FRENCH LANGUAGE INTERFERENCE IN ENGLISH FOR SPECIFIC PURPOSES USE: INTERLINGUAL ERRORS AMONG ELECTRONICS AND AUTOMATION STUDENTS

Naima Khetir [1]
Higher School in Applied Sciences. Tlemcen (Algeria)
naima.khetir@essa-tlemcen.dz

Abstract: This study examines the influence of the French language on the use of English for Specific Purposes (ESP) among engineering students. ESP learners are increasingly in need of English performance at both written and oral levels. Hence, French, a means of instruction, can have an impact on the English language practice. Therefore, the French language interference can occur in different English language use situations. This work sheds some light on interference errors that occur among sixty-nine engineering students while dealing with English in class. It also focuses on the possible frequency of interference misuse. This study was based on discovery approach. To tackle this issue, participants were asked to read a series of words while being recorded and were required to spot mistakes in items that contained grammatical, orthographic as well as lexical errors. A chart was designed to compare the frequency and the type of mistakes in both oral (phonological) and written forms. The analysis of the results showed that the students made a significant number of interference errors at different levels stated above. The lexical test registered the highest number of non-identification of errors. Hence, the role of the French language interference in ESP learning is considered rather facilitative for Algerian students.

Keywords: English for Specific Purposes; French instruction; Interference errors, Algerian students.

How to cite the article :

Khetir, N. (2025). French Language Interference in English for Specific Purposes Use: Interlingual Errors among Electronics and Automation Students. *Journal of Studies in Language, Culture, and Society (JSLCS)8*(2), 435-451.

---

[1] **Corresponding author:** Naima Khetir   **ORCID ID:** https://orcid.org/0009-0005-0663-2310

1. Introduction

Bilingualism in the Algerian education implements the interaction of two linguistic systems that generate the influence of a first foreign language, in this study French as a means of instruction, on second foreign language which is English for Specific Purposes. At the same time, the proximity between both languages is a key factor in the intensity of linguistic influence, which gives rise to possible interference errors. *Interference* is a linguistic phenomenon resulting from the contact of two or more languages. Interference impact is explored on the basis of contrastive analysis as regards the rule of transfer in language learning and language use (Lado, 1957). Lado believes that differences between two languages are interrelated with the degree of difficulty. In other words, the contrastive analysis is based on similarities between languages, as language teaching explores this field of information found to be useful to predict possible interference errors. Lado's view leads to the comparison of phonology, grammar and vocabulary, and analysed ways in which such procedures involve relevant data to syllabus and materials design.

The process of learning the second foreign language passes, according to Trubetzkoy (1939) in the principles of phonology, through the "phonological grid" of the already learned language. This performance is considered to be inevitable during the learning of a second foreign language as a result of interference phenomenon described by linguists, such as Weinreich in his book Languages in Contact (1953). He explains that the interference requires at least two languages in contact.

As Weinreich (1953) and Haugen (1953) started working on modern contact linguistics; the study of individual bilingualism and of societal multilingualism has gained prominence in this field of research (Dörnyei, 2001). Interaction of language systems due to bilingualism gives rise to alterations in the norms of either language that occur in the speech of bilingual individuals (St John, 2010). This phenomenon can manifest in both oral and written speeches (Hornberger, 2010 & Sinha, 2009), this can take place at all levels of the linguistic system, i.e. in phonology, morphology, syntax, semantics, pragmatics, and the lexicon (Boukhentache, 2024) .

Status of French and English in Algeria

French is widely used in different contexts in Algeria, like banks, business, media and higher studies. The French colonisation of Algeria, which lasted for over a century from 1830 to 1962, had a profound impact on the Algerian linguistic features even after independence in 1962. Therefore, French continues to have an important presence in Algerian social and educational life, it is taught since primary school (Mammeri, 2018). Hence, it is considered as a lingua franca and is commonly used by the elite (Benrabah, 2007).

Moreover, English has increased remarkably in the Algerian context, offering a larger status, and the government has lately supported it. English has become the most competitive language in the world involving various factors such as its global reach, economic influence, cultural significance. This language gives access to various purposes throughout the world. In fact, English has the status of a second foreign language (FL) after French as this FL2 is considered as the benchmark of globalisation (Sharifian, 2009; Senouci & Gacem, 2024)).

Algeria considers English -together with French- as a means for knowledge acquisition and scientific progress, and as tools giving access to the people and culture that these foreign languages represent (Journal Officiel, 2008). Thus, the teaching of foreign languages is now part of the curriculum in all schools throughout the country (Selama, 2021). The purpose of such procedure is to accomplish two main objectives: socio-cultural objectives and educational objectives. Therefore, both English for Specific Purposes (ESP) and French

enhance communication in different situations and provide learners with the necessary instruction needed to get access to technical and scientific fields (Gollin-Kies et al., 2015).

