CHAPTER 4

Exclusive Globality, Inclusive Diversity: Internationalisation as a Strategy of Inclusion and Exclusion

Tobias Peter

The Ambivalence of Strangeness

There is a renewed engagement with the concept of strangeness in Germany (*Fremdheit* in German, which can mean strangeness, Otherness and/or foreignness, or all three, depending on the context). Contrary to the rhetoric of migration and global migrant workers, the stranger—or in this case, the foreigner—is apparently no longer seen as "a wanderer, […] one who arrives today and leaves tomorrow, but as one who comes today and stays tomorrow" (Simmel 2009: 611). This has resulted in extremely diverse social references being made to the Other who can occupy a rather contradictory space—either as a potential skilled worker and as someone providing cultural enrichment, or as a subject to be rejected as an economic parasite and a risk to security (Nassehi 2016).

This contribution follows the hypothesis that this ambiguity is particularly prominent in the context of internationalisation and education.

T. Peter (✉)
Institut für Soziologie, Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Freiburg i.B., Germany

C. Maxwell et al. (eds.), *Elite Education and Internationalisation*,
DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-59966-3_4

One the one hand, educational institutions of excellence, especially universities, boast that they promote cosmopolitanism, a global exchange of knowledge and a multicultural atmosphere. Universities aim for elite status through metrics such as international publications, global research partnerships and a diverse student body. Likewise, exclusive schools refer to the international character or profile of their curricula and teachers as a particular feature when competing for pupils. Here internationalisation is used as a source of distinction. However, the increasing multicultural nature of many societies is a form of internationalisation that has been responded to through a focus on inclusion, seeking to ensure all people, no matter what their background, have the potential to achieve academically. In such engagements people do sometimes recognise the value of inter-cultural learning that can occur within mixed spaces.

With exclusivity and excellence at the one end, and inclusivity and the promotion of basic competencies at the other end of the continuum, "the stranger" occupies an ambivalent position in today's educational system. Internationalisation, or "being international", in this context may act as a divide within the education system and as a mechanism for segregating those at the top of the social hierarchy from those at the bottom (Zymek 2009: 185). This chapter explores some of the strategies of inclusion and exclusion that are connected to different facets of internationalisation. It argues that the notion of the stranger has changed to somebody who has to prove his worth as a member of society and within the education system. This changed notion can be found in discourses about elite and international education as well as around inclusive education which promotes diversity, and I show how both position students as self-responsible individuals. I will begin by elaborating the dualism between inclusion and exclusion evident in some processes of internationalisation by adopting a systems theory approach. I will then trace the defining discourses and strategies of, first, exclusive globality and, second, inclusive diversity by discussing some historical examples. The chapter concludes by summarising the differences and the similarities between the various facets of internationality.

Inclusion/Exclusion and Internationalisation

These paragraphs present the socio-theoretical basis of my argument. Unlike the rather normative educational discourse of inclusion that formulates the participation of all students in schools as a goal, the sociological

perspective offered by systems theory is more analytically oriented (Cramer and Harant 2014). The dualism between inclusion and exclusion in systems theory offers a differentiated perspective on the social mechanisms determining these processes that goes far beyond more common analyses of social participation and social (in)equality which are often presented. A systems theory approach on this topic is less interested in what could be termed "external" forms of exclusions—that is, exclusions from society as a whole—and more on the "internal" forms of exclusion that occur *within* society itself. If we consider inclusion and exclusion as mutually dependent, then it might follow that those who are excluded will form a counter structure which also determine and make visible the conditions of inclusion, and are therefore integral to the production of a new social order (Luhmann 2013: 18). Following this approach, the phenomena of strangeness is highly contextual and linked to specific systems of rationality and subjects of inclusion. It serves as means for deciding who will receive recognition within systemic communication, and who will not. Against this backdrop the ambivalence inherent in the figure of the Stranger can be understood. Furthermore, internationalisation, with its many different aspects, is relevant not only for phenomena of inclusion and exclusion across several systems, but also for various mechanisms of inclusion and exclusion operating at different system levels of social subsystems like education, organisation systems such as schools and universities, and interaction systems like lessons or mentoring.

