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One significant phenomenon regarding the internationalization of higher education around the world is the wider use of English as the “lingua franca” for research, scientific study, and graduate education. Germany has increased its English taught Master’s programs by 13 percent since 2011, second behind the Netherlands, with a total of 733 Master’s programs taught in English. The University of Hamburg in Hamburg, Germany, currently offers 18 English Master’s programs, 10 combined German/English Master’s programs, and one English doctoral program. This paper provides findings from interviews of faculty concerning the English programs. Three main themes emerged from the interviews: 1) faculty’s ambivalence concerning the use of English instead of German in graduate programs, 2) administration’s recent emphasis on the importance of faculty publishing in English for promotion and tenure, and 3) faculty interest in further increasing English programs in their graduate programs.
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INTRODUCTION

Internationalization efforts at universities worldwide are increasing at a rapid rate (Horta, 2009; Van der Wende, 2007). The reasons for this quick rise in internationalization of higher education include: 1) the rapid movement of information across borders (Bartell, 2003), 2) the want of cross-border resources (Bartell, 2003), 3) global competition (Bartell, 2003), and 4) cross border cooperation due to the merging of markets across borders caused by globalization (Enders, 2004). An outcome of such internationalization of higher education is the wider use of English as the “lingua franca” for research, scientific study, and graduate education (Altbach & Teichler, 2001; Horta, 2009; Van der Wende, 2007).

A country that is increasing its use of English in the teaching of its Masters courses is Germany (Brenn-White & Faethe, 2013), and, thereby, increasing the country’s number of international graduate students. As recently as 2005, Germany held a reserved view on the use of English in graduate education because of a desire to retain its German language cultural heritage (Luijtjen-Lub, Van der Wende, & Huissen, 2005). Additionally, in 2010, Chancellor Angela Merkel echoed a German jeremiad, repeated since Chancellor Helmut Schmidt, that Germany was not a land of immigration and that integration into German society via a total immersion of the German language in culture was the priority.
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(Williams, 2014). However, because of the advent of a loosening of integration and citizenship laws (Williams, 2014), a demand by international graduate students for quality higher education research (Luijten-Lub et al., 2005), and a population decline (Daley & Kulish, 2013), Germany has increased the number of English programs in its Masters programs by 42 percent since 2011 (Brenn-White & Faethe, 2013). Today, because of the more lenient laws, Germany is a country of immigration ranking second behind the US (Webb, 2014).

The University of Hamburg in Hamburg, is one of many universities in Germany that is delivering Masters programs in English. To determine why the university developed English-taught Masters and doctoral programs, a study was undertaken, with the research questions being:

1) How do faculty in the Masters and doctoral programs that use English for instruction perceive the use of English as opposed to using German in the programs at the University of Hamburg?
2) What is the specific goal of having these programs in English at the University of Hamburg?
3) What is the relationship between the German state and the University of Hamburg regarding the programs that use English for instruction?

This paper provides a review of the literature demonstrating that Germany’s “new” nationalism, or loosening of its citizenship and immigration laws could be impacting the English taught Masters and doctoral programs. The methods used to answer the research questions and findings from the research are described below.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE:

Reasons for internationalization of Universities

Bartell (2003, p. 51) identifies three reasons for the internationalization of universities worldwide:

1) Since information is moving at such a high rate between borders, higher education is in a position to mediate this information by providing for an “understanding through personal, cross-cultural, international, and shared experiences.”

2) Previously isolated communities are now aware of democratization and modernization and are demanding resources, recognition, independence, and universities are in a position to educate communities about each other.

3) Because of economic and political interdependence, such as free trade agreements and the standardization of academic norms, such as the Bologna Process in Europe, universities worldwide are feeling the impact of not only competition from other universities but also a reliance on shared partnerships and exchanges.

Enders (2004) describes how the contemporary university is a reflection of the specific nation-state that created it. However, Enders sees internationalization and globalization putting pressure on nations and, thus, on universities. He notes that internationalization refers to the “processes of greater cooperation between states, and consequently, to activities which take place across state borders” (p. 367). Globalization is seen as a “processes of increasing interdependence, and ultimately convergence of economies, and
to the liberalization of trade and markets” (p. 367). One such specific pressure on universities and the state related to both internationalization and globalization is the use of English as the language of research and communication. Similarly, Healy (2008) describes internationalization of universities as “driven by innovations in information and communication technologies and mass air travel and underpinned by the growing dominance of English as the common language of business, politics, and science” (p. 334).