ESP provides particular vocabulary and skills by involving students in basic language skill practices which are: listening, speaking, reading and writing. It is assumed that English for science and technology encompasses scientific English texts that require combined effect of clusters of features (Arias-Contreras & Moore, 2022). The relations of these features throughout linguistic patterns and vocabulary of science or technology should not be considered as separate from the field of study that students encounter.

1.2 Contrastive Analysis

Fries (1945) and Lado (1957) discussed the learning of different languages through a comparison of their respective linguistic systems. They set out a comparison of the language systems present in teaching/learning contexts in order to identify both similarities and differences. This is known as contrastive analysis (CA) that leads to predicting what, from the L1, can be transferred without difficulty when using a new language (Mehlhorn, 2007). The L1 thus becomes a filter for the acquisition of the L2. Subsequently, linguists proposed to predict interference patterns which, according to them, would make it possible to avoid and correct errors.

For instance, French and English share common criteria while remarkable differences can be detected. French is a Romance language, however, English is a Germanic language. Moreover, one of the main differences between French and English lies in their grammar and sentence structure. Subsequently, French sentences often follow Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) structure, while English predominantly uses Subject-Verb-Object (SVO) structure (Russell, 1986). This difference can mislead when proceeding in translation between the two languages (Ijaz, 1985). Furthermore, verb tense may change, word order is structured differently, and noun agreement and noun-gender agreement rules are not the same.

French and English have hundreds of cognates (words that look and/or are pronounced alike in the two languages), including true cognates with similar meanings, false cognates with different meanings, and semi-false cognates—some similar and some with different meanings (Jerome et al., 2022; Barbora, 2023). An example of difference is the position of direct pronoun objects, which are placed before the verb in French "l' animal le mange" but after the verb in English "the animal eats it". English learners of French are more likely to say "l' animal mange le" than French learners of English would say "the animal it eats". SOV order is not used in English and so is less available to follow the word order of the native language (Lightbown & Spada 2006, p.79).

Generally speaking, language errors can be classified according to: a. Linguistic levels (i.e., pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary, and style), b. form (e.g., omission, insertion, and substitution), c. type (systematic errors/errors in competence vs. occasional errors/errors in performance), d. cause (e.g., interference, interlanguage), e. norm vs. system and f. modality (i.e., level of proficiency in speaking, writing, listening speaking). Researchers consider L1 interference as the most influential aspect that has an impact on L2 pronunciation as well as writing. For instance, one confusion between the two phonetic systems, that of English and that of French, is the absence of the four nasal vowels like / $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ /, / $\tilde{\operatorname{œ}}$ /, / $\tilde{\operatorname{ɔ}}$ /, / $\tilde{\operatorname{ɑ}}$ / in English. Unlike English, vowels in French are not reduced to schwa /ə/ and /ɪ/, and syllables tend to be open (Griffiths, 2014). In some cases, ESP learners make more phonetic errors than students of English and the French accent is often present in their sentences.

Interference of French in English errors are commonly found in Algerian learners' written and spoken English language. This can be highlighted as follows:

a)*Overgeneralisation* while applying the foreign language rules (where most of 'intralingual' errors are made) the learner tries to set up rules which predict how the different patterns are organised, however, the student's predictions are wrong, may be because of two underlying reasons: *a*- an exception to the general rule or because *b*- a new category and rule must be designed. In the two cases, the learner's initial error is due to overgeneralization of the rule which causes the wrong prediction. When overgeneralisation occurs, it is his/her previous knowledge of the foreign language that the learner uses. For instance, the use of "s" of plural form with the first item in noun-noun compound like in *books shop*. Lee & Choi (2001) puts forward the following classification of learner errors:

b) *Grammatical (morphosyntactic) errors* where the need for grammatical accuracy in both speech and writing are emphasised. This may inhibit communication but errors at the sentence level often contain performance "mistakes" that can be considered inappropriate.

c)*Phonologically-induced errors* appear in wrong pronunciation and/or intonation; in the case of English learning, errors of this sort require time-based correction by teachers hearing mispronunciation with: vowel length, voiced and voiceless last consonants, word stress, etc., that can change meaning as it is the case with: *live/leave, ship/sheep, import(n)* and *import(v)*, and so on. More examples can be stated: The initial 'h' is not pronounced, e.g.: *hemisphere* [`emisfiə] instead of [`hemisfiə], *hotel* [o`tel] instead of [həu`tel], etc. Occasionally, the non-initial [h] sound is also omitted, as in *alcohol* [`alkool]. In French, the letter 'h' is always silent. 2. The 'u' vowel is pronounced [y] in French like in 'tu' or 'rue' so learners keep this utterance in English and say for example: /fytʃər/ for 'future' instead of /fjʊtʃə/ (Angel & Blais, 2024).

d) *Orthographic interference* happens when writing words, students misspell the terms written in English and employ the French one instead. The following examples can illustrate such alteration: 1-The addition of an extra 'e' at the end of words, e.g.: *develope instead of develop, groupe* instead of *group*, etc. 2-The adoption of a French suffix such as *–ique,* e.g.: *electrique* instead of *electric, automatique* instead of *automatic* (Alenezi, 2024).