Based on this theoretical approach, the chapter will present an empirical discourse analysis of system-theoretical issues (Peter 2014; Stäheli 2004) that focus on the dualism between inclusion and exclusion, and more specifically how the rhetoric and semantics of inclusion and exclusion establish different figures of educational strangeness. Lying behind this is the assumption that phenomena of exclusion today are no longer characterised by the outright refusal to respect the right to participate, but rather by increasingly "making the 'no' invisible" (Bohn 2008: 178). Exclusion occurs *ex negativo* in relation to how functional systems and organisations articulate and (re)inscribe discourses of inclusion. Conversely, the perceived risks of exclusion are anticipated, and responded to, within inclusion discourses and translated into individual and collective practices.

This paper investigates how these processes might be unfolding in secondary schooling and higher education as those are the segments of the educational system in Germany where processes of selection actively shape who "succeeds" in German society. I analysed various texts in

which internationalisation is treated as an approved and accepted feature of "excellence" in education, denoting either exclusive and/or inclusive education. Contrasting and comparing the social construction of internationality in secondary schooling and in higher education offers the opportunity to focus on the specificity of internationalisation as a mechanism of both inclusion and exclusion in each sector and to identify the continuities between these stages in the educational process. The study is part of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG)-funded project "Equality and Excellence: On the Simultaneity of Counter-Directional Rationalities in the German Education System" that examines the discursive formation and practical effects of the two rationalities of equality and excellence that dominate the contemporary system of education in Germany. These discursive formations are then compared and contrasted to further consider the function of exclusivity and inclusivity in claims relating to internationalisation and being elite.

In terms of practical research, the construction of the text corpus focused on information from the field as well as the reconstruction of the discourses. The identification of discursive events and data resulted from a preliminary investigation into themes, reference phenomena and key terms such as "internationalisation", "immigration" or "diversity" when related to the concepts of excellence or equality. The underlying assumption driving the work was that references to equality and excellence in politically strategic and institutionalised programmes lead to the adoption of an orientation which functions at different levels and, as interpretive schemes, structure individual perceptions and positions (Bröckling 2015: XIIf.). The selection of texts was focused on the time period—1980s up to the current moment. First, education policy documents and statements given by different educational-political agents ranging from governmental authorities and parties and advisory organisations were gathered. Second, various institutional artefacts such as plans of action, guidelines, mission statements and prospectuses of schools and universities were collected. About 204 texts from the policy and administrative level, as well as 134 texts from the institutional level were collected and quantitatively analysed by using MaxQDA. I was able to identify discursive regularities in this material based on the dominance of certain themes like "global competition" or "cultural diversity", which were then coded accordingly. A detailed analysis of the chosen documents led to a reconstruction of various facets of internationality as strategies of inclusion and exclusion. The article concentrates on this aspect. Through the analysis of these different "texts", the original hypothesis of a strict ambiguity within internationality

was modified and the theoretical focus sharpened. I then conducted a more detailed qualitative analysis of those texts that were representative of the different system levels—interaction, organisation and education system—and which appeared to show discursive coherency. This enabled me to problematise the programmatic goals and subjective requirements for achieving internationalisation as a strategy of both exclusion and inclusion, depending on the context. The following is thus a discussion of how and where these features diverge from one another, as well as how and where they are aligned.

Exclusive Globality

To understand the relationship between exclusivity and internationality, it is necessary to reconstruct briefly its historical development. The exchange of ideas across borders has been a universal principle of learning and science since the beginning of modern academia found in the mediaeval university (Scott 1998). This notwithstanding, only a very limited academic exchange was needed to guarantee the cosmopolitan character and function of the medieval university (Stichweh 1994; Schwinges 1986). With regard to studies abroad, the inclusion of people from different regional backgrounds in the *nationes* was limited to a social elite of noblemen or urban patricians, and it was thus characterised by strong social exclusivity. The stranger or foreigner was privileged because he incorporated a fundamental principle of scholarship: the marvel of Otherness that offered a different view of reality (Stichweh 2010: 87ff.).

