

# Languages of Higher Education in Contemporary Israel

Nina G. Kheimets and Alek D. Epstein

*In Israel as elsewhere, English has become the de facto second language of academic life*<sup>1</sup>

## **Anglicization of Scientific Communication: Theoretical Model**

A century ago, in 1905, Otto Jespersen attributed the phenomenal growth and spread of English language to ‘political ascendancy’ rather than to any intrinsic superiority in the language or cultural superiority in its speakers.<sup>2</sup> This relation, however, is reciprocal, since, inasmuch as political ascendancy is likely to affect the status of languages, the spread of a language can result in cultural and/or political dominance of a certain group. For today’s scientists, publishing their research findings in international journals means writing articles in English since most such journals, including those published in non-English-speaking countries, now favor or insist on contributions in English. In a growing number of countries, courses at both graduate and undergraduate level are being held in English, and/or require reading and writing skills in academic English. In other words, English cannot be considered just a medium that enables successful functioning of the international academic community, but rather a ‘ticket’, the absence of which makes the scientist incapable of being a part of it. As stated by Ulrich Ammon,

That English is today’s dominant language of science in almost all countries is stating a trivially obvious insight. Many a triviality, however, reveals less generally agreed-upon, or even hitherto unknown aspects upon closer inspection. Thus in the present case, it may not even be clear what we mean by ‘dominant language’. Do we simply have in mind *prevalence*, i.e. the language being used more frequently than others, or do we imply – in the literal sense of the word – *dominance* of some persons over others *by means of the language* in question? It seems that both meanings make sense in the present context and can be explored as to their reality.<sup>3</sup>

It seems almost self-evident that the native speakers of the prevalent scientific language have less difficulty using it passively (in reading, oral understanding) and actively (in writing or speaking) than non-native or foreign-language speakers do and,

therefore, have advantages over the latter in communicative situations which require the use of this language. It is easier for them to produce utterances and texts in line with the existing, native-speaker norms. Higher investment in language learning and extra costs of producing linguistically adequate texts are additional problems with which the non-native speakers have to struggle. These difficulties extend beyond the individual scientist and scholar to publishing companies or even all firms for which science and scientific communication are economically essential in countries where English is not the native or at least a widely-used official language.<sup>4</sup> This state of affairs makes Ammon argue for 'the equity for non-native speakers of English'.<sup>5</sup>

Yet, the possible disadvantages of scientists who are native speakers of English should not be entirely forgotten. English-speaking scientists typically seem to be less and less inclined to study foreign languages and, as a consequence, are unable to take notice of publications in languages other than English.<sup>6</sup>

The English-speaking scientists' advantages, however, extend way beyond what has been mentioned above. They enjoy, for one thing, their prestigious language's halo effect, in accordance to which texts tend to be valued more highly if written in English. In addition, the English-speaking countries, or their scientists and scholars, are sometimes credited with inventions and innovations which in reality were made elsewhere but have not become known for language reasons.

Before the Second World War nearly all the contributions to science which had been written in the less widely used languages than English, French or German were followed by a summary in at least one of these languages. Moreover, the Dutch, Norwegians and Danes frequently published their whole papers in one of the three languages just mentioned in preference to their own. They sank national pride in the choice of a language which, because it is more widely read, must work for the greatest good of the greatest number.

Moreover, as a result of the further search for a common language which would provide unprecedented possibilities for international cooperation, as well as of the USA domination in the contemporary world, the prevalence and dominance of English in science have become a global fact. This dominance varies, of course, in kind and degree, as well as in its effects, between language communities and countries. In this regard one can distinguish between six groups of countries.

The first group includes primarily English-speaking countries (e.g. UK, Australia and USA). These countries are principal benefactors from the worldwide spread of English. This spread, however, has almost no influence on them, because in these countries English is in any case an undisputable principal language. It is necessary to point out that the 'ethnic revival' of the mid-1960s to the mid-1970s and the rise of the multicultural ideology in the US created a new situation: the English-only movement has ceased to be a mainstream,<sup>7</sup> so that the immigrants' shift to English is not considered the only self-evident option nowadays. It is the high international status of English that has become an essential part of repertoire of formal and informal arguments aimed to influence various groups of immigrants towards such a shift. In any case, many issues related to the foreign language instruction are relevant for these countries as well.<sup>8</sup>

The second group includes countries like Canada, in which English is a native language, but only for some part of the population. Therefore the relative rise in the status of English (and, for example, the relative decline in the status of French) is likely to affect the linguistic status-quo in the case discussed.<sup>9</sup>

The third group of countries includes those with a history of English-language dominance (among them India,<sup>10</sup> Malaysia, Hong Kong and Philippines). In such cases English is likely to be perceived as a threat to the national identity, whereas the relations between the 'global' and the indigenous languages may be construed as a zero-sum game.