e) *Lexical interference Lexical errors* are kinds of errors related to the other linguistic levels which may also inhibit communication and intelligibility. This can be represented by the borrowing of French words which may sound natural in English. Learners who have French at their disposal tend to use French words in order to fill in the existing gaps in their knowledge of English vocabulary, e.g.: *langues* instead of *languages, library* instead of *bookshop, parking* instead of *car park ect.* This is clearly exemplified in 'false friends', e.g.: *abuse* means *insulter* in French and not abuser; in English *take advantage of, accommodate* means *loger* and not *accommoder* which means in English *prepare* (Nana et al., 2022).

f) *Grammatical interference* FL1 influences FL2 in terms of word order, use of pronouns and determiners, tense and plural: French can influence word order by placing adjectives after nouns in noun phrases (Ijaz, 1985). In French, most adjectives go after the word they modify. e.g.: a *condition disturbing* instead of *a disturbing condition, computer expensive* instead of *expensive computer etc.* The use of 's' of the plural is utilised in French in compound nouns like *computers shop instead of computer shop.* Another kind of grammatical interference case from French to English is also the use of a different tense or verb form. e.g.: *He have a course today* or *he has gone yesterday* and the wrong use of the relative pronoun. e.g.: *Here is the man which you told me about* or *the people which arrived.*

2. Research Methodology

2.1 Research Questions

This study provides an analysis of different linguistic errors that interference engenders in this type of adult education. First, it should be noted that our informants are learners present in the author's courses, so that the access to practical observations is made possible. Hence, two research questions are raised:

Research question1:

How does French interfere with English in the learners' performance?

Research question2:

What kind of interference errors are frequently committed?

2.2 Participants

Participants in this study were sixty-nine aged between twenty-two and twenty-five. They are enrolled in studying Electronics and Automation branches[2] (El Watan, 2023). As mentioned above the students are already acquainted with the linguistic system of French since primary school and the modules dealt within their higher education are taught in this medium. Furthermore, English[3] is studied since middle schooling as a second foreign language (seven years) before being learned as a module (cf. 1.1).

2.3 Research Design

The present study consists of testing students learning Automation and Electronics engineering in fourth year in Superior School[4] in Applied Sciences in Algeria. All modules are technical and learned in French[5] , in addition, English for specific purposes is taught once a week one hour and a half. Discovery research method was adopted to analyse two tests that were addressed to the participants to investigate the influence of French as FL1 on the learning of English as FL2. This study is carried out in two steps: data collection and data evaluation. The first one is to ask participants to read a list of words that are recorded, and to answer questionnaires. The second step is to analyse the answers of the students.

2.4 Data Collection and Analysis

The present study is based on a survey conducted with engineering students as explained above. The sixty-nine participants read a series of words and were recorded everyone at one time. In addition, another paper that contained a series of sentences having various written interference errors was provided. The author who is the usual teacher asked the learners to spot the mistakes and correct them and explained that this was not a test but just a simple everyday exercise that students can do at home in order to avoid anxiety and confusion. The selection of students was based on average proficiency level for both foreign languages (French and English). The participants were given enough time (two hours) so that they give answers without being embarrassed.

The provided statements are clarified in the tables in the appendices:

---

[2] English is used as the language of instruction for scientific branches since 2023. (elwatan-dz.com/enseignement-superieur-introduction-officielle-de-langlais-dans-le-cursus-universitaire)

[3] English has recently been introduced in primary schooling: 3rd year. (elwatan-dz.com/decision-prise-lors-du-conseil-des-ministres-vers-lenseignement-de-langlais-des-le-primaire)

[4] This school is evaluated as university where students become engineers in different fields after five years' study. (http://www.essa-tlemcen.dz/en/)

[5] French is taught as a foreign language in Algeria since primary schooling. The other subjects are taught in Arabic. (Official newspaper p.7, 2008)

3. Results and Discussion

Learners' corpora were collected by means of written questionnaires and speech sounds were recorded. Sixty-nine students, male and female, who study electronics and automation, participated in this investigation. They all learned French as a subject in primary school, secondary school and are exposed to the learning of different technical modules taught in French. English has been learned as a second foreign language from 1st year in middle school (4 years), later in higher studies ESP is taught as a module, 1hour and a half per week. Thus, interference errors are expected among the participants who are not supposed to be familiar with syntactic, orthographic as well as phonological structures of English mainly. Thus, according to the stated framework, interference manifestations representing multiple errors were detected and explained by following these sections:

  a- **Patterns of Phonological Interference**
  b- **Patterns of Orthographic Interference**
  c- **Patterns of Grammatical Interference**
  d- **Patterns of Lexical Interference**