**The role of English in the internationalization of Universities**

Altbach and Teichler (2001) note that universities worldwide are expanding their internationalization efforts because of:

1) a common academic model,  
2) an increasingly global marketplaces for students and staff,  
3) the use of English for research and teaching,  
4) an increase in distance learning and the use of the Internet for research and teaching,  
5) universities partnering with universities in other countries, and  
6) the “harmonization” of degrees, curriculum, etc. (p. 6).

Horta (2009) argues that top European research universities’ internationalization efforts involve recruiting more international students instead of undergraduates to maintain their research capacity, “scientific performance, and institutional reputation” (p. 390). He adds that European universities are also increasing their English speaking international faculty since English is the “lingua franca” for research. English is so important at these research universities that publishing in English in international journals and books “surpasses” non-English journals or books (p. 392).

Van der Wende (2007) similarly states that as more Organization of Economic Cooperation and Development states (OECD) continue to internationalize their higher education, English will be the “lingua franca” of undergraduate instruction as well as research and postgraduate studies regardless of the other languages spoken in those states (p. 276–7).

In a recent study by the Institute of International Education, European countries are expanding the number of programs they teach in English to reach a wider worldwide student body (Brenn-White & Faethe, 2013, p. 4). Currently, there are 6,407 programs taught in English in Europe, which represent a 38 percent increase since 2011 (Brenn-White & Faethe, 2013, p. 4). As of June 2013, there were 5,258 Masters programs solely taught in English, which is an increase of 42 percent since 2011 (Brenn-White & Faethe, 2013, p. 4). Germany has increased its English-taught Master’s programs by 13 percent since 2011 and is second behind the Netherlands with a total of 733 Master’s programs taught in English (Brenn-White & Faethe, 2013, p. 6). The most popular Master’s fields taught in English include: business, economics, engineering, technology, and social sciences (p. 9).

According to Luijten-Lub et al. (2005), doctoral studies in Germany “lack structure and transparency” and is “seen as a disadvantage in international competition” (p. 150). Thus, it has been, in recent years, that Germany is increasing more English language programs at the Masters and doctoral levels to attract a worldwide student audience, especially because of American influence on business, engineering, technology, and research.
Ironically, Luijten-Lub et al. (2005) stated that Germany held a reserved response towards increasing more English-taught college programs because they feared “a loss of cultural heritage” (p. 160). However, Germany’s university programs taught in English have increased substantially today (Brenn-White & Faethe, 2013).

**The State, German identity, and the new nationalism**

Since 1945, Germany has struggled with issues concerning immigrants, especially Turkish guest workers and Turkish Germans, such as requiring them to learn German proficiently and to integrate fully into German society and “become” German (Geertz Gonzalez, 2012). So it is ironic that German universities, which are representatives of the state of Germany, are now increasing their English programs in order to attract international students from abroad. For example, in 2010, Merkel declared that “Der Ansatz für Multikulti ist gescheitert, absolut gescheitert” (The attempt at multiculturalism has failed, absolutely failed) in Germany (Evans, 2010). She was remarking that immigrants in Germany were not integrating into Germany society. This German jeremiad about the lack of immigrants integrating into German society is not new. In fact, it has been repeated often since the 1980s. In 1981, then Chancellor Schmidt declared: “The Federal Republic should not and will not be a country of immigration” (Williams, 2014, p. 57). In the 90s, then Chancellor Helmut Kohl also declared: “The Federal Republic of Germany is not a country of immigration” (Williams, 2014, p. 57).