Twenty-five years ago A. Conrad and J. Fishman argued that 'English is used internally for official purposes in non-English mother-tongue countries almost exclusively in countries presently or formerly under the political or economic hegemony of English-speaking powers'.<sup>11</sup> However, during the last decades the situation has changed dramatically. Nowadays the role of English is central also in those countries and language communities whose language was until recently an international language of science. Such countries constitute the fourth group. For them, one would think, it must be extremely hard to adjust to today's Anglicization of scientific communication. This phenomenon becomes noticeable in some of the cases, especially those of France<sup>12</sup> and Germany.<sup>13</sup>

The fifth group consists of the countries (such as Finland, Sweden and Hungary) which have always, or at least in recent times, used languages of science different from, or additional to, their own indigenous tongue. For these countries adjustment to the recent prevalence of English only means shifting from one foreign language to another if at all. Such a shift indeed takes place in all of the abovementioned cases.

Finally, the sixth group consists of the countries whose science and/or culture for some historical reasons have been characterized by the tradition of autarchy. As a result the ingenious language of such country has fulfilled the function of a well-developed scientific language of science; yet, as opposed to German or French, it did not become an international code. This group includes countries like Russia and China. It should be mentioned, however, that at least in the case of Russia, this tradition of self-isolation has been affected by the recent social, economic and political trends, so that the Russian science network became more open towards the other languages.

### **Higher Education, Science and Language: Israel in a Comparative Context**

In fact, the Israeli case combines various characteristics of a number of abovementioned groups. Israel is, indeed, a country with a history of English-language dominance (group 3), but it also has a lot of citizens (and they are over-represented in science and higher education) for whom English is a native language (group 2). One can argue that Israel also belongs to the fifth group (countries, which have used languages for science different from, or in addition to, their own indigenous tongue), due to the spread and high status of German in the Hebrew University of Jerusalem and the Haifa Technion (Technological University) in the pre-state period (both universities were established in 1924, more than two decades before the foundation

of the independent State of Israel). So it could be of particular interest (and, hopefully, could have also a theoretical impact) to study in depth such a complicated case as the Israeli one and analyze how various characteristics presented above influenced the language practice and policy in its R&D and higher education institutions.

Multiple influences of the American economics, politics, culture and science on the Israeli society explain to the great extent the common tendency of the Israeli officials and scholars to compare their country's various characteristics to those of the USA. This tendency manifests itself also in the linguistic preferences of the Israeli scientists (who, presumably, can be acknowledged as the most faithful adherents of the 'English only' movement), to be described in this research in detail. It should be mentioned, however, that, as pointed out by Wald, the small, highly industrialized countries of Western Europe provide the best reference case and hence the least unrealistic model to emulate for a country like Israel.<sup>14</sup> The Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands and Switzerland show a number of similarities to Israel in the organization of their industry, technology, research systems and research policies. Israel's economic and cultural goals and problems have much more in common with those of small European countries than with those of the US; hence, it is reasonable to suppose that the research organization and policies of small European countries are more relevant to Israel than the American experience.

Wald emphasizes that 'making the right comparisons is more than a purely intellectual exercise; France and the UK have made some very costly mistakes because their research and technology policies have too often been inspired by American precedents. Looking at Industry–University links in Israel from an exclusively American point of view could again easily lead to mistakes'.<sup>15</sup> For example, a study on research and technology in Israel, conducted in 1972, recommended that applied research institutes should not be integrated into the university system, advice which made sense in the US, but which contradicted the entire experience of small European countries, in which industrial research institutes and technical universities have very often been closely linked, apparently to the benefit of both.

The Scandinavian countries, the Netherlands and Switzerland are small in comparison to the main industrial powers. Except Sweden, none of these countries has – or has had until recently – mineral resources in significant amounts, but many of them pay a heavy price in infrastructure investments in order to survive in a hostile geographical and climatic environment. 95% of Norway is for all practical purposes a desert; the main regions of the Netherlands would disappear under the sea if water pump and dyke employees ever went on strike – examples which are possibly more relevant to Israel than they may look at first sight. Yet in spite of these difficulties, the countries concerned have reached the highest European standards of living and a relatively egalitarian income distribution. Moreover, each country achieved with little or no foreign aid and without real sacrifices exactly that degree of independence in the development of weapons which it wanted to have: the complete independence in Sweden, the nearly complete independence except in aircraft systems in Switzerland, the independence in certain specialized items with a high export potential in Norway or Holland.