The worldwide institutionalisation of education and science within the nation state in the nineteenth century (Stichweh 2005: 42; Meyer 1992) led to the development of national systems of education, each with their own national discourses and areas of specialism. The concepts of exclusivity, excellence and internationalisation in this particular context and time conjured up connotations of the splendour of particular national models of, for instance, higher education. Thus, the German universities in the nineteenth century became a "much admired model for the entire world" (Nipperdey 1998: 470). With regard to school education, at the systemic level many inclusive and exclusive practices emerged within education, which were also legitimised in relation to the nation state. The perceived hierarchy of "innate" talents of citizens and their associated suitability for different occupational fields (Lenhardt and Stock 1997: 54f.) resulted in the development of an exclusive education track, that still remains today for

the most part, for the selection and training of a national elite of functionaries who would then lead the various domains comprising the nation state (Dreitzel 1962). The German *Gymnasium* (grammar school), for example, became the elite segment of the education system and continues to be a national project that has long been defended in the face of international developments of implementing comprehensive school after the 1960s.

In Germany, after and in response to the atrocities of the Second World War, the discursive coupling of exclusivity and nationalism/nationality was gradually eroded and international understanding, peace and cultural exchange were, at least up to the early 1990s, still an essential part of the discourse of internationalisation in politics and institutions of higher education (Teichler 1999). It is necessary to understand this in order to discuss the fundamental changes that occurred in the wake of the emergence of the powerful discourse promoting neo-liberal *globalisation*. Inclusion and exclusion thus began, in this neo-liberal context, to run counter to the maintenance of nation states, which—along with their social welfare and education systems—were problematised on the one hand as obstacles of globalisation, and on the other as insufficiently equipped to harness its possibilities and potentials. In the texts from the 1990s, an emerging discourse can be detected in which competition was not only regarded as both a necessity due to processes of internationalisation, but also as a catalyst for internationalisation in the education system in Germany. Having internationally competitive institutions of higher education became a way of participating in the global "competition for top positions in key technologies" (Wissenschaftsrat 1988: 161). Finally, political programmes like the German Excellence Initiative strove to raise the international visibility and attractiveness of selected "beacon" institutions in order to "strengthen Germany as a location for science and research in the long term, to increase its international competitiveness and to make outstanding achievement at the university and in research more visible" (GWK 2005: 1). "Being international" and "excellence" thus became mutually dependent and reinforcing. The objectives of exclusive globality became the focus of internationalisation strategies at this time (DFG 2012; BMBF 2014) and were geared towards the establishment of global networks of scholarly communication, in the form of, for instance, transnational research partnerships and the publication of research in international scholarly journals.

In order to be competitive enough for inclusion in top global research league tables, universities need to appeal to the relevant subjects—leading academics. In the "Global Competition for Talent" (OECD 2008),

launched by the OECD and other international organisations, a particular discourse of competition is promoted which defines inclusion in very specific ways. Universities and research institutions are encouraged to "attract excellent scientists and researchers from all over the world in an increasingly tougher competition" (BMBF 2014: 14), and scientists and researchers are urged to present themselves as valuable, demonstrating how they can both individually but also as members of their institutions compete on the global stage. International students, too, are considered valuable to Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) because of their "difference" and international profile, yet other markers of strangeness—for example, their socio-economic status or level of education—should remain excluded from view as they communicate a less productive interpretation of the Otherness. When business schools advertise that their students and managers come from "more than 30 nations with the most diverse professional backgrounds and cultures" (EBS 2011), they regard international experience as a human capital and draw on the status of the stranger as a resource. Exclusive HEIs and elite degree programmes in public universities, also promote a guarantee of exclusivity by focusing on providing high levels of inter-culturality and globality within their provision and as an ambition for their graduates. The promotion of internationalisation in the university context is based on building or securing a reputation of "excellence", as can be seen in the "Diversity Code of Conduct" of the TU Munich (TUM 2015). Achievement standards are not necessarily undermined by a heterogeneous student body. Indeed, in searching for people with "high potential", individuals around the world should be considered for a place on a programme as this promotes a diversity of students and the potential for recruiting the best.

The establishment of exclusive globality in the compulsory education sector in Germany—including the *Gymnasiums*—is less politically charged. This is perhaps because these institutions are oriented more towards inclusion within the nation state. Unlike in higher education, there is arguably less symbolic (and economic) value attributed to Otherness, and international exchanges are at best an ancillary and not a constitutive part of compulsory education. It is telling that the *Gymnasium* has long focused on classical languages and traditional humanistic knowledge as symbol of the specific German educational tradition of *Bildungsbürgertum* (education bourgeoisie) rather than on modern languages as competence of international exchange. However, the shift towards a global order of inclusion, as discussed above, has resulted in Gymnasiums adopting two strategies for

establishing their exclusive globality, as an extension of their already existing vertical differentiation within the German three-tiered school system. As a first strategy, *Gymnasiums* derive their exclusivity from the higher number of foreign languages they teach, as compared to other types of schools (the *Hauptschule* and *Gesamtschule*); second, these schools present an international orientation through their ethos and profile, for instance in the form of international school partnerships and student exchange programmes, and by offering the International Baccalaureate. Interestingly, the latter is framed in the public discourse as appealing to "world-class educators and students", with "the IB support[ing] schools and teachers to provide a rigorous, high-quality education" (IBO 2016a).