a-**Patterns of Phonological Interference** contains errors represented in mispronunciation of given speech sounds. In this test, 21 words were presented, read loudly and recorded. So, interference errors were detected as far as: short and long vowels, diphthongs, triphthong as well as consonants are concerned. The mispronunciation of English speech sounds is due to inattentive consideration of sound combination (Angel & Blais, 2024). Thus, some students find it easier to use the French pronunciation with which they are familiar, being first foreign language learning. Interference error scores rose significantly when expecting vowels such as: /æ/ in words: *anti-virus*, /ʌ/ in *front*. Remarkably enough, error scores varied when students uttered *international* and *syntax*, in fact, they seemed to be more aware of /ɪ/ sound in the first word as 63% pronounced it correctly. The sound /ə/ in *existence*, *develop, system, adult* and /ɑ:/ in *example* registered lower error scores. Utterances such as /ʌ/, /ɑ:/and /ə/ are not used in French, so in some cases students believe that making use of French speech sounds /ɑ̃/, /ɛ̃/, /ɔ̃/, /y/ are accepted (Pyun. In Mehlhorn, 2007) (see Tables 2 and 6). When the written vowel is equivalent to a speech sound in both French and English, learners tend to utter it as it is heard in French like *y* /I/ in *electricity* and *o* /ɔ/ in *work*. Some learners seem to perceive diphthongs differently, higher score of mispronunciation is registered in /aɪ/*identity*; however, /jʊ/ *future* registered the lowest score. The other words: /aɪ/ *microscope*, /jʊ/ *nuclear* and /aɪ/ *classified* had average error utterances. Participants tend to be conscious when pronouncing triphthong /aiə/ in *science as* only 7% was recorded. Most of learners appear to perceive written syllable 'tion' appropriately when uttering it correctly. Nonetheless, 'ch' written form seem to influence participants to make use of the French form as 40% mispronounced *chemistry,* similarly, 'h' is silent in French, so 55% of students made use of the French pronunciation. These utterance errors imply that many participants are affected by the French sound system. Results demonstrate that most of foreign L2 learners tend to emphasise on spelling or contextual understanding rather than on deliberate attention to accurate pronunciation of the target language speech sounds (cf. Table5).

Table 5.

Phonological Interference Errors

Speech sounds			
English short vowel	French interference representation	Total	Relative percentage
/æ/	/ɑ̃/	50	72%
/ʌ/	/ɔ̃/	61	88%
/ɪ/	/ɛ̃/	25	36%
		57	82%
	/ɛ/	4	5%
/ə/	/ɑ̃/	7	10%
	/ɔ/	3	4%
		43	62%
	/ɛ/	3	4%
	/y/	31	44%
English long vowel	French interference representation	Total	Relative percentage
/ɛ :/	/ɔ/	21	30%
/a:/	/ɑ̃/	5	7%
English Diphthong	French interference representation	Total	Relative percentage
/ai/	/i/	49	71%
		34	49%
		14	20%
/jʊ/	/y/	15	21%
		5	7%
English Triphthong	French interference representation	Total	Relative percentage
/aiə/	/iɑ̃/	5	7%
English Consonant	French interference representation	Total	Relative percentage
/k/	/ʃ/	28	40%
/h/	silent /h/	38	55%
/ʃ/	/s/	4	5%
	/s/	3	4%

b-Patterns of Orthographic Interference revealed frequency interference errors as expected and scores varied from item to item depending on participants' consciousness of correct spelling (Lee & Choi, 2001; Alenezi, 2024). Higher scores were registered with final word errors including: Misuse of 'e' like in *groupe, demande,* instead of *group demand,* and mistakes with the words *eventuel, humain, institut, mathematician,* instead of *eventual, human, institute, mathematician.* The other spelling mistakes had average percentages suggesting that interference criteria are ingrained in ESP students' minds who use French orthography as a reference to deal with the English written form. Thus, misuse of middle letters showed higher scores in words: *confort, medicine* and *departement,* instead of *comfort, medicine, department.* Average percentages were recorded with the other spelling mistakes referring to omission of

double 'n' in *dinner*, alteration of 'a' with 'o' in *damage*, misuse of double 'p' in *development* (see Table 6).

Table 6.

Orthographic Interference Errors

Final word error frequencies	Total	Relative Percentage
Misuse of final 'e'	52	75%
	38	55%
	44	63%
	39	56%
	34	49%
Misuse of final 'ic'	19	27%
	19	27%
Misuse of final 'gy'	33	47%
	38	55%
Misuse of final 'ive'	36	52%
Misuse of final 'ual'	42	60%
Misuse of final 'an'	41	59%
Misuse of final 'tute'	54	78%
Misuse of final 'cian'	47	68%
Middle word error frequencies	Total	Relative Percentage
Middle 'p'	15	21%
Middle 'om'	67	97%
Middle 'i'	57	82%
Middle 'a'	32	46%
Middle 'tment'	56	81%
Double 'n'	45	65%

c-Patterns of Grammatical Interference Participants have been exposed to the learning of French grammar first, then the English one, interestingly enough, French and English grammar systems are found of overlap to some extent. Both languages, for instance, share structures such as auxiliaries, compound tenses, participles, active/passive, adverbs, affixation. Nevertheless, the way in which meanings are encoded into wordings in the English language can create interference manifestations in the production of English grammar (see Table 4). As it was hypothesised, (Lee & Choi, 2001), an important number of grammatical mistakes were detected as illustrated in table 7.

