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French Government And Language

• Ministerial Terminology Commissions (1972-1995)
  
  • “Establishing, within a given sector, an inventory of lacunae in French vocabulary” (Prime Ministerial Decree 72-19)
  
  • “Proposing terms necessary for the designation of new realities or replacing undesirable borrowings from foreign languages” (Prime Ministerial Decree 72-19)

• Specialised and General Commissions for Terminology and Neologisms (1996-2015)

• Colleges of Experts (2015-present)
Terms have been recommended for nearly 50 years

Recommendations focus on terms that the everyman is susceptible of coming across in daily life

Do these recommendations lead to the terms being used more frequently?

Uncertain, due to lack of research
Early Implantation Studies

• Domains of genetic engineering, aerospatial remote sensing, health and medicine, advertising and audiovisual, aquaculture, education, legal terminology, automobile terminology, computing...

• Limited scope of languages and countries
What Factors Influence Implantation?

• Terminological factors
  
  • Brevity, proximity to English term, motivation, euphony, derivability, monosemy, neological process…

• Socioterminological factors
  
  • Connotation, business culture, type of discourse, response to real need, linguistic insecurity, resistance to change…

• Procedural factors
  
  • Involvement of experts, normative remarks accompanying terms, novelty of the concept, circulation of recommendations…

Based on Quirion 2000 (32-36), Quirion and Lanthier 2006 (112-116), Montané 2012 (85-110), Renwick 2018 (144-326)
Example: Fugger 1979


• Are interviewees’ attitudes towards terminology planning the same as those of the language/terminology planners?

• Can non-specialists understand the terms and definitions?

• Do people see the recommended terms and their competing terms as the same concept?

• Do interviewees intend to use terms?
What Do These Studies Measure?

- Declared usage of terms or real usage?
- Do they bring any statistical appreciation?
- Is usage of competing designations compared?
- Reproducible?
- Are their corpora created objectively?
Quirion (2000, 2003a,b)

• Without rigid guidelines Quirion sets out, implantation studies won’t be repeatable or objective

• For Quirion, any other researcher should be able to follow the same rules to create the same corpus and obtain the same results
Modern Implantation Studies

- Quirion’s model has been adopted, to some extent, in some 20 studies from 2000 to 2018
- Languages: Basque, Catalan, French (FR), French (QC), Italian, Turkish
- Domains: computing, urban development, winter sports, space science and technology
Modern Implantation Studies

- Quirion’s model has been adopted, to some extent, in some 20 studies from 2000 to 2018
- Languages: Basque, Catalan, French (FR), French (QC), Italian, Turkish
- Domains: computing, urban development, winter sports, space science and technology
- But implantation remains unstudied in many domains
Measuring Implantation

- Is implantation merely the use of a term?

- How embedded in usage does a term have to be to be *implanted*?
After x Occurrences?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occurrences</th>
<th>Term 1</th>
<th>Term 2</th>
<th>Term 3</th>
<th>Term 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Measuring Implantation

- The *Implantation Coefficient* (IC), (Quirion 2000: 129-30) is a calculation of relative use and compares the extent to which competing denominations are actually used in discourse.

- **IC > 0.75 = High; successful implantation**

- **0.25 > IC ≥ 0.75 = Medium; middling implantation**

- **IC ≤ 0.25 = Low; unsuccessful implantation**
Problems with the IC

• How to take account of use at the level texts and authors?

• If a term is used 100 times in 1 text and another term denoting another concept is used 50 times in each of 2 texts, which term is more implanted?

• Is a term used 100 times in 10 texts more implanted than a term used 50 times in 15 texts?
Problems with the IC

• Reliability of data
  
  • Suppose the term *streaming* is used twice in a corpus, and *en flux* is used once
  
  • Suppose *télécharger* is used 400 times in a corpus and *downloader* is used 200 times
  
  • *Streaming* and *télécharger* both have IC of 0.67
  
  • Yet the data retailing to *streaming/en flux* are much more subject to chance
What Type Of Text?

• Institutional texts, per Quirion (2000: 99) as this is the usage that terminological planning seeks to change and “when the intent is to modify the linguistic situation or to influence its development, the linguistic behaviour of institutions must be controlled” (Quirion 2003a: 30)

• Texts where use of terms is a legal requirement?
Renwick (2018a)

- Examining the implantation of recommended terms in Space Science and Technology
- Terms recommended between 2007 and 2015 as designations for 181 concepts
- 181 recommended terms + 691 competing designations = 872 terms, of which 235 attested in corpus
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Occ.</th>
<th>Relative frequency (Occ.)</th>
<th>Concepts evoked</th>
<th>Relative frequency (Concepts)</th>
<th>IC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Press</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>12/M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.57/M</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Reports</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>219/M</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.5/M</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Science</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>222/M</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7.47/M</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics from Renwick (2018 : 248-256)
What Type Of Text?

- Consultation of texts where use is optional can still show whether terminological development succeeds

- But this doesn’t allow for the scope that we can get when examining individual productions

- Also, when beyond English, texts are harder to come by in specialised domains
# What Type Of Text?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Occ.</th>
<th>Relative frequency (Occ.)</th>
<th>Concepts evoked</th>
<th>Relative frequency (Concepts)</th>
<th>IC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Press</td>
<td>417</td>
<td>12/M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0.57/M</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institutional Reports</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>219/M</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.5/M</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular Science</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>222/M</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7.47/M</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theses</td>
<td>6,076</td>
<td>304/M</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>3.55/M</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistics from Renwick (2018 : 248-256)
Objectivity vs Subjectivity

• Martin (1998: 54) “It is clear we have attempted to select terms we believe will be frequently used” (our translation)

• Chansou (1997: 138) “This group of [241] terms appears to us to be too vast and too heterogenous to allow for its use in our study” (our translation)

• Terminological corpus must also be compiled objectively, otherwise the study won’t be repeatable (Renwick 2018: 89-91)
Where Else To Look?

- Quirion (2000: 100-1) maintains that general dictionaries shouldn’t be part of an implantation study, due to:
  - Lexicographical biases
  - Editorial constraints
  - General dictionaries reflection of general language rather than specialised language
What Dictionaries Can Show

• Bias in favour of (or against) recommended terms?
• Are recommended terms present? As headwords?
• Do the dictionaries indicate their recommended status?
• What normative remarks are present?
• Do editorial constraints apply to electronic dictionaries?
• Necessity for decoding/encoding
• Determinologisation
A Gordian Knot?

- IC is useful but:

- Doesn’t take account of number of texts, authors, reliability and comparability of data

- How to numerically factor in presence in dictionaries?

- We need a way to combine these disparate but informative datapoints to generate a scale ranking of the implantation of a term
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