The IB Diploma Programme promises decisive advantages for students because it aims to develop "students who have excellent breadth and depth of knowledge—students who flourish physically, intellectually, emotionally and ethically" (IBO 2016b). In this way, internationalisation, and "being international", aligns with neo-liberal discourses of educational "excellence" and "quality", and the development of appropriate forms of human capital for an international and competitive context. When a *Gymnasium* can offer the IB programme, or a pupil earns an IB certificate, this promises exclusivity because it is still a rare qualification and promises direct access to universities abroad. The educational programmes of international schools also strive towards this goal by incorporating key narratives of the "excellence" discourse of universities. For example, the Berlin International School states: "We have identified the needs of the highly competitive, global world that our students will be part of in the future, and ensure that every child feels happy and secure allowing them to develop the academic and linguistic skills necessary to succeed in it" (Internationale Schule Berlin 2015). Internationalisation, therefore, appears here to be a feature whereby schools and pupils can distinguish themselves from others (Helsper and Krüger 2015). The narrative of "Global Competition for Talent" not only incites educational *institutions* to compete with one another; it also targets *parents and their children*, both of whom are considered and treated, again in the neo-liberal context, as clients.

The constitution of a national elite has thus been transformed by strategies of exclusive globality. Although exclusive schools and higher education institutions are still organised in accordance with a nation-state framework, their stated remit is the cultivation of "global leaders". "Being (truly) international" acts as a distinctive code for signalling that a person

can handle the challenges of complex leadership requirements, and in relation to which the figure of the stranger promotes a certain diversity and inter-culturality that promotes a form of human capital that can be further developed and strengthened throughout one's lifetime.

Inclusive Diversity

Educational institutions that position themselves, and are perceived by others, as "excellent" and "elite", try to preserve and reinforce their international distinction in the education market. In doing so, the "normal" education system must therefore act as the counterpart that has little, if anything, to do with internationality and globality. However, processes of internationalisation do influence the broader education system, but as my analysis argues—they emphasise inclusivity, albeit at different levels and based on other kinds of logic.

A decisive factor in shaping the internationalisation of the school system has been immigration (Zymek 2009). Not only does immigration affect schools in different ways to institutions of higher education, but the effects are also much greater in the compulsory sector. Since the turn of the century, the figure of the first- or second-generation immigrant child living in urban centres has become a symbol of marginalisation in the education system (Allemann-Ghionda 2006). Due to the segregation of immigrant groups into socially disadvantaged neighbourhoods and certain types of schools, like the *Hauptschule* and *Gesamtschule* (forms of lower secondary education schools that, unlike the *Gymnasium*, do not prepare pupils for university), a form of internationalisation has unfolded which is accompanied by a corresponding educational discourse of exclusion.

The poorer educational outcomes of pupils with immigrant backgrounds was another aspect of the internationalisation discourse that was brought to light by the Programme for International Student Assessment (PISA) debate, identifying the main problem not as their insufficient adaptation to the majority cultural norm but their falling short of performance requirements in school. As a result, insufficient integration and language skills were identified as key policy problems (Stanat 2003: 224; Diefenbach et al. 2002). The ensuing debate was dominated yet again by a deficit image of immigrants with low socio-economic status. Following the arguments of the German federal government, this status caused "risks for the educational success of children and youths that must be remedied through adequate, individual support" (BBMFI 2011: 70f.). With this goal in mind, a range of

supportive measures emerged that did not target the complex societal structures behind the increasing segregation, but rather focused on the responsibility of organisations and individuals. According to this logic, an immigrant background may be a resource, but its potentially problematic aspects should not be perpetuated. Egalitarian schools have responded to such directives by emphasising their inclusive understanding of internationalisation by focusing on the effective integration of students, families and parents with diverse immigrant backgrounds into a heterogeneous community.

