies between France and Quebec, particularly in their responses to the influence of English in technical and scientific fields.

While both FT and the GDT aim to promote official French equivalents for English terms, they do not always align in their recommended translations. This divergence reflects regional linguistic preferences and institutional policies in France and Quebec (Humbley, 2009). For instance, the English term *hashtag* is translated as *mot-dièse* by FT, whereas the GDT in Quebec offers *mot-clic* as its official equivalent. Such variations underscore the complexity of linguistic standardisation across the Francophone world, where local considerations and usage practices influence terminological choices. These discrepancies can lead to regional disparities in the adoption and recognition of French equivalents, even within a shared language community.

As Kim (2017, p. 276) observes, although governmental intervention in language use has become less prescriptive—with standardised terms increasingly rare and recommended forms remaining optional—the act of institutional promotion itself continues to play a meaningful role in term adoption, particularly when disseminated through official platforms such as *FranceTerme* or the GDT.

As noted by Cajolet-Laganière and D'Amico (2014), Quebec French no longer automatically adopts terminology from *French of France* (*français de France*) but often develops its own terms, which it perceives as more precise and suitable. This independent approach contributes to regional disparities in the adoption and usage of French terminology, even within the same linguistic community.

[12] https://vitrinelinguistique.oqlf.gouv.qc.ca/ (6-8-2024)

To further explore these nuances, we present a table that includes the terms used in our survey of IT terminology, which we will elaborate upon in the article. Additionally, out of academic curiosity, we provide a comparison of these terms between the FT database and the GDT. This comparison offers valuable insight into the regional variations in the adoption of French equivalents for English IT terms.

English term	French term	Quebec term
E-mail	courriel n.m./courrier n.m.	courriel n.m.
Blog	blogue n.m.	blogue n.m.
Cloud	*informatique en nuage n.m.*	*nuage informatique n.m.*
Chatbot	*dialogueur n.f*	*agent conversational n.m.*
Download v.	télécharger v.	télécharger v
Firewall	pare-feu n.m.	pare-feu n.m.
Hacker	*fouineur n.m.*	*bidouilleur n. m.*
Hardware	matériel n.m.	matériel n.m
Hotspot	*zone d'accés sans fil n.f.*	*point d'accés sans fil n.f.*
Malware	logiciel malveillant n.m.	logiciel malveillant n.m.
Phishing	hameçonnage n.f.	hameçonnage n.f.
RAM	mémorie vive n.f.	mémorie vive n.f.
Shareware	*logiciel à contribution n.m.*	*partagiciel n.m.*
Smartphone	*mobile multifuction n.m.*	*télépfone intelligent n.m.*
Software	logiciel n.m.	logiciel n.m.
Spam	*arrosage n.f.*	*pourriel n.m.*
Spyware	logiciel espion n.m.	logiciel espion n.m.
Tag (HTML)	balise n.f.	balise n.f.
Upload v.	*télécharger v.*	*téléverser v.*
Widget	*vignette active n.f.*	*gadget logiciel n. m.*

Table 1. Comparison of English IT Terms with Terms Proposed by *FranceTerme* and the *Grand Dictionnaire Terminologique*

The French equivalents presented in Table 1 illustrate the terminological strategies adopted by institutional bodies in France and Quebec. In France, terms listed in the *FranceTerme* database are recommended for public and administrative use but remain optional in most other domains. In contrast, Québec's *Grand dictionnaire terminologique* (GDT), maintained by the *Office québécois*

de la langue française (OQLF), adopts a more nuanced classification system. Terms may be labelled as normalised, recommended, proposed, or even discouraged, with further qualifiers such as 'privileged' or 'context specific'. For example, while *FranceTerme* recommends *dialogueur* for *chatbot*, the GDT prioritises *agent conversationnel*, which arguably offers greater semantic transparency. These differences reflect broader institutional philosophies: France's centralised, selective enforcement versus Quebec's graduated model, which encourages usage across registers. The comparison reveals that approximately 55% of the terms are shared between the two databases, while 45% differ, highlighting both linguistic cohesion and regional variation in how English IT terms are localised in the Francophone world. The terms that exhibit consistent linguistic usage between Standard French and Quebec French, demonstrating a unified approach in Francophone IT terminology, include *e-mail*/*courriel*, *blog*/*blogue*, *download*/*télécharger*, *firewall*/*pare-feu*, *hardware*/*matériel*, *malware*/*logiciel malveillant*, *phishing*/*hameçonnage*, *RAM*/*mémoire vive*, *software*/*logiciel*, *spyware*/*logiciel espion*, and *tag* (HTML)/*balise*. These terms reflect a strong consensus on IT vocabulary across French-speaking regions.

In contrast, terms marked in bold and italics in the table represent divergent translations between *FranceTerme* and the *Grand dictionnaire terminologique* (GDT), showcasing the adaptability of the French-speaking technology community to regional linguistic preferences. Such adaptability underscores the distinct efforts of Quebec's linguistic authorities to prioritise clarity and practicality in terminology. As Mudrochova et al. (2024, p. 214) highlight, Quebec French demonstrates a deliberate strategy of modernising language while maintaining functional alignment with English concepts, often distinguishing itself as an innovative force within the Francophone linguistic landscape.

Some terms exhibit slight regional variations that reflect local linguistic preferences and usage. For instance, *cloud* is translated as *informatique en nuage* in Standard French and *nuage informatique* in Quebec French. While both terms convey the same concept, the variation lies in the order of the elements, which may reflect subtle differences in regional phrasing preferences rather than a fundamentally distinct approach.

Certain terms demonstrate notable disparities in translation, reflecting differing linguistic strategies and conceptual emphases between Standard French and Quebec French. In Standard French, *chatbot* is translated as *dialogueur*. This term derives from *dialogue*, emphasising the conversational aspect of the technology. *Dialogueur* implies a programme designed for dialogue, focusing on the interaction itself without explicitly referencing the 'bot' or automation element. While clear in its reference to conversation, *dialogueur* can be somewhat ambiguous for those unfamiliar with chatbots, as it does not explicitly convey the automated or AI-driven nature of the tool. In Quebec French, *chatbot* is translated as *agent conversationnel*. This term more directly translates the English concept, with *agent* indicating an automated or virtual assistant and *conversationnel* highlighting the conversational purpose. *Agent conversationnel* is precise in describing both the function (conversation) and the automated, agent-like nature of the technology. This translation aligns closely with the English meaning, making it more intuitive for users to understand that the term refers to an AI-driven conversational tool.

