Researching global citizenship education: Towards a critical approach

Anne Schippling
Iscte - Instituto Universitário de Lisboa and FernUniversität in Hagen

- Global citizenship is an ambiguous concept determined by a tension between different features.
- Critical research on GCE needs analytical tools that transcend methodological nationalism.
- The concept of transnational capital has great potential as a tool for critical research on GCE.
- This potential is shown in two biographical case studies at an international school in Germany.
- Perspectives and challenges for critical research in GCE are outlined in this paper.

Purpose: This article contains a reflection on researching in global citizenship education with a critical approach that aims to transcend the paradigm of methodological nationalism.

Design/methodology/approach: Starting from outlining different dimensions of global citizenship (education), and looking at the current research situation in GCE, we propose a methodological turn that overcomes the nation-state paradigm as a base for critical research on GCE. Subsequently, using the concept of transnational capital as an analytical tool, we show – in the example of two biographical case studies in an international school in a large city of West Germany – how to put a critical research on GCE into action.

Findings: The article demonstrates, on the one hand, how a critical approach to research aspects of global citizenship education can be taken, starting from a transnational research stance. On the other hand, it presents new perspectives and challenges for critical research in GCE.

Corresponding author: Anne Schippling, Iscte-Instituto Universitário de Lisboa, CIES-Iscte, Edifício Sedas Nunes, Av. das Forças Armadas, cacifo 236, 1649-026 Lisbon, Portugal, E-Mail: anne.schippling@iscte-iul.pt

1 INTRODUCTION: GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP – AN AMBIGUOUS CONCEPT

In order to tackle the concept of global citizenship, it is necessary to take a look at the concept of citizenship. Firstly, citizenship means legal membership in a political community: the nation state, which is related to the right to political and social participation for all citizens, also for marginalized groups (Marshall, 1992). This membership results in a symbolic community of citizens which can implement their right of participation (Benhabib, 2007). It is only through the practice of political and social participation that legal membership is given meaning. Through their social relationships, citizens can develop a feeling of belonging, in this case to the nation state. By sharing the same realities in their daily lives, values and institutions, people create an identity that makes them feel part of the national community (Gosewinkel, 2010). At the same time, citizenship is associated with processes of exclusion of people who do not have the legal status of citizen, even if they live in the territory, which causes a risk of discrimination and racism (Soysal, 1994; Osler & Starkey, 2005; Bloemraad et al., 2008).

Globalisation processes challenge the paradigm of the nation state. Citizens are confronted with "world risks" which are produced by society itself (Beck, 1998). For Beck (1998, p. 6), the concept of "world risk society" refers to a situation of "uncertainty" because of the "limited controllability of the dangers we have created for ourselves". There seems to be growing pressure on individuals who perceive themselves as part of a community which goes beyond a feeling of state; they are being increasingly pressured to take on the responsibility for confronting "world risks". In this context, Soysal (1994, p. 164) observes "a shift in the major organising principle of membership in contemporary polities: the logic of personhood supersedes the logic of national citizenship". Tackling world risks is a "task" which is now being pushed onto individuals who see themselves as part of the world as world or global citizens.

An aspect related to globalisation is growing migration, which is simultaneously part and consequence of globalisation processes. On the one hand, there are persons who live in a certain territory of a nation state but are excluded from the legal status of citizenship and related rights and obligations (Bates, 2012). On the other hand, there are persons who have a sense of plural belonging to different regions and states and identify with communities which transcend the nation-state borders.

In this context, the traditional concept of citizenship (Marshall, 1992) is confronted with new challenges caused by hitherto unknown dimensions of globalisation and migration processes and there are emerging alternative concepts, such as 'global citizenship'. This concept has different dimensions, sometimes even apparently contradictory. Morais and Ogden (2011, p. 5) define global citizenship as "as a multidimensional construct that hinges on the interrelated dimensions of social responsibility, global competence, and global civic engagement". There are cosmopolitan approaches focused on the individual and his/her responsibilities towards human communities (e.g., Nussbaum, 1996; Appiah, 2006; Glick Schiller & Irving, 2015). These approaches, which are related to cosmopolitanism and a more ethical dimension, are often based on the idea of cosmopolitanism according to Greek antiquity, for example in the figure of Diogenes the Cynic. Diogenes, based on his disappointment with the Greek *polis*, points out a sense of commitment to help other human beings without paying attention to the territory where they are from: "The question was put to him what country he was from, and he replied, 'I am a citizen of the world'" (Laertius, 1925, p. 63; also Brown, 1984).