The emphasis of this particular articulation of the internationalisation discourse—the promotion of inclusive pedagogical approaches—goes far beyond a commitment to special needs education, and thereby paving the way for a more general education paradigm change (Hunt and McDonnell 2007; Booth and Ainscow 2011). As one of the most influential discourses of education reform around the world, inclusive education is based on human rights, is a powerfully normative approach and is aimed explicitly at counteracting phenomena of social exclusion (Peters and Besley 2014: 108ff.). The so-called education of diversity is based on the assumption that there are multiple cultural characteristics that cannot be defined beforehand and that intersect on a case-by-case basis (Prengel 2005). This heterogeneity is based on different forms of discrimination related to, for instance, cultural, social, immigrant or ethnic background, or having a disability and/or being of a certain gender or age. However, although it may no longer be legal to attribute negative aspects to Otherness, those who are underprivileged must still prove their usefulness and worth in the "right" way in order to be acknowledged by, and integrated within, society.

In exploring this approach, we can see that the German discourse of diversity also has a clear economic bias. According to the corporate initiative *Charta der Vielfalt* (Diversity Charter): "We can only be successful in business if we acknowledge and leverage diversity" because "the diverse competencies and talents of management and staff open new chances for innovative and creative solutions" (Charta der Vielfalt e.V. 2011). Business-oriented diversity *management* is thus ultimately aimed at increasing productivity through optimal human resource management. If we assume that successful education efforts are essentially investments in human capital, as claimed by neo-liberal discourses, then it perhaps becomes clear why this approach is being applied in the education sector. In light of a diverse education clientele, it seems problematic that "the degree programmes and academic organisation of many institutions of higher education in Germany are [oriented towards] an ideal 'norm stu-

dent', a pupil with an *Abitur* [entrance qualification for university] from a German family, who begins his or her full-time studies immediately after finishing school and regards this as the centre of his or her life. However, diversions from this 'norm' are more the rule than the exception," reports the *Stifterverband für die deutsche Wissenschaft* (Donors' Association for the Promotion of Humanities and Sciences in Germany) (2015). The target group of diversity management strategies is thus those who are disadvantaged, including students with immigrant backgrounds. Strategies of standardisation, like the *Stifterverband's* diversity audit, are thus designed to try and "increase equal opportunity in university education and to ensure that access to, and success in, higher education is not dependent on cultural or social background, previous education, experience or life situation, but rather on personal motivation and abilities" (Stifterverband für die deutsche Wissenschaft 2015).

At an institutional level, the programmatic goals of inclusive diversity are thus translated into higher education institutions as egalitarian spaces, thereby contrasting starkly with the internationalisation strategies of elite universities. Both emphasise their international network of partners, but non-elite universities also stress an ethos and mission of providing "equal opportunities for all". As one higher education institution put it: "The percentage of students with an immigrant background at universities [in Germany] is generally too low. In the Ruhr area, which has a specific demographic structure, a lot of potential is left undeveloped this way"; for this reason, it aims to "increase the percentage of students with immigrant backgrounds and include as many nationalities and domains of experiences as possible in the academic and non-academic personnel at the university" (Hochschule Ruhr West 2015). In this case, "being international" is problematised as something which may require remedial action. Crucially, such remedial action is not targeted at equalising deficit, but at activating potential (Karakaşoğlu 2012: 93f.).

Reviewing documents highlights that diversity and inclusion policies in university have a tendency to be totalising: they "focus on accessing and promoting the potential of all people involved at the university" (Folkwang Universität 2012). However, they tend to be more oriented towards disadvantaged students. Strategies of inclusive diversity support those students with immigrant backgrounds who need help preparing for and undertaking study at higher education institutions. Other strategies also support foreign students by providing them with "tailor-made programmes that enable them to advance through education". Participation in the

labour market is perhaps the ultimate goal of these integration strategies, albeit not on the level of global leadership, but on the level of "normal" professionals.