1) Verb tenses have common patterns in both French and English, yet tenses describe different temporal concepts implying different references, either in French or English. In many cases, a speaker can perceive a given verb tense aspect and its purpose as appropriate in both foreign languages. The wrong choice of tense emerged involving the misuse of past simple in *I played tennis yesterday* and mistake with present continuous in *I can't play now. I'm doing my homework*. The highest percentage (92%) was registered with present perfect use that was detected in *I have lived in London since last year*. Another faulty sentence containing wrong use of future with subordinating conjunction 'as soon as' was visualized in, *I will tell you as soon as I know*. Even though

there exist external similarities of verb position in both French and English, there are frequent occasions when French uses a different verb to convey a particular meaning. The following faulty sentences were recorded: Use of 'have' instead of 'am' in *I am 23 years* and in *I have fear*.

2) In spite of the fact that English and French share the same basic parts of speech, there are numerous differences in the word order of questioning as well as adjective and adverb positions. For example, incorrect adjective position (78%) in *I do preferred tasks*. Similarly, error in placing adverb (84%) like in *I sometimes play golf*, wrongly positioned quantifier (71%) in *I have eaten too much* and lower score (37%) mentioned with false position of superlative in *It was the best film I have seen*. Misuse of word order in questioning was also registered marking an average percentage (50%), in *do you know what time is it?*

3) Article use imply similar but not identical role in French and English. Thus, remarkable differences arise in many occasions such as the article omission in English that students neglec in many cases, as average percentages were scored (47%, 50%, 66%) like in *this is John'car* and in *French is easier than English.* Nonetheless, in other instances the indefinite article 'a' is necessary which is not the case in French like in *he is a doctor* and in *what a stupid thing to do* (More illustration is provided in table 7).

4) Pronouns in the English language replace nouns and function like a noun that they substitute in a sentence, moreover, the neutral pronoun 'it' does not have an equivalent in French. Pronouns in the French language are based on the gender of the noun they are associated with and the possessive adjectives agree with the nouns they qualify. Therefore,learners are confused while using pronouns in English in many cases. The highest percentage was recorded with the misuse of the pronoun 'her' instead of 'his' (65%) in, *I met John and his wife at the meeting* and omission of 'it' (46%, 37%) in *do you like my umbrella? It was very cheap*.

5) Adjectives agree with the nouns that they modify in French, unlike English adjectives that serve as modifiers but do not agree with nouns. Furthermore, compound nouns belong to this rule (except for specific cases). In fact, participants do not seem to be conscious that the 1st noun in a compound noun combination does not take plural's'. So, a high figure was registered (94%) showing that students could not identify the misuse of 's' plural in *we went to a shoes shop*.

Table 7.

Grammatical Interference Errors

Interference Error Type		Total	Relative Percentage
Misuse of tense	48		69%
	33		47%
	64		92%
	48		69%
Misuse of adjective position	54		78%
Misuse of adverb position	58		84%
Misuse of quantifier position	49		71%
Misuse of superlative position	26		37%
Misuse of gerund	27		39%
Misuse of Word order in questioning	35		50%
Misuse of article	19		27%
	33		47%
	46		66%
	35		50%
Misuse of pronoun	32		46%
	45		65%
	26		62%
Misuse of verb	43		62%
	63		91%
Misuse of adjective-noun agreement	65		94%

   e-Patterns of Lexical Interference French and English share a wide range of vocabulary items considered to be cognates. Cognates are generally defined as words which have a common origin and a similar or identical meaning. Thus, our participants associate meaning with written-based references that have already been acquired in 1st foreign language learning i.e., French (Nana et al., 2022) (see Table 5). Hence, interference errors are commonly committed when the learner transfer such lexical items from the 1st foreign language into the target language. As hypothesised (Ijaz, 1985), high scores were registered when identifying mistakes (see Table 8), so the following results were recorded:

1) **Verb Interference Error**
2) **Adverb Interference Error**
3) **Adjective Interference Error**
4) **Noun Interference Error**
5) **Phrase Interference Error**

Table 8.