Possibly, not the only, but still the main reason of the wealth of small countries in Europe is their successful integration into the international trade. They export 20–40% of their Gross National Product. Having liberated themselves of autarchic illusions, they accepted the challenge of foreign competition in most, if not all manufacturing sectors and specialized in those which afforded them comparative economic advantages. Although some of these advantages appeared to be based on natural resources, it was skills, will and organizational talent which counted most. In fact, exports of unprocessed raw materials from the countries concerned are insignificant, whereas products of the agricultural, fishing, forestry and mining sectors which indeed play a considerable role in exports, are most often processed and of high quality.

As a matter of fact, the quality or novelty of their products, often tested first by a very fastidious home-market, but always offered to the world at large, permitted small European countries to reach a dominating position in the world production and trade of certain commodities. Thus, by choosing wisely, small countries have found the way to become big, at least economically.

It is in this framework – namely the quality and novelty of products – that research and universities come into the picture. It is true that the Scandinavians, Dutch and Swiss have for a long time excelled in exactitude, work commitment and practical sense, traditional farmer and craftsmen virtues. Although one should not underestimate the value of such qualities in modern industry, it is certain that none of the countries concerned would have achieved its present industrial strength without the contributions of science and engineering; they account for much of the quality and innovativeness of many manufacturing sectors.

Economic needs have clearly shaped much of the system and climate of research in small European countries. ‘Applied’ or useful research as well as engineering enjoy high prestige. Technical universities are often considered elite schools and closely geared to the needs of industry. Governments, although leaving most of the initiative to create Industry–University links to industry itself, have acted in various ways to give preferential support to industrial research and technology.

These developments, however, do not imply that Israel should or could closely imitate the experience of the small European countries. There are too many exceptional and unique phenomena in the Israeli situation. It means, however, that this experience is a safer indication of what a small country can achieve in spite of its limited natural resources, than the experience of the past or present Big Powers. Due to the fact that English is not the native language either in Scandinavian or Central European countries, the comparison between these states and Israel regarding the spread of English within their scientific communities can contribute to the understanding of this phenomenon as well.

During the recent decades scientific research has followed the globalization trend, with more and more large-scale projects demanding international cooperation and funding. Competition for research funding has also become more international, as has competition for space in prestigious journals. Increasing communication, cooperation and competition have all affected language practices at universities. The

trends towards using more English are by no means uniform. In Europe, however, they have tended to be more far-reaching in 'small-language' countries such as Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands and Finland, and less extensive in countries with large populations.<sup>16</sup> The fact that Danish, Swedish, Dutch and Finnish are spoken by relatively few people and that German, French and even Italian have much larger numbers of speakers means that the availability of textbooks and other instructional materials will be higher – and that their cost will be lower – in the German, French or Italian national languages than in Danish, Swedish, Dutch or Finnish.<sup>17</sup> The implication here is that if textbooks are not available or too expensive, English textbooks will be used instead.

There are only 5.2 million Jews in Israel, and a significant number of them speak languages other than Hebrew (Russian, English, sometimes Yiddish, Ladino, German, Romanian, Georgian, various Ethiopian languages, etc.). Furthermore, there are only eight universities in the world, all of them situated in Israel, that use Hebrew as the language of instruction. So it seems that regarding the language situations within the institutes of higher education and research the Israeli case is likely to be similar to that of Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands, Finland and other small highly industrialized Western European countries. In fact, for the Israelis, English dominates foreign language learning from the beginning of their schooling, enjoying high acceptance as a vehicle of scientific communication.

Israeli, as well as European, universities face new linguistic situations and difficult language policy decisions as a result of the growing internationalization and Anglicization of their curricula and research. Often an increase in the use of English for spoken or written communication is involved, which may entail a related decrease in the use of the local language – Hebrew. From a sociolinguistic perspective, this may be construed as a move towards diglossia, and give rise to fears that the Hebrew language will inevitably be diminished (the situation in a number of small European countries seems to be similar).

In Israel, as, for example, in Sweden, Switzerland<sup>18</sup> and other small European countries, English has become, in many fields, a primary language for research and academic writing (and to a lesser extent for spoken communication), and all the signs point that it is going to become even more important. Philipson and Skuttknab-Kangas have gone so far as to label the situation at Scandinavian universities as diglossic and as marginalizing the state language;<sup>19</sup> the situation in Israel is quite similar. It is possible that neglecting Hebrew in scientific discourse may entail that scientific registers in Hebrew will not develop as fully as the English ones.

Recently some pressure has been put on universities in Israel, as well as in Europe, to dissociate themselves from their previously prevailing ivory tower image and to become more 'open' to the needs and expectations of the broad society. However, the spread of English in the academic circles in Israel, as well as in Europe, seems to go against this trend. This strengthening of the role of English is likely to even widen the already sizeable communications gap between the scientific and non-scientific communities (scientific texts, particularly, the formal ones, are difficult for non-specialists to understand in any language), and thus lead to further social stratification.