While elite students may try to distinguish themselves from others through their prestigious degrees, perhaps the goal for upwardly mobile students (from lower socio-economic backgrounds) is simply to obtain a degree in the first place. The techniques used "to promote hidden talents and potential" systematically and comprehensively empower the students with immigrant backgrounds via remedial education, mentoring and self-management courses (UDE 2013: 23, 2013). Universities, like the TU Dortmund, highlight in their development plan the ways to "make the start of students' careers easier: The goal is to establish a culture of inclusion that will be a resource and a competitive advantage for the university" (TU Dortmund 2013: 16). Thus, although the policies of more egalitarian universities regard the Other as a marginalised figure that needs to be included, they are not referring to inclusion in an academic world in which there is a pure exchange of ideas; nor are they talking about inclusion in a society conceived as democratic. First and foremost, these policies position inclusion as taking place in a society concerned with labour and competition.

On the one hand, the international(ised) and exclusive discourse of excellence can be traced back to a well-established academic culture of privileged Otherness; on the other, discourses of inclusion and diversity are articulated in a politically motivated reversal of the negative aspects attributed to Otherness. Exclusive internationalisation strategies are translated into vertical stratifications, while inclusive strategies of diversity regard the characteristics of Otherness as a horizontal difference (Jäckle 2009: 311). Personality and competence development is associated with such strategies as diversity management that envision the individual as a resource to be both mined and worked. The more uncertainty there is about the skills expected to be acquired in the future, the greater the necessity to promote special talents today. The radical individualisation that goes hand in hand with subjectivising strategies of inclusive diversity means that individuals must assert the uniqueness of their personalities in a competition with others.

Productive Otherness

"Being international" is linked with strategies of inclusion and exclusion that are negotiated and enacted in very different ways in the various sectors of the education system. The notion of the stranger has changed to

somebody who has to prove his worth as a member of society and within the education system. Although all approaches are based on a heterogeneous education clientele, exclusive strategies focus on stressing the positive aspects of Otherness, while inclusive strategies strive to overcome the negative aspects attributed to it. In both cases, there are implications for how we understand inclusion and exclusion in education and elsewhere today. Although "being international" might be characterised by strategies of exclusivity at elite institutions and at some schools and universities, due to the limited number of pupils and students they serve, these institutions still strive towards inclusion but only for a small global elite. On the other hand, because egalitarian and less-privileged educational institutions are open to all, their potentially more diverse social and cultural intakes pose problems for, and inform, their pedagogical and inclusion strategies. These institutions must identify and try to address the perceived risks of exclusion posed by their student intakes in order to legitimate and demonstrate their own inclusivity. Unlike the global focus of Others make an active choice to be mobile and attend more exclusive education institutions, schools and universities, stressing diversity in these non-exclusive institutions focuses on the inclusion of local clientele with immigrant backgrounds.

Despite these differences, the excellence and the egalitarian approaches outlined in this chapter do share many common goals that are based on a positive, resource-oriented connotation of Otherness, strangeness or foreignness. For both international education and education of international students, the stranger has to prove his/her worth, that is, that he/she can become productive. Both strategies are concerned with the economic cultivation of Otherness, and both regard heterogeneity and diversity as a resource that needs to be utilised effectively. Exclusive globality and inclusive diversity are both geared towards developing potentials that can be identified through performance tables and rankings. On the one hand, inter-culturality at exclusive institutions of higher education is part of the education trajectory for leadership positions; at the other end of the continuum, the diversity within schools where a high number of students with an immigrant background are found is focused on ensuring basic competences which can be applied later to the benefit of the labour market. Foreignness for both academics and students recruited to leading/exclusive universities, as well as the composition of students in multicultural schools in inner cities thus becomes a strategy for education institutions. Practising tolerance serves to improve talents and outcomes for both sectors. What was once a privilege in the medieval university is

thus transformed into a visible, positively articulated international form of human capital that promises an advantage in the competition for the best students and researchers in global higher education. Meanwhile the permanent exclusion of immigrant potential is positioned as economic wastefulness, this making the promotion of inclusion and diversity a necessary investment. It would appear that the original ambivalence of Otherness is now located somewhere between privilege and exclusion. The Other—the stranger and the foreigner—is now someone who comes today and must prove him- or herself tomorrow. Otherness has thus become productive.

References

Allemann-Ghionda, C. (2006). Klasse, Gender oder Ethnie? Zum Bildungserfolg von Schüler/innen mit Migrationshintergrund. Von der Defizitperspektive zur Ressourcenorientierung. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik, 52*(3), 350–362.