Nevertheless, according to Williams (2014), Germany’s perceptions about immigrants and integration changed with the passing of the new *Nationality Act* on January 1, 2000. The *Nationality Act* reduced the residency requirement from 15 to 8 years and allowed “children of foreigners with permanent settlement status to be born with German nationality” (Williams, 2014, p. 59). Prior to this, only those born in Germany under the “just soli” or right of soil law, and with at least one German parent under “jus sanguinis” or right of blood law, were allowed German citizenship. Thus, Germany began to loosen its once restrictive citizenship policies. On July 2004, the *Immigration Act* (*Auswärtiges Amt*) was passed, which introduced: a basic language test for non-German family members, a one-year reduction of residency if an integration course was taken, and the creation of the Federal Agency of Migration and Refugees (Williams, 2014, p. 61; Federal Foreign Office, 2017).

After the passing of the *Immigration Act*, politicians began to agree that Germany was indeed a land of immigration (Williams, 2014, p. 61). Although politicians now and then continue to decry the supposed lack of integration of immigrants, Williams states that “public opinion has grown steadily more welcoming towards immigration and more positive in the appraisal of immigrants’ contributions to German culture and society” (p. 71). Additionally, the German public has chastised outcries of outright racism. In 2010, Thilo Sarrazin, former member of the Executive Board for Deutsche Bundesbank, published a book titled: *Deutschland schafft sich ab* (*Germany is doing away with itself*), lamenting that multiculturalism and the integration of immigrants in Germany has failed. Sarrazin was forced to step down because of the public’s rage that his book was offensive, which Williams (2014) notes demonstrates that the “German public has moved slowly left” (p. 73).

Overall, Williams (2014) believes that, because of the new policies and discursive practices in Germany regarding immigrants and integration, both elites and the public appear “to be growing more liberal and more stable, and the country appears to be
establishing a new discursive norm that is more inclusive and exhibits more elements of reciprocal integration” (p. 73). And now that Germany is second behind the US in terms of number of migrants (Webb, 2014), it appears that Germany is incorporating a new nationalism no longer based on restrictive policies but based on the idea that they are indeed an immigrant nation.

It is also a reality that Germany is undergoing a large population decline; according to a recent census, Germany’s population has decreased by 1.5 million since 2013 (Daley & Kulish, 2013). By 2060, the country could shrink from a current population of 82 million to about 66 million. Thus, to prevent a future labour shortage, Germany has to “attract immigrants and make them feel welcome enough to make a life” there (Daley & Kulish, 2013).

The German university case

The University of Hamburg is a large university in Hamburg, Germany. It was founded in 1919 and has a total of 44,800 students (40,000 students at home and 4,800 students abroad) (University of Hamburg, University history, 2013). The university has 18 departments, seven senate institutions (equivalent to American research centres), eight interdisciplinary degree programs, and four joint university programs. The university campus is spread throughout the centre of the city of Hamburg and throughout other parts of the city.

In 2010-2011, the University of Hamburg underwent an internationalization audit and, after a successful review, was awarded an internationalization certificate by the German Rector’s Conference (HRK), (University of Hamburg, International audit, 2013). The HRK is a voluntary association of state and state-recognized universities in Germany established in 1949 (German Rectors’ Conference, 2013). It serves as the “political and public voice” of German universities and “provides a forum for the process of forming joint policies and practice.” Currently, the University of Hamburg offers 18 English Master’s programs, 10 combined German/English Master’s programs, and one doctoral program in English (University of Hamburg, Degree Programs, 2013).

METHODS: CASE STUDY INQUIRY

The research questions for this study are as stated in the introduction above. To answer these questions, a case study methodology was implemented. Creswell (2013) states

[C]ase study research is a qualitative approach in which the investigator explores real-life, contemporary bounded system (case) or multiple bounded systems (cases) over time, through detailed, in-depth collection involving multiple sources of information (e.g., observations, interviews, audiovisual material, and documents and reports), and reports a case description and case themes. (p. 97).