Members of the large immigrant communities (since 1989 more than one million immigrants have arrived in Israel), who often are already struggling with several languages, are likely to suffer from the effects of this gap most strongly. As mentioned by Horowitz, 'in spite of intensive effort on the part of the educational system to teach the Hebrew language to the immigrant youth, there are many cases of dropout due to inability to master the language at the pace and time dictated by the system ... The difficulties are revealed mainly in the 'academic language' of the subject matter (as opposed to spoken language which is acquired more easily)'.<sup>20</sup> Unfortunately, there is no comprehensive research on immigrant students' difficulties caused by the simultaneous learning of two different foreign languages (i.e. Hebrew and English), but it seems that the linguistic factor seriously hampers the progress of their studies in various disciplines.

### **Language Education in the Israeli Universities: From the Past to the Present**

Although founded as a Hebrew University, the oldest Israeli institute of higher education has never been monolingual. As mentioned by Norman Bentwich, the study of European languages and literatures was early recognized as a necessity for the students at the Hebrew University.<sup>21</sup> Due to the fact that a large part of faculty members were by themselves graduates from various German universities, at least until the 1960s the German language played an important role in the University of Jerusalem (although there was still no Department of German). While Hebrew was the language of teaching for all purposes, the students had to be able to read English or French, or other modern European languages, whether their principal study was classics, history, biology or law.

The French Government, anxious to maintain the influence of French culture in the Middle East, shortly before the outbreak of the World War II created an Institute of French Culture at the University. In 1938 it provided the means for the appointment of one senior (Dr Abraham Duff) and several junior teachers, and for a library of French literature; in addition it liberally granted scholarships for Jerusalem students to study at French universities. General de Gaulle's Government in exile in London, through Professor Rene Cassin, a Jewish member of his Cabinet, maintained that link.<sup>22</sup> The government of Mussolini provided likewise for a teacher of Italian literature in Jerusalem; but when the Italian Fascists surrendered to Nazi pressure and introduced racial legislation into Italy's academic life, the Hebrew University refused to accept the subvention. Russian language also had some place in the departments of comparative literature and linguistics; yet the Department of Russian and Slavic studies was not founded before the beginning of the 1970s.

Presumably, the most problematic linguistic case had to do with the teaching of Yiddish. The proprietor of *The Day*, a Yiddish newspaper in New York, David Shapiro, offered an endowment for a Chair of Yiddish in the Institute (in his second book, Bentwich wrote that a lectureship in Yiddish was endowed in 1947 by an American Labor Alliance).<sup>23</sup> That provoked an outcry by the adepts of Hebrew, who feared that Yiddish might be a dangerous rival. In the words of Norman Bentwich,

'walls in Jerusalem were placarded with accusations of treason. In order to preserve peace, it was agreed to suspend consideration of the gift'.<sup>24</sup> In 1949 the Board of Governors resolved to establish a Yiddish department. In 1950 Dov Sadan was appointed the first lecturer in Yiddish language and literature.

The Friends of the University in England established a Chair of English Literature and Language, the first holder of which was Professor Jacob Isaacs of London University. He did not stay permanently, and the department was headed by another teacher from England, Adam Abraham Mendilow, who had held a chair in an Annamalai University (South India).<sup>25</sup> The department grew rapidly. A large proportion of those taking a Bachelor of Arts degree chose English as their foreign language, and a smaller number chose it as their major subject for a higher degree. The staff was built up mainly of English and American young men and women, with a few South Africans and one Indian woman. The British Council helped at the outset with a generous provision for a departmental library; and when, after 1948, the Council gave up its Institute of Higher Education in Jerusalem, it made a loan to the University of its library with fifteen thousand books for an indefinite period. However, the status of English was still relatively low.

It is important to mention that although English still was not a compulsory subject these days, a working knowledge of it was essential, because the students already had to read the textbooks and periodicals in it.<sup>26</sup> In the recent years the effects of the globalization, as mediated in the English language, on the Israeli society in general and its academic institutions in particular have become even more obvious, so that the status of the language and competence in its use has been growing. The teaching of English in Israel has moved from an earlier (pre-1960) concern for literature and culture to a stress on English as an international language of communication. As well as serving as a language for access to business, science, education, and travel, English is the language of major Jewish diasporas in the US and elsewhere.<sup>27</sup> Most important, the spread of English in Israel was significantly affected by the large number of English-speaking immigrants who arrived in Israel during the last decades. In Israel both at the elementary and secondary school level, English is the language studied by all pupils. At high schools, all students continue with English, while a large number of them add Arabic, French or Russian. University students must satisfy an English-proficiency requirement in order to obtain their first degree; English is a requirement for a substantial proportion of jobs, and this tendency increases over time; it is a vehicle for international pop culture; and it is the language most likely to be used between an Israeli and someone from abroad, whether the foreigner is a supplier, a customer, a tourist, or a relative. Moreover, the knowledge of English is a marker of socioeconomic status, inasmuch as educational status is. In the words of Ben-Rafael, 'English holds the top of the language status hierarchy'.<sup>28</sup>