Bohn, C. (2008). Inklusion/Exklusion: Theorien und Befunde. Von der Ausgrenzung aus der Gemeinschaft zur inkludierenden Inklusion. In S. Farzin, S. Opitz, & U. Stäheli (Eds.), *Inklusion/Exklusion. Rhetorik—Körper—Macht* (pp. 171–190). Stuttgart: Lucius & Lucius.

Booth, T., & Ainscow, M. (2011). *Index for inclusion. Developing learning and participation in schools.* Bristol: Centre for Studies on Inclusive Education CSIE.

Bröckling, U. (2015). *The entrepreneurial self.* London: Sage.

Bundesministerium für Bildung und Forschung BMBF. (2014). *Aktionsplan "Internationale Kooperation" des Bundesministeriums für Bildung und Forschung.* Berlin.

Charta der Vielfalt e.V. (2011). *Die Charta im Wortlaut. Diversity als Chance—Die Charta der Vielfalt der Unternehmen in Deutschland.* Retrieved from www.charta-der-vielfalt.de/charta-der-vielfalt/die-charta-im-wortlaut.html

Cramer, C., & Harant, M. (2014). Inklusion. Interdisziplinäre Kritik und Perspektiven von Begriff und Gegenstand. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft, 17*, 639–659.

Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft DFG. (2012). *Die Internationalisierungsstrategie der DFG.* Bonn.

Die Bundesbeauftragte der Bundesregierung für Migration, Flüchtlinge und Integration BBMFI. (2011). *Nationaler Aktionsplan Integration. Zusammenhalt stärken—Teilhabe verwirklichen.* Berlin.

Diefenbach, H., Renner, G., & Schulte, B. (Eds.). (2002). *Migration und europäische Integration. Herausforderungen für die Kinder- und Jugendhilfe.* München: Deutsches Jugendinstitut.

Dreitzel, H. P. (1962). *Elitebegriff und Sozialstruktur. Eine soziologische Begriffsanalyse.* Stuttgart: Ferdinand Enke.

EBS Universität. (2011). Mission statement. Retrieved from www.ebs.edu

Folkwang Universität. (2012) *Rahmenplan für die Bereiche Gender und Diversity Management der Folkwang Universität der Künste. (Gleichstellungsplan)*. Essen.

Gemeinsame Wissenschaftskonferenz GWK. (2005) *Bund-Länder-Vereinbarung gemäß Artikel 91b des Grundgesetzes (Forschungsförderung) über die Exzellenzinitiative des Bundes und der Länder zur Förderung von Wissenschaft und Forschung an deutschen Hochschulen*. Bonn.

Helsper, W., & Krüger, H. H. (Eds.). (2015). *Auswahl der Bildungsklientel. Zur Herstellung von Selektivität in "exklusiven" Bildungsinstitutionen*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS.

Hochschule Ruhr West. (2015). *Diversity management. Vielfalt als Chance*. Retrieved from www.hochschule-ruhr-west.de/die-hrw/hrw-profil/diversity/

Hunt, P., & McDonnell, J. (2007). Inclusive education. In S. L. Odom, R. R. Horner, M. E. Snell, et al. (Eds.), *Handbook of developmental disabilities* (pp. 269–291). New York: Guilford.

International Baccalaureate Organisation IBO. (2016a). *Homepage*. Retrieved from www.ibo.org

International Baccalaureate Organisation IBO. (2016b). *Diploma programme*. Retrieved from www.ibo.org/programmes/diploma-programme/

Internationale Schule Berlin (2015). *Welcome. All you can be*. Retrieved from www.internationale-schule-berlin.de/index.php/de/oberschule-ueber-uns-isb/articles/oberschule-isb.html

Jäckle, M. (2009). *Schule M(m)acht Geschlechter. Eine Auseinandersetzung mit Schule und Geschlecht unter diskurstheoretischer Perspektive*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften.

Karakaşoğlu, Y. (2012). Interkulturelle Öffnung von Schulen und Hochschulen. In C. Griese & H. Marburger (Eds.), *Interkulturelle Öffnung. Ein Lehrbuch* (pp. 93–118). München: Oldenbourg Wissenschaftsverlag.

Lenhardt, G., & Stock, M. (1997). *Bildung, Bürger, Arbeitskraft. Schulentwicklung und Sozialstruktur in der BRD und der DDR*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Luhmann, N. (2013). *Theory of society*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Meyer, J. W. (1992). *School knowledge for the masses: World models and national primary curricular categories in the twentieth century*. Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Nassehi, A. (Ed.). (2016). *Kursbuch 185: Fremd sein!* Hamburg: Murmann.