A case may be “an individual, a small group, an organization, or a partnership” (p. 98). Additionally, a case study focuses on “contemporary events” (Yin, 2009, p. 11). For this research, the University of Hamburg is the specific case. The specific issues examined for this case study are the reasons for the recent increase of Masters and doctoral programs taught in English at the University of Hamburg. Therefore, this was a “single, instrumental case study” (Stake, 1995, p. 3), since the issues that were examined were looked at within only one bounded system: the University of Hamburg.
Case study data collection commenced in May 2014 and finished in September 2014. Yin (2009) describes six sources of evidence in case studies: documentation, archival records, interviews, direct observations, participant observation, and physical artefacts (p. 101). Documentation includes: letters, notes, emails, memoranda, agendas, meetings, minutes, administrative documents, formal studies or evaluations of the same case for this study, and news clippings and articles (p. 103). For this case, the documents used were those that refer directly to Masters and doctoral programs taught in English at the University of Hamburg. Yin (2009) states that “the most important use of documents is to corroborate and augment evidence from other sources” (p. 103).

Interviews are “one of the important sources of case study information” (Yin, 2009, p. 106). For this case study, in-depth interviews were undertaken in order to solicit from respondents “facts of the matter as well as their opinions about events” (Yin, 2009, p. 107). Four faculty who are involved in Masters and doctoral programs taught in English at the University of Hamburg were interviewed between 20 May 2014 and 11 June 2014 on campus. Six other faculty who are involved in Masters and doctoral programs in English were interviewed between 18 August 2014 and 10 September 2014 via SKYPE phone because they were unavailable for face-to-face interviews while I was in Hamburg, Germany. Interviews continued until saturation or until the same information was repeated among respondents (Creswell, 2013, p. 89). Appendix A provides the framework for interview questions for faculty. Since qualitative interviewing is “continuous,” participants answers might lead to new inquiries and thus, questions were modified throughout the study when necessary (Rubin & Rubin, 1995, pp. 47–48).

A purposeful sampling of participants; that is, those with direct experience with the case, were interviewed for this study (Creswell, 2013, p. 155). Interviews were scheduled for 60 to 90 minutes: 60-minute interviews were for those participants who might not have enough time to do a longer interview; 90-minute interviews were for participants who could stay longer. Seidman (2006) suggests that participants be interviewed for 90 minutes, which is long enough “to make them feel they are being taken seriously” (p. 20). Since these respondents are involved with English programs, interviews were all conducted in English.

Member checking consisted of sending the participants a copy of the transcripts to confirm or edit their interviews (Creswell, 2013, p. 252). Finally, “rich, thick description” was utilized for this study since the researcher “describes in detail the participants or setting under study” because it “enables readers to transfer information to other settings and to determine whether the findings can be transferred” (p. 252).

**FINDINGS**

Themes revealed from an analysis of data include:

1. English vs. German academic graduate instruction: Faculty discussed their ambivalence towards using English for instruction over German;
2. English skills for faculty: Faculty discussed the importance of having English publications for promotion and the hiring of new faculty; and
3. English instruction in future courses: Faculty discussed the importance of expanding English instruction in graduate academic programs to attract international students as well as to provide their current students with adequate
English instruction so they are prepared to apply to international businesses within and outside of Germany.

**English vs. German academic instruction**

At the time of the interviews for this study in May 2014, there were 25 Masters programs taught either in English or a combination of English and German, and one doctoral program fully in English. One of these programs, the Masters of International Business Administration (MiBA) was about to cease and be subsumed under the Masters of International Business and Sustainability (MiBAS). According to Dr Henry, the new MiBAS program would be taught under an English track by faculty. Faculty in different programs within the Social Sciences at the University of Hamburg all agreed that English teaching in the Masters programs and one Ph.D. program were all-important and becoming commonplace because of their perception that English was now the language of scholarship and it was the most commonly understood language in the world. Thus, according to Dr Stuart, most of these faculty see the importance of teaching at least some courses in English in their Master’s programs:

Even now, there is no discussion of having English courses exclusively and no German courses anymore. One professor in one of our programs said “no” and that he wanted to teach in German for the Master’s or certificate degree. He threatened to sue the Department for using English; maybe he would have had success with that, but he decided to leave the Department instead. There is no debate here that there should be at least some German courses though.