However, although English has been recognized as a compulsory subject in all the Israeli universities (including the Open University of Israel, which has adopted the distance learning model) and all the academic colleges, the number of students who study English as their main subject in the institutes of higher education is relatively low (1,757 from 113,750 university students in 2000/2001 academic year, about



1.5% of the total number of the university students. The Safed Academic College is the only college that has its own department of English as a main subject). During the past decades the number of students who study English as their main subject in the Israeli universities grew rapidly (from 1,135 in 1969/1970 to 1757 in 2000/2001; the total increase is 54.8%), yet the average annual increase in the number of students in general was much faster (from 33,383 in 1969/1970 to 113 750 in 2000/2001; the total increase is 240.7%).<sup>29</sup> As a result, during the last thirty years, between 1970 and 2001, the average annual increase in the number of students who study English language and literature as their main subject was 1.42%, whereas that in the number of university students in general amounted to 4.03%.

The study of languages has never been a field popular among the Israeli university students. Moreover, the proportion of students who study various languages as their main subject towards an academic degree among all the students in the Israeli universities has been decreasing. So, in 1969/70, 4,018 out of 33,383 university students (12%) studied a language/literature as their main subjects, whereas in 2000/01 only 8.6% of students (i.e. 9 796 out of 113,750) did so. Thus despite an apparent increase both in the total number of the university students (+240.7%) and in the number of those who study language and literature as their main subject (+143.8) that took place between 1969/70 and 2000/01, the proportion of the latter among all the university students decreased by almost a third (-28.3%).

It should be mentioned that the rates of this decrease have been varying with respect to the language/literature studied. Though Hebrew remains the most popular subject among those who study a language/literature as their main field (41% in 1969/70, 34.2% in 2000/01), the decrease in the proportion of its students among all the university students is more rapid than that in the proportion of the students of Arabic. Arabic has proved to be the language that 'suffered' least of all from the aforementioned trend: the total increase in the number of students of this subject constituted 122% (from 432 in 1969/70 to 959 in 2000/2001), which exceeds the total increase rates in the departments of Hebrew, French and English. When the graduates are concerned, Arabic is the only subject (as compared to Hebrew, English and French) that shows growth in the relative number of its students with respect to the total number of MA and PhD students in the Israeli universities.

The description of the dynamics of popularity of various languages among the university students in Israel would not be complete, if the interest in the other languages studied in the Israeli universities were not accounted for. The number of students of the European languages other than English and French, i.e. of German ( $n=38$  in 2000/01), Russian ( $n=49$  in 2000/01) and Italian ( $n=42$  in 2000/01), as well as of Yiddish ( $n=50$ ), languages studied in the framework of the departments of Classical Studies ( $n=136$  in 2000/01) and of Indian, Iranian and Armenian studies (the number of students was 40 in 2000/01) is diminutive.

There exist two fields in which the dynamics of interest for the languages offered is opposed to the one described above. So, the number of students of Eastern Asia Studies has almost duplicated since 1989/90 (from 323 to 659 in 2000/01), while the proportion of its students among all the students in the Israeli universities grew from

0.49% in 1989/90 to 0.58% in 2000/01. By the same token, the number of students of the Spanish and Latin-American studies has grown by more than 80% since 1989/90 (from 96 to 177 in 2000/01).

The complex picture having been displayed, the following explanations can be suggested to account for the phenomena described:

One could assume that the relative stability of interest for the Arabic language is an outcome of the language shift policy that was applied to the immigrants from the Middle East that came to Israel in the 1950s. As a result, the number of Jews who speak Arabic is lower than the demand for the employees who possess this skill (for instance, for the teachers of Arabic in Jewish schools, Intelligence officers and the officials of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs). Moreover, to gain promotion in the latter two fields mentioned, one is often expected to master Arabic. Hence studying this language is often considered a key to a successful career, attracting students to the corresponding departments. It should be mentioned that, surprisingly enough, the peace process did not cause a significant increase in the popularity of Arabic among the university students. So, in 1989/90 academic year 708 students studied it as their main subject (9.8% among the students of a language/literature), whereas in 2000/01 the number of students of Arabic amounted to 959 (the percentage among the students of a language/literature did not change).

The popularity of Hebrew can be explained in terms of an instrumental motivation, though, undoubtedly, the ideological reasons that root in the image of Hebrew as 'the connection to the glorious past' (in terms of Fishman's terminology)<sup>30</sup> are also likely to be a very powerful factor that motivates one to choose this language as his/her main field of studies. Coming back to the more earthly motives, however, Hebrew is likely to be considered a tool to earn one's living. So, hoping to face less problems when dealing with a native language, a speaker of Hebrew might choose it as a main field of studies, in order to become a school teacher of this language afterwards.