Lexical Interference Errors

Interference Error Type	Total	Relative Percentage
Misuse of verb	58	84%
	68	98%
	38	55%
	56	81%
	67	97%
	66	95%
	68	98%
	64	92%
Misuse of adverb	62	89%
Misuse of adjective	63	91%
Misuse of noun	64	92%
	67	97%
	60	86%
	64	92%
	57	82%
	62	89%
	65	94%
	65	94%
Misuse of Phrase	66	95%
	60	86%

1)Verb Interference Error in this type of mistake students seemed to fail in identifying the wrongly used verbs (percentages ranged from 84% to 97%) like in *I work in order to ~~win~~[6] earn money, he got nearer to ~~approached~~ the desk, attend means to be present ~~or to be patient for a moment~~, he doesn't know ~~ignores~~ driving, the majority of second year students ~~passed~~ went to third year, we will ~~pass~~ take the exams next week, this house is inhabited ~~habited~~ since 1980.* Yet, an average percentage (55%) was registered with *to achieve means realise ~~or finish.~~*

2) Adverb Interference Error this mistake (89%) is connected with improper use of *actually means ~~nowadays or~~ really.*

3)Adjective Interference Error learners did not succeed to detect misuse (91%) in *sensible means reasonable ~~or fragile.~~*

4)Noun Interference Error contains mistakes with misplaced nouns representing high percentages (from82% to 97%) exemplified in cases like in *I got my ~~post~~ position in 2014, we buy books from the ~~library~~ book shop, 15 is my ~~note~~ mark in English, I am learning ~~economy~~ economics, there is a ~~changement~~ change in the timetable, we haven't got enough ~~material~~ equipment in the laboratory, my sister succeeded in her ~~license~~ bachelor in English.*

5)Phrase Interference Error participants could not identify wrongly written phrases (86% and 95%) like in *~~letter of motivation~~ cover letter and ~~good appetite~~ have a good dinner/lunch.*

---

[6] The wrongly used items are crossed out.

Erroneous use of cognate lexicons proves the negative influence of the FL1 lexis on the lexis of FL2 system. It is considered that FL1 influence on meaning of lexical units are subject to interference.

4. Conclusion

This paper contributes to understanding ESP learners' errors that can be categorised as expressive and receptive errors which are manifestations of expressive and receptive behaviour and depend upon knowledge of the "formation rules" of foreign language learning. Inadequate knowledge of these rules will therefore be manifested in mispronunciation and misuse of different written patterns. Commonly committed interference errors demonstrate a clear influence of foreign L1 learning (French) on foreign L2 learning (English). ESP students consider them as facilitative while teachers find them inhibitory. The present study brought, relatively, some clarification to the area of interference errors that occur in bilingual learning. This investigation focuses on the type and frequency of interference mistakes that learners make in their ESP leaning. Remarkably, language proficiency can contribute to consciousness-based elimination of errors, namely, our participants need to focus on both foreign languages correctness to have access to knowledge and technology. Possible future research could deal with deep analysis of Written Expression errors, related to meaning-focused input where learner's attention is on ideas rather than the form. Learners' dependence on proficiency level should be associated with both understanding and using foreign language effectively and appropriately.

References

Alenezi, M. (2024). The French influence on modern English orthography: A historical and linguistic analysis. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, *24*(4), 183–190. https://doi.org/10.36923/jicc.v24i4.914

Angel, A., & Blais, J. G. (2024). Evaluating the explanation inference of a high-stakes French listening test: An argument-based perspective. *The Canadian Modern Language Review*, *79*(2). https://doi.org/10.3138/cmlr-2021-0060

Arias-Contreras, C., & Moore, P. (2022). The role of English language in the field of agriculture: A needs analysis. *English for Specific Purposes*, *65*, 95–106.

Barbora, M. (2023). *L'interférence de l'anglais sur le français chez les apprenants tchèques du FL* [Licence thesis, Univerzita Karlova, Pedagogická fakulta].

Benrabah, M. (2007). The language planning situation in Algeria. In R. B. Kaplan & R. B. Baldauf Jr. (Eds.), *Language planning and policy: Africa, Vol. 2: Algeria, Côte D'Ivoire, Nigeria and Tunisia* (pp. 25–148). Multilingual Matters.

Boukhentache, S. (2024). Evaluating translation in the Algerian English language public school textbooks. *Journal of Studies in Language, Culture and Society*, *7*(3), 26–34. https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/261520

Décision prise lors du Conseil des ministres : Vers l'enseignement de l'anglais dès le primaire. (2022, June 6). *El Watan*. https://elwatan-dz.com/decision-prise-lors-du-conseil-des-ministres-vers-lenseignement-de-langlais-des-le-primaire

Dörnyei, Z. (2001). *Motivational strategies in the language classroom*. Cambridge University Press.

Enseignement supérieur : Introduction officielle de l'anglais dans le cursus universitaire. (2023, July 23). *El Watan*. https://elwatan-dz.com/enseignement-superieur-introduction-officielle-de-langlais-dans-le-cursus-universitaire

Fries, C. C. (1945). *Teaching and learning English as a foreign language*. University of Michigan Press.

Griffiths, M. (2014). A diachronic analysis of schwa in French. *NCUR Proceedings*. https://ncurproceedings.org/ojs/index.php/NCUR2014/article/viewFile/739/639

Gollin-Kies, S., Hall, D. R., & Moore, S. H. (2015). *Language for specific purposes*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Haugen, E. (1953). *The Norwegian language in America: A study of bilingual behavior*. University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hornberger, N. H. (2010). Language and education: A Limpopo lens. In N. H. Hornberger & S. L. McKay (Eds.), *Sociolinguistics and language education* (pp. 549–564). Multilingual Matters.