In comparing the term *widget* in Quebec French and Standard French, we see Quebec French's emphasis on descriptive clarity versus Standard French's more visual adaptation. In Quebec French, *widget* is translated as *gadget logiciel*, meaning 'software gadget', which highlights the widget's function as a small, software-based tool or application element, providing users with a clear sense of its digital utility. This higher degree of semantic transparency makes the term more immediately accessible, as its morphological components directly evoke its function. In Standard French, however, *widget* is translated as *vignette active* ('active thumbnail' or 'interactive thumbnail'), which

focuses more on the visual aspect, often suggesting a small graphical element rather than a functional software tool. While *vignette active* emphasises interactivity, it can be less transparent for users unfamiliar with the widget's software-based role. Thus, *gadget logiciel* in Quebec French provides a more precise and transparent understanding of a widget's purpose than *vignette active* in Standard French, reflecting Quebec's broader preference for clarity and practicality in technology terminology.

Quebec French's focus on precision and practicality is further evident in the translation of terms related to cybersecurity, such as *phishing*, where the Quebec term *hameçonnage* offers a vivid and functionally transparent alternative to its Standard French counterpart.

The English word *spam* is translated as *arrosage* in Standard French and *pourriel* in Quebec French, as proposed by *FranceTerme*. These differences reflect attempts either to create terms that resonate culturally with local users or to avoid undesirable connotations associated with the English term. Interestingly, while *FranceTerme* opts for *arrosage*, traditional dictionaries such as *Le Petit Robert* and *Larousse* also suggest *pollupostage*. This variance is significant: *pollupostage* arguably offers greater specificity, as it conveys the nuisance aspect of *spam*—akin to pollution—whereas *arrosage* ('watering') lacks brevity and direct association with unwanted messages. As Humbley (2009) explains, linguistic borrowing often poses challenges when native equivalents fail to align semantically or culturally with user expectations. Borrowed terms such as *spam* thus retain an advantage due to their brevity, entrenched use, and perceived modernity, making it difficult for newly coined French equivalents to achieve similar levels of uptake. This discrepancy underscores a broader linguistic dynamic: institutional bodies may propose terms that aim for linguistic purity, while dictionaries often prefer solutions with clearer semantic parallels to English, illustrating the tension between innovation and tradition in French IT terminology.

In addition to nouns, Quebec French also demonstrates greater precision in its treatment of verbs. Unlike Standard French, which uses *télécharger* for both *download* and *upload*, Quebec French differentiates between the two: *télécharger* for *download* and *téléverser* for *upload*. This distinction introduces greater specificity by capturing the directional nature of the action, and it enhances clarity in technical contexts where accuracy is critical. While *télécharger* may be more economical in form, the addition of *téléverser* exemplifies a trade-off between brevity and precision, reflecting Quebec's concern with functional transparency in terminology.

This meticulous approach contributes not only to semantic clarity but also to broader acceptance within the Francophone community. Terms that achieve greater transparency and precision, such as *hameçonnage* for *phishing*, tend to gain traction even in France, where less evocative alternatives like *filoutage* (listed in *Larousse* and *Le Petit Robert*) have remained marginal. Notably, *FranceTerme* itself has adopted *hameçonnage*, further recognising its descriptive clarity and effectiveness. Similarly, the widespread adoption of *courriel* in France—originally a Quebec coinage blending *courrier* and *électronique*—demonstrates how brevity and motivation can drive cross-regional uptake, displacing the more literal but cumbersome *courrier électronique*.

In our empirical section, which examines how French students translate the selected terms into French, we will assess not only their ability to provide the equivalents recommended by *FranceTerme*, but also whether Quebec French variants appear in their responses. This analysis will shed light on the extent of student awareness of regional variation and the influence of Quebec terminology on linguistic practices in France. It thus offers insights into how brevity, specificity, and transparency shape the adoption and diffusion of French equivalents across the Francophone world.

6. Assessing Compliance with French Linguistic Policies: A Survey of French-speaking Computer Science Students' Use of English Terms

Although English terms dominate the field of Information Technology, this chapter investigates whether French-speaking computer science students are aware of and able to use the French equivalents endorsed by *FranceTerme*. We present the methodology of our survey, outline participant profiles, and analyse the results to assess the effectiveness of French linguistic policy in promoting native terminology. The survey explores both recognition and preference: are students familiar with the official French terms, do they use them, and what motivates their lexical choices? The findings provide insight into how institutional recommendations are received by younger users and whether they influence language practices in a globally Anglicised digital environment.

6.1. The Creation of Our Corpus

We developed a corpus of twenty Anglicisms selected from *FranceTerme* (FT), the official French government database for standardising terminology in specialised fields. For this study, we focused on the *Domaine Informatique* (Information Technology domain), which includes 573 recommended French terms intended to replace English-origin expressions. Our review of the 28 pages comprising this domain confirmed that all proposed equivalents correspond exclusively to English borrowings.

Using *FranceTerme* as the foundation of our corpus ensures that our selection reflects institutional priorities and provides a direct lens into how such official recommendations are received by students in the IT field. We limited the corpus to twenty terms to maintain a manageable scope for in-depth analysis while preserving a representative cross-section of key IT concepts. This corpus then served as the basis for the student survey, which examined both recognition of and preference for these terms.

fouineur, n.m.
• Domaine : INFORMATIQUE / Internet
• Définition : Personne passionnée d'informatique qui, par jeu, curiosité, défi personnel ou par souci de notoriété, sonde, au hasard plutôt qu'à l'aide de manuels techniques, les possibilités matérielles et logicielles des systèmes informatiques afin de pouvoir éventuellement s'y immiscer.
• Équivalent étranger : hacker (en)

Table 2. Example of a recommended French equivalent derived from *FranceTerme* in the information technology domain

The selected terms span key IT areas including hardware (e.g. *matériel*, *mémoire vive*), software (e.g. *logiciel*, *logiciel espion*, *logiciel malveillant*, *logiciel à contribution*), cybersecurity (*pare-feu*, *hameçonnage*, *pollupostage*), digital communication (*courriel*, *blogue*, *minimessage*), and networking (*zone d'accès sans fil*, *nuage*). Additionally, items such as *dialogueur* (used in the context of AI and chatbots) and *télécharger* (common in both file transfers and online communication) reflect the diversity of the terminology in our corpus.

Together, these examples provide a representative cross-section of French institutional terminology in IT and allow us to assess whether such equivalents are recognised and preferred by users in practice.