Presumably, the shrink of the interest for the European languages can be explained in terms of the growing popularity of the other regions, specifically – of the Eastern Asia and the Latin America, among the younger generation of the Israelis. Inspired by their (future) trip to these destinations (that has become an almost traditional treat for the army veterans), the young people turn to study the languages, literatures and philosophies of the exotic countries they have visited or plan to travel to. Besides, the mastery of Chinese, Japanese or Spanish, which give access to either well developed economies, or the enormous markets of the speakers of the corresponding languages, is likely to be considered a skill that might help one build his/her career.

Paradoxically, it is the globalization and the related spread of English that seem to account for the decline in the number of those who study this language as their main subject. The relatively good mastery of English is a part of both entrance and graduation requirements in all the Israeli universities. Not to mention that this language is an essential component of the matriculation exams. Consequently, as the status of English is growing, its mastery is likely to be considered self-evident by the future students, which does not attract them to the departments that specialize in the study

of this language. Instead they prefer to register to the other departments, where they hope to obtain more or less unique skills and knowledge.

### **The Anglicization of the Israeli Universities**

As stated by Guri-Rosenblit, 'As a matter of fact, Israeli academics have been strongly oriented towards international collaboration and participation in international research projects and conferences, from the very initial stages of formulating the Israeli academia'.<sup>31</sup> However, the significant change in the kind of this international orientation took place in almost all the Israeli universities: the ultimate orientation towards the American universities and the English language replaced the original Humboldtian model and the German language. Although according to Guri-Rosenblit all those university-level institutions that were established between 1955 and 1970 (among them Tel-Aviv University, Bar-Ilan University, Haifa University and Ben-Gurion University) tended to follow the Humboldtian model adopted by the two veteran institutions – the Hebrew University and the Technion,<sup>32</sup> the process of Anglicization has been evidently taking place in all the Israeli universities.

The majority of the Israeli scholars publish their research findings in English and outside Israel. In addition, most Israeli scientific and semi-scientific journals in exact and natural sciences, as well as in humanities are also published in English. According to the data collected in the current research, the list of Israeli scientific and semi-scientific periodicals in English has been included 60 journal titles in almost each field of knowledge, among them – 32 in the fields of Judaism, Jewish and Israeli history, archeology and arts (see Table 1), and leaves no doubt concerning the linguistic preferences of the Israeli academic institutions.

That English has become a necessary tool in the modern scientist's intellectual equipment, seems to be unquestionable nowadays. Irrespectively of the trace the English language has left in a country's history, it is most likely that this language will be chosen as the most convenient medium of international communication when the local academic community decides to communicate with the external world. Moreover, having internalized globalization tendencies, the academic communities have chosen English as an axis around which they build their domestic stuff, publication and teaching policies. This trend is likely to have a crucial impact on small countries which have developed independent industrial, academic and economic networks, on the one hand, and, due the fact that their populations are relatively small, cannot offer a full scale market for teaching, scientific and publication activities in the national language(s), on the other. This situation can be exemplified by some European countries, such as Sweden, Norway, Netherlands, as well as by the Israeli case. Indeed, the Israeli academic community has been shaped in the grip of two contradictory aspirations: the will to revive and maintain the national language and the desire to share the language and values with the global academic community. Apparently, it is the latter trend that has been taking over: while Hebrew has been remaining the language of oral teaching, it was substituted by English practically in all the spheres of academic activity and career building. This shift to the global language at the expense of the

**Table 1.** Israeli scientific periodicals in English in the fields of Judaism, archeology, Jewish and Israeli history

Journal's title	Publisher	Field	Period of publication	Announced number of issues per year and ISSN	
1. Aleph: Historical Studies in Science and Judaism	Hebrew University of Jerusalem	Theology Philosophy History	2001 – ...	2	1565-1525
2. Assia – Jewish Medical Ethics (bilingual, English and Hebrew)	Shaare Zedek Medical Center, Jerusalem	Medicine Theology	1988 – ...	4	0793-2952
3. Atiqot (bilingual, English and Hebrew)	Israel Antiquities Authority	Archeology	1955 – ...	2	0066-488X
4. Avar ve'Atid. A Journal of Jewish Education, Culture and Discourse	Joint Authority for Jewish-Zionist Education, Jerusalem	Jewish Education	1994–1998	2	0793-1816
5. Azure. Ideas for the Jewish Nations (simultaneously published in Hebrew)	Shalem Center, Jerusalem	History Philosophy Political science	1996 – ...	2	0793-6664
6. B'Or Ha'Torah: Journal of Science, Art and Modern Life in the Light of the Torah	Shamir – Israel Association of Religious Professionals from the Former Soviet Union	Theology Philosophy	1982 – ...	1	0333-6298
7. Bar-Ilan Studies in Near Eastern Languages and Culture	Bar-Ilan University	Linguistics History	1974 – ...	1	Each volume has its own ISBN number
8. Beer-Sheva: Studies in Bible, Ancient Israel and the Ancient Middle East	Ben-Gurion University	Archeology History	1973 – ..., suspended 1974–1984	1	Each volume has its own ISBN number
9. Excavations and Surveys in Israel	Israel Antiquities Authority	Archeology	1982 – ...	1	0334-1607
10. Israel Exploration Journal	Israel Exploration Society & Institute of Archeology, Hebrew University of Jerusalem	Archeology History	1950 – ...	2	0021-2059