Ijaz, H. (1985). *Native language and cognitive constraints on the meaning ascribed to select English spatial prepositions by advanced adult second language learners of English* [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. University of Toronto.

Jerome, B., Glebova, Y. A., Voloshina, T. G., Blazhevich, Y. S., & Birova, J. (2022). Analyzing the effect of interference on the utilization of French in Ivory Coast: Social and linguistic aspects. *Revista de Investigaciones Universidad del Quindío*, *34*(S2), 13–19. https://doi.org/10.33975/riuq.vol34nS2.873

Journal officiel. (2008). Ministry of Interior.

Lado, R. (1957). *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. University of Michigan Press.

Lee, H. S., & Choi, J. E. (2001). Integrated language teaching through content-based storytelling. *The Korea Association of Primary English Education*, *7*(1), 133–157.

Lightbown, P. M., & Spada, N. (2006). *How languages are learned* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Mammeri, S. (2018). Language conflict in Algeria: From colonialism to post-independence [Review of the book]. *Journal of Studies in Language, Culture and Society*, *1*(1), 188–189. https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/144584

Mehlhorn, G. (2007). From Russian to Polish: Positive transfer in third language acquisition. In *16th International Congress of Phonetic Sciences* (pp. 1745–1748). Saarbrücken.

Nana, A., Gonga, G., Crasborn, O., & Omel, E. (2022). Interference: A case study of lexical borrowings in international sign interpreting. *International Journal of Multilingualism*, *21*(1), 169–188. https://doi.org/10.1080/14790718.2022.2074999

Russell, S. (1986). *Basic word order: Functional principles*. Croom Helm.

Selama, S. A. (2021). Students' attitudes towards autonomous learning in ESP context. *Journal of Studies in Language, Culture and Society*, *4*(1), 79–90. https://asjp.cerist.dz/en/article/161005

Senouci, M., & Gacem, M. (2024). English as a medium of instruction in Algerian higher education: Issues and new avenues. *Global Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, *14*(3), 186–200. https://doi.org/10.18844/gjflt.v14i3.9261

Sharifian, F. (2009). *English as an international language: Perspectives and pedagogical issues*. Multilingual Matters.

Sinha, A. (2009). Interference of first language in the acquisition of second language. *Journal of Psychology and Counseling*, 118–122.

St John, O. (2010). Bilingual lexical interillumination in the foreign language classroom. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, *23*, 199–218.

Trubetzkoy, N. (1939). *Grundzüge der Phonologie (TCLP 7)*. Jednota Československých matematiků a fysiků.

The World Book Encyclopedia. (1983). [Hardcover edition].

Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in contact: Findings and problems*. Mouton.

Appendices

Table 1.

Patterns of Phonological Interference

Phonological interference			
Words in English	Phonological transcription[7]	Words in French	Phonological transcription
1.identity	/aɪdentɪtɪ/	1.identité	/idɑ̃titɛ/
2.science	/saɪəns/	2.science	/siɑ̃s/
3.anti-virus	/æntɪvaɪrəs/	3.antivirus	/ɑ̃tiviʁys/
4.work	/wɛ :rk/	4.travail	/tʁavaj/
5.microscope	/maɪkrəskəʊp/	5.microscope	/mikʁoskɔp/
6.electricity	/elktrɪsɪtɪ /	6.electricité	/ɛlɛktʁɛsitɛ/
7.front	/frʌnt/	7.front	/fʁɔ̃t/
8.example	/ɪgzɑ:mpl/	8.exemple	/ɛgzɑ̃mpl/
9.chemistry	/kemɪstrɪ/	9.chimie	/ʃimi/
10.existence	/ɪgzɪstəns/	10.existence	/ɛgzistɑ̃s/
11.connection	/kənekʃən/	11.connexion	/kɔnɛksiɔ̃/
12. to develop	/dɪveləp/	12.developper	/dɛvlɔpɛ/
13.national	/næʃənəl/	13.national	/nasiɔnal/
14.system	/sɪstəm/	14.systéme	/sistɛm/
15.international	/ɪntənæʃəl/	15.international	/ɛ̃tɛʁnasiɔnal/
16.adult	/ædəlt/	16.adulte	/adylt/
17.syntax	/sɪntæks/	17.syntaxe	/sɛ̃taks/
18.classified	/klæsɪfaɪd/	18.classifié	/klasifiɛ/
19.nuclear	/njʊklɪə(r)/	19.nucléaire	/nyklɛeʁ/
20.future	/fjʊtʃə/	20.futur	/fytyʁ/
21.alcohol	/ælkəhəʊl/	21.alcool	/alkɔl/

---

[7] The phonetic transcription mentioned in the table is based on Received Pronunciation Reference.

Table 2.