6.2. Participant Overview and Organisation of Our Survey

This study focused on computer science students, a group regularly exposed to English terminology due to the international nature of the IT sector. Participants were drawn from EFREI (*École Française d'Électronique et d'Informatique*), a well-established institution specialising in software development, artificial intelligence, cybersecurity, and related fields. Located in Villejuif near Paris and affiliated with the University of Paris, EFREI's students typically demonstrate strong English proficiency.

Data collection was conducted in two phases, involving 68 native French speakers with English levels ranging from B1 to C1 (B2: 47 participants, C1: 21 participants). The first phase took place in November 2023 at the Technical University of Ostrava with 34 undergraduate students, aged 19–24, participating in a six-month academic exchange. The second phase occurred in April 2024 with an additional group of 34 students. The temporal gap between these phases allowed us to explore whether awareness or integration of French equivalents evolved over time, offering insights into the potential adoption of recommended terms in a dynamic linguistic environment. Moreover, comparing responses across the two groups enabled us to evaluate the consistency of preferences and familiarity with the terms, shedding light on the stability of usage patterns.

Students in Ostrava were enrolled in a French-language technical programme conducted entirely in French and English. Interaction with Czech was minimal, ensuring that their exposure to French and English IT terminology remained comparable to students in a fully Francophone environment.

To initiate the study, participants completed a brief preliminary questionnaire on their awareness of *FranceTerme* and general attitudes towards French versus English terminology.

Question 1: Are you familiar with FranceTerme?

This closed question aimed to determine whether students had prior knowledge of the official French terminology database. The results showed that 20% of participants (14 students) were familiar with the platform, 25% (17 students) had heard of it but never used it, and 55% (37 students) were not familiar with it at all.

Question 2: ***Which tools do you most often use to translate or understand technical terms?***

This was a multiple-choice question allowing participants to select more than one option. A very high proportion of students (98%, or 67 out of 68 participants) reported using ChatGPT or another AI-based assistant. Google Translate was also widely used, selected by 60% of participants (41 students), followed by DeepL, used by 45% (31 students). A few students also mentioned tools such as Linguee or YouGlish, typically for checking usage or context.

Note: As multiple responses were allowed, the total exceeds 100%.

Question 3: Which terminology is predominantly used in your university computer science courses?

This single-choice question asked students to reflect on the language environment in their studies. A majority (60%, or 41 students) reported that English terms were mainly used, while 40% (27 students) stated that both languages were used equally.

Question 4: Do you think it is important to protect the French language against Anglicisms and other foreign words?

This closed question assessed students' general attitude towards linguistic protection. Most participants (78%, or 53 students) answered *Yes*, while 15% (10 students) were indifferent, and 7% (5 students) answered *No*. These results suggest widespread ideological support for maintaining the integrity of the French language.

Question 5: In the field of IT, I personally prefer to use English terms rather than their French equivalents.

Students responded on a Likert scale (strongly agree to strongly disagree) and were given the opportunity to explain their choice. A total of 74% of participants (50 students) either strongly agreed or rather agreed with the statement, indicating a clear preference for Anglicisms in the digital and technical domain.

Among the 50 students who provided written justifications, several key motivations emerged. Approximately 60% (30 students) stated that English is the default language of programming and software. While the specific wording varied, this idea appeared in different forms across most of the comments. Additionally, 44% (22 students) referred to the greater international comprehensibility of English terms. 36% (18 students) observed that most digital resources and documentation are available in English, and 24% (12 students) remarked that French equivalents often fail to convey the original meaning with the same precision. A smaller group (20%, 10 respondents) described English as more natural or habitual in IT contexts.

From the materials made available to us, one example is the *Coupe robotique des IUT GEII*, whose regulations are written in French but incorporate numerous Anglicisms in their original, non-adapted form, particularly in technical specifications and code-related terminology. Terms such as *datasheet, debugger, firmware, driver, joystick, Wi-Fi, PC,* and *checksum* appear alongside standard French syntax, illustrating the degree to which English lexis permeates even officially Francophone documentation. These regulations, which serve as reference material in certain project-based modules, show that while the medium of instruction may be French, the embedded terminology often reflects the global dominance of English in specialised technical domains. Other examples include *sensor, Bluetooth, Wi-Fi, joystick,* and *firmware*, alongside programming and hardware-related vocabulary. Such materials may normalise the use of English terminology, potentially shaping student preferences even when French equivalents are available.

Following the preliminary questionnaire, the main part of the survey assessed students' actual knowledge and preferences regarding specific IT terms. This stage tested their recognition of French equivalents for common English IT terms and examined their preferences between English and French usage in context. The first section collected participants' personal data and ensured familiarity with the subject matter by asking them to review a list of English IT terms. The second and principal part of the survey involved a structured terminology test requiring students to translate 20 English IT terms and indicate their preferred usage.

The questionnaire was distributed via Google Forms and completed in a supervised classroom setting during coursework. All instructions were embedded within the form, and no additional clarification was provided by instructors or researchers. Participants received a list of 20 English IT terms, each embedded in a short, contextually realistic sentence to simulate authentic usage and reduce ambiguity. For instance, instead of presenting the word *firewall* in isolation, the sentence read: *Assure-toi que ton firewall est activé avant d'accéder au réseau.* This approach ensured that participants interpreted each term within a relevant IT context.

The test section was presented in a tabular format with three columns: English Term, French Equivalent, and Preferred Term. Participants were first instructed to replace the English term with its official French equivalent, where known. Finally, they were asked to indicate which version—English or French—they personally preferred to use. This structure allowed for a dual analysis of both terminological knowledge and usage preferences.

Following completion of the survey, we analysed the participants' translations to assess their familiarity with the French equivalents and their actual preferences in practice. This analysis provided valuable data to measure not only the participants' recognition of the terms recommended by *FranceTerme*, but also their willingness to adopt these alternatives over the English terms commonly used in IT contexts. By examining their preferences and translation choices, the survey sheds light on the efficacy of French linguistic policies in influencing terminology use among a younger, tech-savvy demographic. Furthermore, the results contribute to understanding how regional linguistic policies align with or diverge from the linguistic practices of everyday users, offering a foundation for future investigations into the interaction between language planning and real-world usage in the IT sector.