Similarly, Dr Pamela described how important it was to establish English as the teaching language for a Ph.D. program, which cooperated with other non-English and English speaking countries:

So the discussion we had is that teaching in English is a good thing, but if we would do more programs, there is a Ph.D. program where we also want to attract more international students where we would do a mixture of German and English language courses to encourage people to go deeper into German language and culture so that they had the benefit of learning German and applying it and staying on in Germany so at least part of their Ph.D. was in German. Not sure if it works. Now I would go for a mixture of local languages and English. But we are partners with the Netherlands and there are more countries and more of a tradition in teaching in English. At the moment, using another language would not make any sense.

While Dr Pamela does detail that having a mixture of German and English or local languages with English at other institutions would benefit international students, the faculty decided that since other non-English speaking countries like the Netherlands had been using English in their programs for a while now that English would be the language used for their Ph.D. program. For most faculty, such as Dr Stuart and Dr Pamela at the University of Hamburg, English was chosen outright since it meant that they were aligning themselves with the language of scholarship and the university would attract more international students.

Nevertheless, administrators and faculty alike were more deeply engaged and concerned with how to incorporate and assess English taught graduate programs campus wide. For example, Dr Richard sees English taught graduate programs at the University as a “conundrum:”
English is the language of communication today. Maybe, it is as important and useful, and practical, and productive as Latin was at some point. Why not have one language or standard to which to communicate? However, on the other hand, I feel it may also entail a loss of diversity of scholarship through different tongues and different discourses. People in French academia feel that they are being disadvantaged. French colleagues apologize at conferences by saying their English is bad. I think that it also applies to members in German academia. And yet, Germans are much more willing to give in and also it is much easier for them to give in.

Dr Richard sees not only practicality with English as the language of research communication today but he also the problems it brings, such as loss of scholarship in other languages. It is interesting that these German faculty see English for graduate studies and research as inevitable while simultaneously struggling with how to handle it within the University of Hamburg.

Likewise, Dr Stephanie, who serves on a campus wide committee that looks at internationalization efforts at the University of Hamburg, described one of the committee’s recent discussions:

We are discussing things such as the role of English at the university. For example, which graduate programs without any doubt must incorporate English with respect to internationalization. But is it an indicator of quality of teaching if it is offered in English? There is a lot of doubt about this question. What is the appropriate mission for this direction knowing that English is unavoidable, but on the other hand respecting the role of academic German.

Dr Stephanie’s comments demonstrate that, while all the faculty for this study agreed that English was important and necessary—especially with a globalized world, assessment of English taught graduate programs at the University of Hamburg needed to be more rigorous and thoroughly looked at. She also mentions how important English should be regarding faculty publications and how these are aligned with internationalization. Some faculty stated that publishing in English was important for advancement at the University of Hamburg. Nevertheless, Dr Stephanie also criticized the overreliance on English instruction in graduate programs as proof of internationalization:

Two former mayors and two other former politicians blame the university for not being innovative enough but they are not close to the University of Hamburg. The city of Hamburg is not supportive of cultural or scientific institutions because it is a city of merchants. They see cultural institutions in terms of investment. They have a narrow view of the value of academics or research; very narrow. That is very different from other universities I stayed in, like Göttingen where I taught before. They have a better relationship with the city. They see the university as the core development with the city. The University of Hamburg sees internationalization in simple ways with English courses and incoming international professors with English skills, which is too simple.

Thus, from an internal faculty perspective, English instruction at the University of Hamburg is conflicted. On the one hand, it is a positive development to increase the number of international students and elevate the academic reputation of the university, since English is the “language of scholarship,” on the other hand, it is a simplistic way to offer proof of internationalization on campus. It also demonstrates that the state of Hamburg via politicians are also interested in expanding internationalizing efforts beyond English instruction on campus to encompass a more international programming beyond
the typical “merchant” aspects, such as oceanography and shipbuilding engineering, which are mainstays of the university.

English skills and faculty

Although most faculty stated they were hired for their English skills rather than faculty expertise and training skills, all agreed that hiring faculty today with English skills was important at the University of Hamburg. For example, the current faculty job descriptions at the University of Hamburg (2014) for Software Engineering, Education, and even German Linguistics, among others, reveals that “Foreign applicants are expected to be proficient in German or English” which demonstrates that English now has equal weight with German as far as the teaching language at the University of Hamburg. However, according to Dr Stuart, knowing or publishing in English was not important at the University of Hamburg when he started back in 1992:

Germany at that time was very isolated. They did not care about English publications. For the past seven years, I have been publishing in English because things have changed, times have changed. I am afraid to say that all the work I have done during the early first years of my university career are now senseless because they do not go into the rankings because they are not published in international journals. A radical shift occurred when German universities began telling faculty to focus on publishing exclusively in international English publications.