Patterns of Orthographic Interference

Orthographic Interference		
Words containing orthographic errors	The words in English	The words in French
1.groupe	1.group	1.groupe
2. develope	2.develop	2. developper
3. developpement	3.development	3. developpement
4. confort	4.comfort	4. confort
5. medecine	5.medicine	5. medecine
6. to demande	6.to demand	6.demander
7. electrique	7.electric	7.éléctrique
8. technologie	8.technology	8.technologie
9. creatif	9.creative	9.créatif/ive
10. salade	10.salad	10.salade
11. soupe	11.soup	11.soupe
12. domage	12.damage	12.domage
13. departement	13.department	13.département
14. diner	14.dinner	14.diner
15. economique	15.economic	15.économique
16. eventuel	16.eventual	16.éventuel
17. mathematicien	17.mathematician	17.mathématicien
18. humain	18.human	18.humain
19. energie	19.energie	19.énergie
20. institut	20.institute	20.institut

Table 3.

Patterns of Grammatical Interference

Grammatical Interference		
Sentences containing errors	The correct sentence in English	The sentence in French
1. I **have** 23 years.	1. I am 23 years.	1. J'ai 23 ans.
2. I do tasks ***preferred***.	2. I do preferred tasks.	2. Je fais mes tâches préferées
3. I like ***read*** books.	3. I like reading books.	3. J'aime lire des livres.
4. I ***have played*** tennis yesterday.	4. I played tennis yesterday.	4. J'ai joué au tennis hier.
5. I can't play now. I ***do*** my homework.	5. I can't play now. I'm doing my homework.	5. Je ne peux pas jouer maintenant. Je fais mon devoir de maison.
6. I ***live*** in London since last year.	6. I have lived in London since last year.	6. Je vis à Londres depuis l'année derniére.
7. I will tell you as soon as I ***will*** know.	7. I will tell you as soon as I know.	7. Je te le dirai une fois le saurai.
8. I play ***sometimes*** golf.	8. I sometimes play golf.	8. Je joue quelques fois au golf.
9. I have ***too much*** eaten!	9. I have eaten too much.	9. J'ai trop mangé.
10. It was the film ***the best*** I have seen.	10. It was the best film I have seen.	10. C'était le meilleur film que j'ai vu.
11. Do you know what ***is the time?***	11. Do know what time is it?	11. Vous savez quelle heure il est ?
12. He is ***doctor.***	12. He is a doctor.	12. Il est medecin.
13. This is ***the*** John's car.	13. This is John's car.	13. C'est la voiture de John.
14. What ***stupid*** thing to do!	14. What a stupid thing to do!	14. Quelle stupide chose à faire.
15. ***The*** French is easier than ***the*** English.	15. French is easier than English.	15. Le français est plus facile que l'anglais.
16. Do you like my umbrella? ***He*** was very cheap.	16. Do you like my umbrella? It was very cheap.	16. Est-ce-que tu aimes mon parapluie. Il n'est pas cher.
17. I met John and ***her*** wife at the meeting.	17. I met John and his wife at the meeting.	17. J'ai rencontré John et sa femme à la réunion.
18. Technology is important, but ***she*** is expensive.	18. Technology is important but it is expensive.	18. La technologie est importante mais elle est chère.
19. We went to a ***shoes*** shop.	19. We went to a shoe shop.	19. Nous sommes partis à un magasin de chaussures.
20. I ***have*** fear.	20. I am afraid.	20. J'ai peur.

Table 4.

Patterns of Lexical Interference

Lexical Interference		
Sentences containing interference words	The words in English	The words in French
1. I work in order to **win** money.	1.earn	1. gagner
2. I got my **post** in 2014.	2. position	2. poste
3. We buy books from the **library**.	3. book-store	3. librairie
4. **Actually** means nowadays or really.	4. Actually means really	4. Actuellement=currently
5.Good **appetite**	5. Have a good lunch.	5. Bon appétit
6. He **approached** the desk.	6.He got nearer to the desk	6. Il s'est approché du bureau.
7. **Sensible** means: reasonableOr Fragile	7. Sensible means reasonable.	7. sensible= fragile
8. **To achieve** means: Realise or finish	8. To achieve means realise	8. Achever
9. 15 is my **note** in English.	9.15 is my mark in English.	9. A notice
10.**Attend** means:To be present Or To be patient for a moment	10. Attend means to be present.	10. Attendre
11. Our teacher asked us to write **a letter of motivation**.	11. cover letter	11. Lettre de motivation
12. I am learning **economy.**	12. Economics	12. Economie
13. He **ignores** driving. He never drives.	13. not know	13. ignorer
14. The majority of second year students **passed** to third year.	14. Passer	14. Go to
15. We will **pass** the exams next week.	15. Take	15. Passer
16. I remember many **souvenirs** of my grandmother.	16. Memories	16. Souvenirs
17. There is a **changement** in the timetable.	17. Change	17. Changement
18. We haven't got enough **material** in the laboratory.	18. Equipment	18. matériel
19. My sister succeeded in her **license** in English.	19. Bachelor	19. License
20. This house is **habited** since 1980.	20. Inhabited	20. Habiter