7. Comprehensive Analysis of Survey Findings

The survey conducted for this study presents several notable strengths that enhance the relevance and reliability of the findings. First, it is grounded in recent data gathered from a specialised and well-targeted population—French-speaking IT students—who are regularly exposed to English-based digital terminology. This makes them a particularly insightful group for assessing the reception and usage of Anglicisms versus official French equivalents. Second, the transparent structure of the questionnaire enables a clear comparison between terminological recognition and actual preference, thus shedding light on both passive knowledge and active usage. Finally, the survey offers an empirical perspective on the practical impact of institutional tools such as *FranceTerme*, making it a valuable contribution to discussions on language policy, lexical choice, and normative approaches to terminology in professional and educational contexts.

7.1 Linguistic Awareness and Terminological Attitudes

The first question focused on students' awareness of *FranceTerme*, the official French terminology database. The results revealed that more than half of the participants (55%) had no familiarity with the platform at all, while an additional 25% had only heard of it but never used it. Only 20% claimed to be familiar with it. These findings point to a relatively low explicit awareness of institutional terminology planning tools among IT students, even in a Francophone academic context. However, it is important to note that familiarity with *FranceTerme* as a platform is not necessarily expected at the student level. The database primarily functions as a source of coinages and recommended equivalents for institutional or official use, and students may well encounter such terms indirectly through textbooks, interfaces, or classroom instruction—without recognising their institutional origin. Nonetheless, the lack of direct recognition underscores the disconnect between language planning bodies and the everyday linguistic practices of digital-native learners.

In line with this, the second question explored the tools students most used to understand or translate technical terms. The overwhelming reliance on AI-based solutions was striking: 98% of respondents reported using ChatGPT or a comparable assistant, underscoring a clear generational shift towards conversational and context-sensitive technologies. Google Translate and DeepL were also widely used (60% and 45%, respectively), reflecting a broader reliance on fast, user-friendly digital tools. A few participants also mentioned platforms such as Linguee or YouGlish, but overall, the

responses indicate a clear preference for rapid, accessible tools capable of providing immediate and contextually relevant translations.

Question 3 addressed the perceived linguistic landscape of the students' academic environment. A majority (60%) reported that English terminology was predominantly used in their university courses, while 25% stated that both languages were used equally. This suggests that, for the students surveyed, English occupies a central role in their IT courses, often serving as the primary working language even when instruction is delivered in French. Such predominance likely influences their own terminological preferences and reinforces their reliance on English-based resources.

Interestingly, Question 4 revealed a seemingly contradictory attitude: despite their overwhelming use of English in both academic and practical contexts, 78% of participants still believed it was important to protect the French language against the influence of Anglicisms and other foreign elements. Only a small minority rejected this idea outright. This points to a recurring phenomenon observed in sociolinguistic studies—namely, the ideological support for language preservation coexisting with pragmatic language choices that deviate from institutional norms.

This tension becomes especially clear in the final question, where students were asked to indicate whether they personally preferred English terms over their French equivalents in the field of IT. A full 90% agreed with the statement (either strongly or rather), and none selected *strongly disagree*. This highlights a pronounced preference for Anglicisms in technical domains, even among students who simultaneously support protective language policies. Among the 50 participants who chose to elaborate on their responses, a range of justifications was offered. The most frequent themes included the default status of English in programming and software development (mentioned in varied wording by approximately 60% of respondents), the global comprehensibility of English terms (44%), and the dominance of English in digital resources and documentation (36%). Some students also expressed that French equivalents were imprecise or artificial (24%), while others found English terminology more natural or intuitive in everyday use (20%).

Taken together, these findings suggest a consistent pattern: while participants may ideologically support the preservation of French, their linguistic behaviour—shaped by academic exposure, technological tools, and the prevailing norms of the IT sector—is overwhelmingly oriented towards English. The preliminary questionnaire thus provides an essential foundation for understanding the lexical choices students make in the main survey task and highlights the practical limitations of institutional terminology planning within contemporary IT education.

7.2. Analysis of the First Survey

English terme **Terme anglais**	**Correct responses in %** **Réponses correctes en %**	**Preferred term in %** **Terme préféré en %**
e-mail/courriel	73	English 100
blog/blogue	0	English 100
cloud/informatique en nuage	50	English 100
chatbot/dialogueur	23	English 100
download/télécharger	100	French 82
firewall/pare-feu	79	French 91

hacker/ fouineur, pirate (informatique)	61	English 56
hardware/matériel	12	English 100
hotspot/zone d'accés sans fil	23	English 100
malware/logiciel malveillant	18	English 52
phishing/hameçonnage	14	English 100
RAM/mémoire vive	53	English 100
shareware/logiciel à contribution	38	English 91
smartphone/mobile (multifunction)	91	French 91
software/logiciel	62	English 88
spam/ pourriel, arrosage	26	English 91
spyware/logiciel espion	61	English 91
tag/balise	0	English 100
upload/télécharger	74	English 73
widget/vignette active	0	English 100

Table 3. The analysis of our first questionnaire survey in %

The table reveals participants' ability to provide the official French terms and, where applicable, terms from their native language. The results demonstrate varying levels of familiarity with the French equivalents of English IT terms and participants' practical preferences for terminology.

Participants performed well in providing the French equivalents for certain terms. For instance, *download* (*télécharger*) was successfully identified by all participants, reflecting its widespread recognition and integration into everyday usage. Similarly, *smartphone* (*mobile multifonction*) and *firewall* (*pare-feu*) were correctly provided by 91% and 79% of participants, respectively. These results suggest that such French terms, owing to their functional clarity and alignment with the concept they represent, have gained substantial acceptance among Francophone users. *Upload* also performed relatively well, with 74% of participants identifying the French equivalent, although the shared translation *télécharger* with *download* may have contributed to some confusion.

The term *e-mail* (*courriel*) was correctly identified by 73% of participants, indicating a relatively strong familiarity with the French equivalent. However, in terms of preference, 100% of participants favoured the English term *e-mail* over the French equivalent. Interestingly, participants exclusively proposed *courriel*, the Quebec-coined term, rather than *courrier électronique*, the more literal French alternative included in dictionaries such as *Le Petit Robert*. This outcome underscores the widespread acceptance and recognition of *courriel* in Francophone contexts, likely due to its brevity and its effective blending of *courrier* and *électronique*. Despite this recognition, the continued preference for the English term reflects its global dominance and practicality in the IT field, where brevity and international comprehension are often prioritised.

Conversely, there were terms where participants struggled to provide the French equivalents. Notably, *blog* (*blogue*), *tag* (*balise*), and *widget* (*vignette active*) received no correct responses. While

blogue and *balise* are relatively simple graphical adaptations of their English counterparts, participants did not identify them, possibly due to an expectation that official translations would differ more significantly from the English terms. For *widget*, the descriptive translation *vignette active* appears too distant from its English counterpart, which may explain participants' inability to identify it. These examples underscore a gap between the official translations and users' expectations or familiarity.