**Table 1.** *Continued*

Journal's title	Publisher	Field	Period of publication	Announced number of issues per year and ISSN	
11. Israel – Land and Nature	Society for the Protection of Nature in Israel	Biology Geography Environmental studies		4	0333-6867
12. Israel Numismatic Journal	Israel Numismatic Society	Numismatics	1963 – ...	1	0021-2288
13. Israel Studies	Ben-Gurion University & Indiana University Press	Sociology Political science History	1995 – ...	3	1084-9513
14. Iyuan. The Philosophical Quarterly (also published twice a year in Hebrew)	Hebrew University of Jerusalem	Philosophy	1990 – ... (published in Hebrew since 1945)	2	0021-3306
15. Jerusalem Cathedra (simultaneously published in Hebrew)	Izhak Ben Zvi Institute, Jerusalem & Wane State University Press	History Archeology Geography	1981–1983	4	0333-7618
16. Jerusalem Quarterly	Middle East Institute, Van Leer Foundation, Jerusalem	Political science History	1976–1990	4	0334-4800
17. Jerusalem Studies in Geography	Hebrew University of Jerusalem	Geography	1970–1971	2	0085-235X
18. Jewish Bible Quarterly	Jewish Bible Association, Jerusalem	Theology	1972 – ...	4	0792-3910
19. Jewish History	University of Haifa & Kluwer Academic Publishers	History	1986 – ...	3	0334-701X
20. Jewish Political Studies Review	Jerusalem Center for Public Affairs	Political science History International relations	1989 – ...	4	0792-335X
21. Jews in Eastern Europe	Hebrew University of Jerusalem	History Sociology Political science	1985 – ...	4	0334-6242

**Table 1.** *Continued*

Journal's title	Publisher	Field	Period of publication	Announced number of issues per year and ISSN	
22. Journal of Israeli History (former Studies in Zionism)	Tel-Aviv University & Frank Cass Publishers	History Political science	1980 – ...	3	1353-1042
23. Journal of Torah and Scholarship (bilingual, English and Hebrew)	Bar-Ilan University	Theology Science	1995 – ...	2	0793-3894
24. Kibbutz Trends	Yad Tabenkin	Sociology Agriculture	1991 – ...	4	0792-7290
25. Michmanim (bilingual)	Hecht Museum, University of Haifa	Archeology	? – ...	1	0334-7311
26. Mitekufat Haeven (bilingual)	Israel Prehistoric Society	History Archeology	1964 – ...		0334-3839
27. Philosophia. Philosophical Quarterly of Israel	Bar-Ilan University	Philosophy	1971 – ...		0048-3983
28. Scripta Hierosolymitana	Hebrew University of Jerusalem	Humanities, other fields also	1954 – ...	1	Each volume has its own ISBN number
29. Shvut. Studies in Russian and East European Jewish History and Culture	Ben-Gurion University & Tel-Aviv University	History Cultural studies	1993 – ... (15 volumes published in Hebrew in 1973–1992)	1	0334-4002
30. Studies in Contemporary Jewry	Hebrew University of Jerusalem & Indiana University Press (vols. 1-2) / Oxford University Press (from vol. 3)	History Sociology Political science	1984 – ...	1	0740-8625 (vols. 1-2) / from vol. 3 each volume has its own ISBN number
31. Tel-Aviv	Tel-Aviv University	Archeology	1970 – ...	2	0334-4355
32. Yad Vashem Studies on the European Jewish Catastrophe and Resistance	Yad Vashem	History	1957 – ...	1	0084-3296

local one cannot help creating a gap between the academia and the rest of the society. English has become a marker of the Israeli middle class; and yet the mastery of the

medium of globalization does not necessarily entail one's abandonment of his/her national language and culture. In this respect, the Israeli academia's radical shift to the English language and American standards seems to contradict the aspirations of the other representatives of the middle class. This assumption can be supported by the findings presented in this paper: while the higher education institutions and their staff members attribute growing importance to the activities conducted in the English language, the students' choice of languages to be studied indicates that they are interested either in domestic languages (i.e. Hebrew and Arabic), or in those which could provide them with an access to non-English language mediated, sometimes exotic cultures (such as Eastern Asian languages and Spanish). Thus the Israeli academy finds itself again in the ivory tower. This time, however, this (self)isolation is due not so much to the unique knowledge its inhabitants possess, rather than to the linguistic medium they have chosen for their activities.