Similarly, Dr Henry acknowledged that, according to his hiring committee experience, English is essential for teaching and research now at the University of Hamburg:

For recruiting purposes, international experiences, of course, are a very important criteria and they measure that of course by the English language students you taught and how you spent part of your academic career abroad. And this is a huge plus as part of our recruiting. I was just chairing a recruiting committee and that was again a major issue and we emphasized that teaching and research in English were important components when it came to hiring new faculty.

And, according to Dr Gabriel, “If you applied for a faculty position right now, you have to give at least one presentation in English and then that discussion is in English; but 10 years ago that was not common.” Thus, it appears that between seven and 10 years ago, English started to take hold at the University of Hamburg, making it more important for current faculty and for applicants of current jobs.

Dr Henry also remarked how students have come to him and asked if he could teach his courses in English:

Actually because students realized they won’t get away without knowing English. It’s a truism now that you need to know the English language and they see it as an opportunity to kind of practice that and use it especially when applying for international job positions inside and outside Germany. And students appreciate that increasingly. You always have some who are always moaning. And secondly of course, at least in the Masters course they have to read English articles and they are taught in English too.

This appearance of and emphasis in English instruction at the University of Hamburg appears to coincide with two central events in Germany:
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1) the passing of the Immigration Act of 2004 which loosened immigration restrictions, and
2) an economic recovery after three years of stagnation (OECD, 2004).

English courses at a German university

Although most faculty spoke about the importance of teaching their programs in English, Dr Stephanie stated she refused to do that in her classes:

I do not. I refuse to do that for international students since they get every support they want, but the reason to come to Germany is Germany and not Britain or America. The reason is to introduce them to German. We help them by giving them English textbooks and partnering with other English-speaking students, but I refuse to teach wholly in English. Some English-speaking country background faculty teach in English in the School.

It is surprising that Dr Stephanie would feel this way since she serves on an internationalization committee that is looking at how best to incorporate English in programs at the University of Hamburg. Additionally, faculty in her program who are from English speaking countries teach their courses in English. But, it does match other professors’ ambiguity about English at the University of Hamburg. On the one hand they believe English is important to attract international students while on the other hand they believe that international students should learn German. For example, Dr Richard not only sees English at the University of Hamburg as a “conundrum,” but also as an “unsolved problem” that is fine:

Germans are much more willing to give in and also it is much easier for them to give in. So I think from a German perspective, this tendency towards internationalization and the use of English as the standard communication is fine. It is basically accepted and it is all right.

Dr Pamela stated that they were thinking of using German as the language of instruction for their Ph.D. program in “Denmark where there are students who know German well.” But, “they are no longer interested in going to Hamburg which has to do with the German language not being attractive any longer.” Thus, their Ph.D. program is now in English. Dr Meiner teaches in a Masters program where the English track is for those students wanting to work abroad while the German track is focused on those wanting to stay and work in Germany. Similarly, 80 percent of Dr Stephanie’s students in her program are German, take most of their classes in German, and, thus, focus on getting jobs within Germany. According to Dr Karl, his program plans on adding more courses in English, but, they “have not decided which direction to take” about establishing a Masters program completely in English at a “specific state.” He added that they will “decide that in the future, but for now, it will be in German.”

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Overall, it seems that Germany’s “new nationalism” has indeed stimulated internationalization efforts at the University of Hamburg because, in part, of its increase in the use of English in graduate programs. However, surprising issues emerged. The first interesting issue arising from the interviews, especially considering Germany’s prominence as a top world economy and a top industrialized nation that produces many high technology items, was that while studies demonstrate that English as the language
of graduate instruction is increasing in Germany overall (Brenn-White & Faethe, 2013),
at the University of Hamburg it depended specifically on the program itself. Another
surprising issue was the faculty’s description of how the university recently failed their
most recent internationalization audit by the German Rectors Conference, which they had
passed previously in 2013 (University of Hamburg, International audit, 2013) and
because of this, how the university hired a new Vice President of Internationalization for
the university. Additionally, there was no centralized office or university-wide curricular
practice regarding graduate programs in English and, in fact, while most faculty described
the importance of implementing more English language courses in their programs, other
faculty questioned the quality of English instruction at the graduate level as well as how
to assess these English courses at the university to enhance overall quality.