Moderate success was observed for terms like *software* (*logiciel*, 62%), *hacker* (*pirate informatique*, 61%; *fouineur*, 0%), and *RAM* (*mémoire vive*, 53%). For *hacker*, participants predominantly provided the French term *pirate informatique*, a widely accepted alternative meaning "computer pirate" that aligns more closely with the English concept of unlawful digital activity. This term, included in French dictionaries such as *Le Petit Robert* and *Larousse*, reflects the legal and media framing of hacking. However, none of the participants supplied the term *fouineur*, which lacks broader recognition. These results suggest that *pirate informatique* has achieved a higher degree of integration and acceptance among French speakers, while *fouineur* remains less familiar, perhaps due to its more niche or informal usage.

Similarly, the descriptive translations *logiciel malveillant* for *malware* and *hameçonnage* for *phishing* were provided by only 18% and 14% of participants, respectively, underscoring the challenge of adopting complex or less intuitive French equivalents. For *phishing*, participants exclusively provided *hameçonnage*, a term originating in Quebec, rather than *filoutage*, the French alternative included in dictionaries such as *Le Petit Robert* and *Larousse*. This preference for *hameçonnage* may reflect its greater precision and vividness in capturing the deceptive nature of phishing, contributing to its adoption over the less evocative *filoutage*.

The term *spam* further illustrates the influence of Quebec terminology. While 26% of participants provided the French equivalent, they exclusively used *pourriel*, another Quebec-coined term blending *courriel* (*email*) and *poubelle* (*trash*). The alternative *arrosage*, listed in FranceTerme, was not recognised by any participants, likely due to its semantic distance from the concept of unsolicited digital communication.

The participants also indicated their preferences for English or French terms, revealing a strong inclination towards English for most terms, regardless of their ability to provide the correct French equivalent. For example, while *firewall* (*pare-feu*) and *smartphone* (*mobile multifonction*) had high French preferences at 91%, terms like *blog*, *cloud*, and *chatbot* were unanimously preferred in their English forms. Even when participants successfully identified the French term, such as *download* (*télécharger*, 100% recognition), the English equivalent retained notable appeal in some cases.

Interestingly, terms with shared translations, like *upload* and *download* (*télécharger*), highlighted linguistic challenges. While participants correctly identified *télécharger* for both terms, the lack of distinct translations for these separate concepts likely contributed to the 73% preference for the English version of *upload*.

These findings suggest that while some French equivalents have gained recognition and acceptance, others remain less integrated into participants' linguistic repertoire. The results also indicate that providing the correct French term does not always correlate with its preference or practical use, as the brevity and global familiarity of English terms often make them more appealing. Future research could explore these preferences in greater depth, examining the roles of linguistic economy, usability, and the contexts in which these terms are encountered.

7.3. Comparative Insights: First vs. Second Survey

English term Terme anglais	Correct responses in % Réponses correctes en %	Preferred term in % Terme préféré en %
e-mail/courriel, courrier	85	English 88
blog/blogue	0	English 100
cloud/informatique en nuage	59	English 85
chatbot/dialogueur	18	English 100
download/télécharger	94	French 94
firewall/pare-feu	85	French 94
hacker/fouineur, pirate (informatique)	79	English 85
hardware/matériel	11	English 100
hotspot/zone d'accés sans fil	17	English 100
malware/logiciel malveillant	15	English 100
phishing/hameçonnage	11	English 100
RAM/mémoire vive	38	English 100
shareware/logiciel à contribution	44	English 91
smartphone/mobile (multifunction)	94	French 94
software/logiciel	71	English 56
spam/pourriel, arrosage	20	English 91
spyware/logiciel espion	59	English 91
tag/balise	0	English 100
upload/télécharger	79	English 88
widget/vignette active	0	English 100

Table 4. The analysis of our second questionnaire survey in %

A comparison of the two survey datasets indicates that recognition patterns remained broadly stable, with only modest fluctuations in a handful of items. High recall clustered around short, domain-anchored items: *download* (*télécharger*) remained very strong (100% → 94%); *smartphone* (*mobile multifonction*) likewise stayed high (91% → 94%); *firewall* (*pare-feu*) rose (79% → 85%); and *software* (*logiciel*) improved (62% → 71%). *E-mail* (*courriel*) also increased (73% → 85%). *Upload* (*télécharger*) showed respectable recall (74% → 79%) despite sharing its French form with *download*.

A mid-tier comprised items with moderate recall. *Hacker* (*pirate informatique* / *fouineur*) moved up (61% → 79%), with responses overwhelmingly giving *pirate (informatique)*; *fouineur* did not surface. *RAM* (*mémoire vive*) declined (53% → 38%). *Spyware* (*logiciel espion*) was essentially stable (61% → 59%). *Shareware* (*logiciel à contribution*) ticked up (38% → 44%). *Cloud* (*informatique en nuage*) rose modestly (50% → 59%), whereas *hotspot* (*zone d'accès sans fil*) slipped (23% → 17%).

Recognition outcomes were largely consistent across the two surveys, with only minor changes observed in a few items. Low-recall items remained persistently weak. *Malware* (*logiciel malveillant*) (18% → 15%), *phishing* (*hameçonnage*) (14% → 11%), and *hardware* (*matériel*) (12% → 11%) stayed at the bottom; when *phishing* was recognised, respondents again supplied *hameçonnage*, not *filoutage*. *Chatbot* (*dialogueur*) was rarely retrieved (23% → 18%). *Spam* (*pourriel* / *arrosage*) showed limited recall (26% → 20%), and when supplied it was *pourriel*. *Pourriel* and *hameçonnage* were consistently provided in their Quebec-origin forms, underscoring the influence of Canadian coinages even where adoption remains limited. Three items were never retrieved in either survey: *blog* (*blogue*), *HTML tag* (*balise*), and *widget* (*vignette active*) (all 0% → 0%).

Taken together, items that combine brevity with clear conceptual anchoring and sustained input exposure—*download* (*télécharger*), *firewall* (*pare-feu*), *smartphone* (*mobile multifonction*), increasingly *software* (*logiciel*), and *e-mail* (*courriel*)—drive recognition. By contrast, periphrastic multiwordings (*informatique en nuage*, *zone d'accès sans fil*), formally concise but semantically diffuse or weakly salient items (*matériel*, *blogue*, *balise*), and low-visibility technical calques (*dialogueur*, *logiciel malveillant*) remain difficult to retrieve.