Nipperdey, T. (1998). *Deutsche Geschichte 1800–1866. Bürgerwelt und starker Staat*. München: Beck.

OECD. (2008). *The global competition for talent*. Paris: OECD.

Peter, T. (2014). Umkämpfte Systematizität. Zur diskursiven Konstruktion des Erziehungssystems. *Soziale Systeme, 19*, 53–84.

Peters, M. A., & Besley, T. A. C. (2014). Social exclusion/inclusion. Foucault's analytics of exclusion, the political ecology of social inclusion and the legitimation of inclusive education. *Open Review of Educational Research, 1*(1), 99–115.

Prengel, A. (2005). Heterogenität in der Bildung. Rückblick und Ausblick. In K. Bräu & U. Schwerdt (Eds.), *Heterogenität als Chance. Vom produktiven Umgang mit Gleichheit und Differenz in der Schule* (pp. 19–35). Münster: LIT Verlag.

Schwinges, R. C. (1986). *Beiträge zur Sozial- und Verfassungsgeschichte des Alten Reiches (Nr. 6: Deutsche Universitätsbesucher im 14. und 15. Jahrhundert. Studien zur Sozialgeschichte des Alten Reiches)*. Stuttgart: Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden.

Scott, P. (1998). Massification, internationalization and globalization. In P. Scott (Ed.), *The globalization of higher education* (pp. 108–129). Buckingham: Open University Press.

Simmel, G. (2009). *Excursus on the stranger. Sociology. Inquiries into the construction of social forms (Vol. II)*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.

Stäheli, U. (2004). Semantik und/oder Diskurs. "Updating" Luhmann mit Foucault? *KultuRRevolution, 47*, 14–19.

Stanat, P. (2003). Schulleistungen von Jugendlichen mit Migrationshintergrund. Differenzierung deskriptiver Befunde aus PISA und PISA-E. In J. Baumert, C. Artelt, E. Klieme, et al. (Eds.), *PISA-2000—Ein differenzierter Blick auf die Länder der Bundesrepublik Deutschland* (pp. 243–260). Opladen: Leske + Budrich.

Stichweh, R. (1994). *Wissenschaft, Universität, Professionen*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

Stichweh, R. (2005). *Inklusion/Exklusion und die Soziologie des Fremden. Inklusion und Exklusion. Studien zur Gesellschaftstheorie*. Bielefeld: Transcript.

Stichweh, R. (2010). *Der Fremde: Studien zur Soziologie und Sozialgeschichte*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.

Stifterverband für die deutsche Wissenschaft. (2015). *Diversity-audit "Vielfalt gestalten"*. Essen.

Technische Universität Dortmund. (2013). *Technische Universität Dortmund Hochschulentwicklungsplan 2013–2017*. Retrieved from www.tu-dortmund.de/uni/de/Uni/Zahlen__Daten__Fakten/Dokumente/Hochschulentwicklungsplan_2013-2017.pdf

Technische Universität München TUM. (2015). *Diversity code of conduct*. Retrieved from www.diversity.tum.de/tum-diversity-code-of-conduct/

Teichler, U. (1999). Internationalization as a challenge for higher education in Europe. *Tertiary Education and Management, 5*(1), 5–23.

Universität Duisburg-Essen UDE. (2013). *Offen im Denken. Imagebroschüre*. Duisburg and Essen: UDE.

Wissenschaftsrat. (1988). *Empfehlungen des Wissenschaftsrates zu den Perspektiven der Hochschulen in den 90er Jahren*. Köln: Wissenschaftsrat.

Zymek, B. (2009). Prozesse der Internationalisierung und Hierarchisierung im Bildungssystem. Von der Beharrungskraft und Auflösung nationaler Strukturen und Mentalitäten. *Zeitschrift für Pädagogik, 55*, 175–193.

Tobias Peter is a Post-doctoral Researcher at the Institute of Sociology at Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg and a member of the DFG research group "Mechanisms of elite formation in the German educational system". His current research project concerns the counterdirectional rationalities of equality and excellence in the German education system. His research interests are sociology of education and higher education, systems theory and discourse analysis.