Some faculty complained that, within their program, they had a hard time receiving help
regarding internationalization efforts because there was no one specifically hired to do
this or because administration was not interested. However, faculty stated that for the past
seven to 10 years, many programs now throughout the university require that new faculty
hired be able to speak German or English to be able to teach at the university. Most faculty
also agreed that a marker of quality and research that was used was the number of research
publications in English speaking journals in order to get credit for tenure, since at the
administrative level, English was the language of research and quality. Nevertheless,
these faculty expressed the tension, conflict, and ambiguity of accepting and using
English as the language of research and graduate education because of
internationalization to the detriment of other languages.

In the case of the University of Hamburg, Childress’s (2009) recommendations for
successful internationalization at universities might prove useful, considering that
English is only a part of efforts that are primarily dealt with at the program level rather
than at the institutional level. First, the University of Hamburg should develop a clear
internationalization plan, including the role of English, and place it on the university’s
website as well as distribute it to all university stakeholders (p. 304). Second, the
internationalization plan can serve as a “vehicle” to stimulate discussion among faculty,
alumni, administrators, students, etc., at the University of Hamburg regarding
internationalization where issues such as the tension between using English versus
German in graduate instruction (p. 304) can be discussed. Third, the specific
internationalization plan can be used to “explain and clarify the meaning of
internationalization goals” and the role of English instruction (p. 305). Fourth, an
internationalization plan can stimulate interdisciplinary collaboration between programs
that utilize English instruction with those that do not (p. 305). Fifth, this plan could also
serve as a fundraising tool, especially considering University of Hamburg’s role as a state
entity whose funding is based solely on the number of students in the classroom,
especially with international businesses interested in recruiting students with English
and/or English/German competency. Thus, external agencies could help fund
internationalization efforts by seeing a clear university-wide internationalization plan
regarding the widening of English instruction which can then be used to promote
expansion of such programs beyond what state politicians see as a focus on programs that
focus on the “merchant” aspects of the city of Hamburg in general (p. 305). Finally,
a centralized campus-wide task force on internationalization should be established that
comprises faculty, administrators, and students (p. 298). One of the faculty indeed
mentioned that there was a campus-wide task force on internationalization, but the other
faculty I interviewed never mentioned this task force. Thus, it would be essential for this
taskforce to reach out to these faculty and others who are not aware of their role regarding internationalization throughout the University of Hamburg, especially to discuss the role of English instruction such as assessment, quality, and role within internationalization efforts.

REFERENCES


Internationalization at a German University


APPENDIX A

Interview questions for faculty at the University of Hamburg

1) When did the University of Hamburg start incorporating Master’s programs taught in English?

2) Were you hired specifically because of your English language skills and/or content expertise? How many years have you taught/in English within your Master’s program?

3) For your doctorate/Master’s degree, were you required to intern/research/teach abroad? When and where did you receive your doctorate/Master’s? When and where did you do your Habilitation?

4) Why were these programs started? Were they a response to globalization/internationalization such as more competition from universities around the world for students from English speaking nations? Are there plans to create more of these programs?

5) Considering this is a German university in Germany: what are your thoughts about these Master’s programs taught in English? Do you think there will be cultural repercussions such as more English loan words incorporated into German? What does the German public think of these programs? Have these students experienced any negative reactions on/off campus?

6) How has the state of Hamburg and/or Germany supported or not supported these Master’s programs taught in English?

7) Where do most of the students in these programs come from? How do these students compare to German students?

8) What kind of support (financial, peer, housing, etc.) do these students have within these programs?

9) When these students graduate: how many of them will they go back to their home country, another country, or stay in Germany?