Analysis of both survey datasets reveals a clear pattern: short, monolexemic coinages consistently outperform their longer, multi-word counterparts, achieving an average recognition rate of 45.3% compared to 40.0% for periphrastic forms. Yet this apparent advantage of brevity is no guarantee of success. Without semantic transparency, domain anchoring, and sustained institutional reinforcement, even the most concise forms risk slipping into obscurity.

Within the category of short forms, several achieved strong results. *Télécharger* (*download*) was identified by 94–100% of participants, reflecting its high integration into everyday use. *Pare-feu* (*firewall*) scored 79–85% recognition, supported by functional clarity and conceptual alignment. *Courriel* (*e-mail*) achieved 73–85% recognition, consistently retrieved over its more literal variant *courrier électronique*. *Logiciel* (*software*) also performed well (62–71%), benefiting from its specificity to IT and absence of strong competing meanings in general French. *Smartphone* (*mobile*) maintained high recognition (91–94%), aided by its international familiarity and overlap with global usage patterns.

By contrast, other short forms were far less successful. *Matériel* (hardware), a partial semantic calque, reached only 11–12% recognition, likely due to its broad polysemy ("equipment," "material") in non-IT contexts. *Blogue* (*blog*), a French orthographic adaptation, and *balise* (*HTML tag*), a pre-existing French lexical item meaning "beacon" or "marker," were entirely absent from correct responses, suggesting low digital-domain salience. Intermediate scores were found for *mémoire vive* (*RAM*, 38–53%), *pourriel* (*spam*, 20–26%), *hameçonnage* (*phishing*, 11–14%), and *logiciel espion* (*spyware*, 59%), reflecting partial familiarity but limited spontaneous recall.

Another variable that may help explain the uneven performance of certain items is the timing of their introduction relative to the first appearance of the underlying concept. If a French equivalent is available from the moment the concept first enters use, it is more likely to be adopted, as speakers can integrate it immediately rather than relying on an English form. By contrast, when the French term is coined only after the concept has already gained currency—often in English—its chances of

replacing the established form are reduced. However, determining these dates with precision is challenging, as it is often difficult to establish both when speakers first begin using the concept and when the equivalent term is created (Kim 2017, pp. 280–284).

Long, multi-word equivalents generally underperformed. *Zone d'accès sans fil* (*hotspot*, 17–23%), *logiciel malveillant* (*malware*, 15–18%), *logiciel à contribution* (*shareware*, 38–44%), and *vignette active* (widget, 0%) all recorded low recognition rates. Even *informatique en nuage* (*cloud computing*, 50–59%), the highest performer among long forms, remains far behind its English counterpart. Morphological complexity appears to reduce recall, and in cases where recognition exists, active usage is still rare.

Overall, these findings indicate that while brevity can facilitate recall and encourage adoption, it must operate alongside other decisive factors such as semantic precision, semantic transparency, motivation, domain-specific salience, and sustained institutional reinforcement. Without these, even short forms risk marginalisation, while long forms face an additional barrier of morphological complexity that demands stronger institutional and contextual support to gain traction. Evidence from the present data also suggests that Québec-origin solutions may hold an advantage when they are morphologically transparent and semantically evocative, as in *courriel*, *hameçonnage*, and *pourriel*. These items were retrieved in preference to their less transparent metropolitan alternatives (*courrier électronique*, *filoutage*, *arrosage*), which were not produced at all, suggesting that Québec coinages often achieve greater conceptual clarity than some metropolitan French equivalents. Nevertheless, overall recall appears to be governed more by salience, transparency, and frequency in learners' linguistic input than by regional provenance alone.

While recognition patterns provide insight into participants' familiarity with French IT terminology, they do not in themselves determine which forms are actually used. The next stage of the analysis therefore examines stated preferences, showing the extent to which recognition does—or does not—translate into active adoption.

Across the two surveys, preference patterns were remarkably stable. English remained the dominant choice for most items, particularly *blog* (*blogue*), *cloud* (*informatique en nuage*), *chatbot* (*dialogueur*), *hotspot* (*zone d'accès sans fil*), *phishing* (*hameçonnage*), *tag* (*balise*), and *widget* (*vignette active*), all of which were unanimously preferred in their English forms in both datasets. Even where recognition of the French equivalent improved—such as *informatique en nuage* (*cloud*) from 50% to 59% or *pare-feu* (*firewall*) from 79% to 85%—the English term often retained strong appeal (85% for *cloud*, despite higher French recognition).

A small number of French terms combined strong recognition with high preference. *Télécharger* (*download*) and *pare-feu* (*firewall*) both reached over 90% preference for French in the second survey, while *smartphone* (*mobile*) also maintained consistently high French preference, although *mobile* itself is widely internationalised.

Other cases illustrate the tension between recognition and preference. For example, *logiciel* (software) rose from 62% to 71% recognition, yet English preference dropped from 88% to 56%, suggesting a modest shift toward acceptance of the French form. Conversely, *courriel* (e-mail) maintained high recognition in both surveys (73%–85%) but continued to face English preference in most cases (88% in the second survey). This pattern aligns both with the broader attitudinal findings from Question 5, in which many participants expressed that English is the default language of programming and software—valued for its international comprehensibility, predominance in digital resources, and perceived precision compared to some French equivalents—and with our initial hypothesis that, despite familiarity with official equivalents, IT students would continue to prefer

Anglicisms for their conciseness, global recognisability, and ubiquity in professional and educational contexts.

Overall, the preference data indicate that familiarity by itself does not guarantee adoption. Practical factors, perceptions of international reach, and the strong association of English with the IT domain often outweigh recognition, enabling English to remain dominant even when the French equivalent is well known and institutionally promoted.

8. Conclusion

One of the most persistent challenges in maintaining linguistic integrity within technical domains arises from the process of translation itself. In the field of Information Technology, where English functions as the default global language, French equivalents frequently struggle to match the precision, efficiency, or semantic clarity of their English counterparts. This translational disparity plays a substantial role in sustaining the preference for Anglicisms, even in contexts where language policy explicitly advocates the use of French alternatives. The obstacle does not necessarily stem from the absence of a French equivalent, but rather from its perceived insufficiency.