### **Acknowledgement**

Various parts of the paper were presented at the 2<sup>nd</sup> Annual Conference of the Israeli Association for the Study of Language and Society (Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 15 June 2003) and at the 36<sup>th</sup> World Congress of the International Institute of Sociology (Beijing, 7–11 July 2004). This manuscript originated from the research conducted by the first author at the Bar-Ilan University in the framework of her doctoral studies supervised by Professor Bernard Spolsky.

### **Notes**

1. Spolsky B. and Shohamy, E. *The Languages of Israel. Policy, Ideology and Practice*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1999, 165 [emphasis added].
2. Jespersen, O. *Growth and Structure of the English Language*. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1905.
3. Ammon, U. "Preface." In *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science*, edited by U. Ammon. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2001, v.
4. *Ibid.*, vii.
5. *Ibid.*, viii.
6. *Ibid.*, viii.
7. Crawford, J. *Hold Your Tongue. Bilingualism and the Politics of 'English Only'*. Reading: Addison-Wesley, 1992.
8. See, for example, the analysis presented by R. Lambert, "Some issues in language policy for higher education." *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 532 (1994): 123–137.
9. See the analysis of the competition of English and French as languages of science and technology in Quebec in A. Martel, "When does knowledge have a national language? Language policy-making for science and technology." In *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science*, edited by U. Ammon. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2001, 27–57.
10. See Jayaram, N. "The language question in higher education: trends and issues." *Higher Education* 26, no. 1 (1993): 93–114.
11. Conrad A. and Fishman, J. "English as a world language: the evidence." In *The Spread of English. The Sociology of English as an Additional Language*. Edited by J. Fishman, R. Cooper and A. Conrad. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1977), 55.

12. See Flaitz, J. *The Ideology of English. French Perceptions of English as a World Language*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1988; Truchot, C. "The languages of science in France: public debate and language policies." In *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science*, edited by U. Ammon. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2001, 319–328.
13. See Ammon, U. "German or English? The problems of language choice experienced by German-speaking scientists." In *Language Conflict and Minorities*, edited by P. H. Nelde. Bohn: Dümmler, 1990, 33–51; Ammon, U. "English as a future language of teaching at German universities?" In *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science*, edited by U. Ammon. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2001, 343–361.
14. See Wald, S. *Industry, science, university in Israel: opportunities and problems of a young country. An exploratory study*. Research Report, National Council for Research and Development, Jerusalem, 1972.
15. *Ibid.*, 4.
16. Murray H. and Dingwall, S. "The dominance of English at European universities: Switzerland and Sweden compared." In *The Dominance of English as a Language of Science*, edited by U. Ammon. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2001, 86.
17. *Ibid.*, 103.
18. *Ibid.*, 106.
19. Philipson R. and Skuttknab-Kangas, T. "English only worldwide or language ecology?" *TESOL Quarterly* 30, no. 3 (1996): 429–452.
20. Horowitz, T. "Assimilation, monolingualism, unidirectionality, and stereotyping." In *Children of Perestroika in Israel*, edited by T. Horowitz. Lanham: University Press of America, 1999, 54.
21. Bentwich, N. *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1918–1960*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1961, 70–71.
22. *Ibid.*, 37.
23. *Ibid.*, 71.
24. Bentwich, N. *For Zion's Sake. A Biography of Judah L. Magnes*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1954, 163.
25. Adam Abraham Mendilow was born in London in 1909. He received his BA in 1931 and his PhD in 1950 (London). He joined the Hebrew University of Jerusalem staff in 1937 and was promoted to Associate Professor in 1952.
26. Bentwich, N. *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*, 37.
27. Spolsky, B. "The role of English as a language of maximum access in Israeli language practices and policies." *Studia Anglica Posnaniensia* 33 (1998): 377–398.
28. Ben-Rafael, E. *Language, Identity, and Social Division: The Case of Israel*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1994, 183.
29. All the calculations are based on the original unpublished data collected by the Israeli Council for higher education.
30. See Fishman, J. *Language and Nationalism*. Rowley, MA: Newbury House, 1972.
31. Guri-Rosenblit, S. "Changing boundaries in Israeli higher education." *Mediterranean Journal of Educational Studies* 4, no. 2 (1999): 108.
32. *Ibid.*, 93.