From the coexistence of multiple French equivalents for certain English IT terms to the complete absence of viable translations for others, the situation reflects the ongoing challenges of linguistic standardisation in a field characterised by rapid innovation and international communication. Factors such as brevity, semantic transparency or motivation, precision, and perceived necessity strongly influence the adoption of new terms. However, even when all these criteria are met, this does not necessarily guarantee widespread knowledge, consistent usage, or preference for the proposed substitute. As Holeš (2024, p. 438) observes, the fate of neologisms remains unpredictable and depends not only on linguistic factors such as morphological conformity to the rules of the language, but also on extralinguistic ones, including their official imposition, integration into terminological databases, inclusion in dictionaries, dissemination in the media, and use in advertising. Above all, however, their survival hinges on acceptance by the Francophone speech community.

FranceTerme in France, as well as the *Grand dictionnaire terminologique* (GDT) in Québec, Canada, constitute the central official repositories for standardised French terminology and play pivotal roles in the formal process of coining equivalents. Their function, however, cannot be viewed in isolation from the broader sociolinguistic dynamics that shape terminology adoption. Rather than adopting a prescriptive stance on the success or failure of French linguistic policy in this domain, this survey approaches the phenomenon as an observer of a distinctive case—one that remains unparalleled in other linguistic contexts. The French language may not always prevail in resisting Anglicisation, particularly in the fast-paced, innovation-driven field of IT. Nevertheless, the determination to craft and promote French alternatives reflects a deeply rooted cultural commitment to the maintenance of linguistic heritage. It is precisely this tension—between global linguistic convergence and local linguistic resilience, and between the practical ease of adopting Anglicisms and the enduring cultural attachment to protecting the French language—that renders the French experience both distinctive and intellectually compelling.

Our findings underscore the unique challenges French faces as it strives to preserve its linguistic identity in a globalised world. English's influence is not solely a product of cultural hegemony but also reflects its role as the lingua franca of innovation. New concepts and terms in IT often emerge in English first, with native alternatives developed later, if at all. This lag, combined with the global nature of IT, where English is universally understood, often leaves French equivalents feeling cumbersome or less intuitive. For example, while terms like *courriel* for *email* or *matériel* for *hardware*

exist, students overwhelmingly favour their English counterparts, reflecting the linguistic and practical realities of the IT sector.

A key methodological contribution of this survey lies in its innovative approach, combining a two-phase questionnaire with a comparative analysis of Standard French and Quebec French terminologies. This dual focus not only provided a temporal dimension to observe changes in familiarity and preference but also highlighted regional linguistic differences. The findings confirm a consistent preference for English terms, illustrating the enduring dominance of Anglicisms such as *blog* and *cloud*. Notably, students showed marked resistance to adopting extended periphrastic equivalents, such as *zone d'accès sans fil* for *hotspot* and *logiciel malveillant* for *malware*, favouring instead more concise or internationally recognisable forms. By contrast, terms like *télécharger* for *download*, *pare-feu* for *firewall*, and the Quebec-origin *pourriel* for *spam* demonstrate that functional clarity, semantic precision, and cultural resonance can foster the successful integration of French alternatives. As Kramsch (1998, pp. 44–46) observes, language is inextricably tied to cultural identity, and in this context, the adoption or rejection of certain terms reflects the interplay between linguistic adaptation and the sociocultural values of the speech community, even within a highly specialised field like IT.

Although the survey is based on a relatively modest sample size of 68 participants, the targeted focus on IT students—frequent users of both English and French terminology—offers valuable insights into the dynamics of language usage in a specialised IT context. The stability of these findings over time validates the robustness of the initial results and highlights the deeply ingrained linguistic habits among the surveyed demographic.

Future research could expand this analysis by investigating other demographic groups and professional contexts to examine whether similar trends are observed. In an ideal scenario, the specialised community and standardising authorities would reach a consensus and adopt a designation that meets both linguistic and practical needs, particularly in light of the students' expressed support for protecting the French language. However, as this survey and other cases suggest, the communicative priorities of experts and users do not always align with the preferences of language planning institutions. This divergence helps explain why Anglicisms often persist, despite the availability of officially sanctioned French equivalents. Additionally, comparisons across linguistic corpora could validate these findings and provide a richer understanding of how French responds to the demands of a transnational sphere of communication. As the English language continues to dominate the sphere of technological innovation, the tension between maintaining linguistic distinctiveness and embracing practical communication tools remains a critical area of study. Ensuring that proposed French equivalents combine conceptual accuracy with cultural and linguistic resonance will be key to fostering their integration into everyday usage.

References

Académie française. *Mission de l'Académie française*. Académie française [online]. https://www.academie-francaise.fr (accessed 15 July 2025).

Bouchard, P. (2002). *L'aménagement linguistique du français au Québec*. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.

Cajolet-Laganière, H., & D'Amico, S. (2014). Le traitement des emprunts critiqués à l'anglais dans le *Dictionnaire de la langue française : Le français vu du Québec (FVQ)*. In W. Remysen (Ed.), *Les français d'ici : Du discours d'autorité à la description des normes et des usages* (pp. 141–162). Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.

Candel, D., & Humbley, J. (2017). *Les anglicismes : Entre réalité linguistique et fait culturel*. Paris, France: Le Monde/Garnier.

Chansou, M. (1984). L'aménagement linguistique du vocabulaire scientifique et technique en France. In B. Quemada (Ed.), *La néologie dans les langues romanes* (pp. 277–286). Paris: Didier Érudition.

Commission d'enrichissement de la langue française. *Présentation de la Commission d'enrichissement de la langue française*. Ministère de la Culture [online]. https://www.culture.gouv.fr/Sites-thematiques/Langue-francaise-et-langues-de-France (accessed 15 July 2025)

Crystal, D. (2012). *English as a global language* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139196970.

Délégation générale à la langue française et aux langues de France (DGLFLF). *Principes et critères de création terminologique*. Ministère de la Culture [online]. https://www.culture.gouv.fr/Sites-thematiques/Langue-francaise-et-langues-de-France (accessed 13 July 2025).

Del Pino Romero, F. J. (2013) *Influencia del inglés sobre cuatro lenguas europeas: Anglicismos crudos y semánticos en francés, italiano, neerlandés y ruso*. Doctoral dissertation, Universidad de Valladolid [online]. https://doi.org/10.35376/10324/3573 (accessed 7 June 2025).

Di Spaldro, J., Auger, P., & Ladouceur, J. (2010). Le calque technoscientifique. *Neologica. Revue internationale de néologie*, 4, 163–178.

Dubuc, R. (2002). *Manuel de la terminologie* (3rd ed.). Montréal: Linguatech.

Dury, P. (2012). *La néologie terminologique en question(s)*. Rennes: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.

Elchacar, M. (2022). *Le modèle québécois de lutte aux anglicismes : une approche « mur-à-mur » ? Espaces Linguistiques*, (4). https://doi.org/10.25965/espaces-linguistiques.466 (accessed 13 September 2025).

Faber, P., & L'Homme, M.-C. (2014). Lexical semantic approaches to terminology: An introduction. *Terminology, 20*(2), 143–150. https://doi.org/10.1075/TERM.20.2.01INT.

Fishman, J. A. (1991). *Reversing language shift: Theoretical and empirical foundations of assistance to threatened languages*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

FranceTerme. *Base de données terminologique officielle de la langue française*. [online]. https://franceterme.culture.fr (accessed 11 July 2025).

Fugger, H. (1979). Sociolinguistique et terminologie officielle : le cas des anglicismes en France. *Langue Française*, 43(1), 78–89. https://doi.org/10.3406/lfr.1979.5405.

García, L., & García-Sánchez, S. (2020). Anglicisms in the field of IT (GitHub and 3D Slicer): Multilingual evidence from European languages (French, German, Italian, Portuguese and Spanish). *Erasmus Research Journal for Social and Economic Studies*, 41, 143–171. https://doi.org/10.24197/ersjes.41.2020.143-171.

Grand dictionnaire terminologique (GDT). *Office québécois de la langue française*. [online]. https://gdt.oqlf.gouv.qc.ca (accessed 11 July 2025).

Gouadec, D. (2007). *Translation as a profession*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/btl.73.

Holeš, J. (2024). Quels termes pour communiquer ? Autour des néologismes officiels dans le domaine de la communication sur *FranceTerme*. *Çedille. Revista de Estudios Franceses*, (25), 421–440. https://doi.org/10.25145/j.cedille.2024.25.16.

Humbley, J. (2009). Présentation. Terminologie : orientations actuelles. *Revue française de linguistique appliquée*, XIV(2), 5-8. https://doi.org/10.3917/rfla.142.0005.

Journal officiel de la République française. *Vocabulaire de l'informatique et de l'internet*. 9 December 2018 [online]. https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr (accessed 13 July 2025).

Kim, M. (2017). *Variation terminologique en francophonie. Élaboration d'un modèle d'analyse des facteurs d'implantation terminologique* [Doctoral dissertation, Université Paris-Sorbonne]. HAL. https://theses.hal.science/tel-01859665v1 (accessed 14 September 2025).

Kramsch, C. (1998). *Language and culture*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Labelle, H. (2017). Le traitement métalexicographique des anglicismes au Québec, de 1988 à 2015. *Cahiers de lexicologie*, 110(1), 77–94.

Lamontagne, D. (1996). *Le traitement lexicographique des anglicismes dans les dictionnaires généraux du français québécois*. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.

Lazarev, A. (2017). Anglicisms in French Vocabulary in the Early 21st Century. *Journal of History Culture and Art Research* 6(6):187. https://doi.org/10.7596/taksad.v6i6.1340.

Léopold, J. (2017). Sommes-nous [réellement] envahis par les anglicismes ? Deux décennies d'anglicismes / Is the French language [really] invaded by Anglicisms? Two decades of French Anglicisms. *Lengas. Revue de sociolinguistique*, (82). https://doi.org/10.4000/lengas.5200 (accessed 13 September 2025).

Légifrance. *Décret n° 72-19 relatif à l'enrichissement de la langue française*. [online]. https://www.legifrance.gouv.fr/loda/id/JORFTEXT000000378502.

Le Petit Robert. *Dictionnaire Le Petit Robert de la langue française.* Anglicisme. [online]. https://dictionnaire.lerobert.com (accessed 16 July 2025).

Larousse. *Dictionnaire de français*. Anglicisme. [online]. https://www.larousse.fr/dictionnaires/francais/anglicisme (accessed 15 July 2025).

Maillet, A. (2016). *Langue et légitimité : La norme linguistique au Québec*. Québec: Presses de l'Université Laval.

Mudrochova, R., Lazar, J., & Hirsch, F (2024). L'emploi des anglicismes de la mode et les recommandations officielles : étude des usages basée sur des outils linguistiques. *Romanica Wratislaviensia*, 71, 211–224. https://doi.org/10.19195/0557-2665.71.14.

Office de la langue française. (1994). *La situation des anglicismes au Québec*. Montréal: Gouvernement du Québec.

Office québécois de la langue française (OQLF). *Loi 101 : Charte de la langue française*. [online]. https://www.oqlf.gouv.qc.ca (accessed 12 July 2025).

Pergnier, M. (1989). *L'emprunt linguistique*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

QS World University Rankings. (n.d.). *Top universities for computer science and IT*. Retrieved July 15, 2025, frQS World University Rankings. *Top universities for computer science and IT*. [online]. https://www.topuniversities.com (accessed 28 July 2025).

Rey, A. (2010). *Dictionnaire historique de la langue française* (4th ed.). Paris: Le Robert.

Rey-Debove, J., & Gagnon, R. (1990). *Les anglicismes : Traitement dans les dictionnaires*. Paris: Le Robert.

Sager, J. C. (2000). Pour une approche fonctionnelle de la terminologie. In H. Béjoint & P. Thoiron (Eds.), *Le sens en terminologie* (pp. 40–60). Lyon: Presses universitaires de Lyon.

Schmidt, C. (2003). Vocabulaire général, vocabulaires techniques et scientifiques. In W. Forner & B. Thörle (Eds.), *Manuel des langues de spécialité* (pp. 49–66). Berlin: De Gruyter.

Science and Media Museum. (n.d.). *A short history of the internet*. [online]. https://www.scienceandmediamuseum.org.uk/objects-and-stories/short-history-internet (accessed 22 July 2025).

Seidlhofer, B. (2004). Research perspectives on teaching English as a lingua franca. *Annual Review of Applied Linguistics*, 24, 209–239. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0267190504000145.

Théoret, M. (1994). La situation des anglicismes au Québec. In *Actes du Colloque sur les anglicismes et leur traitement lexicographique (Magog, 24-27 septembre 1991)* (pp. 79–92). Montréal: Office de la langue française. between Seidlhofer and World Wide Web Consortium.

World Wide Web Consortium (W3C). (n.d.). *Technical standards for web development*. [online]. https://www.w3.org (accessed 28 July 2025).