At the same time, the concept of global citizenship refers to more active political participation and engagement in public decisions with a global approach (e.g., Dower & Williams, 2002; Peters et al., 2008; Benhabib, 2009; Cabrera, 2010). Some of these approaches (e.g., Benhabib, 2009) take as a starting point Immanuel Kant's distinction between *ius publicum civitatum,* which regulates the legal relationships between persons within a state; *ius gentium*, which refers to the

legal relationships between states, and *ius cosmopoliticum*. This distinction was developed in Kant's work *Perpetual Peace*. The cosmopolitan law regulates legal relationships between persons, who are not seen as citizens of a state, but as "citizens of a universal state of mankind" (Kant, 1991, p. 99). Based on this distinction, Benhabib (2009, p. 5) concludes that, in such a global civil society, "individuals are holders of rights due to their identity as citizens of states, but primarily because they are humans".

Based on the approaches outlined above, Oxley and Morris (2013) developed a differentiated typology, which distinguishes eight forms of global citizenship underlining the ambiguous character of this concept, which is characterised by contrasts and even conflicting tendencies between these forms. The two main categories are 'cosmopolitan' and 'advocacy' types of GC: The cosmopolitan branch comprises 'political', 'moral', 'economic' and 'cultural' forms of GC, whereas as the advocacy branch includes its 'social', 'critical', 'environmental' and 'spiritual' forms (in detail: Oxley & Morris, 2013, pp. 305-315). Oxley and Morris (2013, p. 316) consider further that the conceptions of GC developed in this typology "are not fixed or absolute", because there are conceptions of GC that combine elements of the different forms of the proposed typology.

In times of global capitalism and the challenges of mobility and flexibility, the concept of global citizenship can also be regarded as closely linked to a mechanism of social exclusion, as Balarin (2011, p. 355) points out:

> "The aim of developing a global form of citizenship stands in rather tense relation with the realities of vast numbers of marginalised citizens across the globe, to the extent that marginality seems to be the hidden other of global citizenship."

Bates (2012, p. 262) asserts a "hierarchy of citizenships" in this context and describes the attempt that many individuals make to migrate in order to step up within this hierarchy by obtaining multiple citizenships, especially citizenships in "first world countries". He concludes that one way to get an "access route to prestigious first world universities and first world citizenship" is renowned educational qualifications. Due to this fact, an explosion of international school models can be observed in developing countries. Global citizenship, from this perspective, is associated with being a member of an emerging transnational capitalist class (e.g., Sklair, 2001; Robinson, 2004; Firmino da Costa, 2012). Schippling et al. (2020) have shown that this transnational elite imagine themselves as world citizens defending an ideal of cosmopolitanism (also Brown & Lauder, 2010; Keßler et al., 2015).

2 GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION: DIFFERENT WAYS OF CREATING GLOBAL CITIZENS

In recent decades, global citizenship education (GCE) has grown significantly and this is related to the diversification of educational concepts and practices. Dill (2013, p. 1) designates GCE as "one of the fastest growing educational reform movements today". In Europe, especially after the European Congress on Global Education in Maastricht in 2002, the strengthening of policy frameworks in various countries can be seen, in which different actors participate such as national governments, NGOs, academic institutions or international organisations such as UNESCO or the OECD (in more detail Hartmeyer & Wegimont, 2016; Verger et al., 2018). At the beginning of the new millennium, with the Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), a starting point for various initiatives was set to develop global citizenship education, which is actually a key target of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.

At the moment, there are many normative approaches related to an idea of global citizenship education and practical conceptions on how global citizenship could be taught in educational institutions or learned in other settings. At the same time, a tendency can also be seen towards

more analytical and critical approaches to GCE (e.g., Andreotti, 2006, 2011; Andreotti & Souza, 2012; Torres, 2017; Sant et al., 2018; Coelho et al., 2018; Szakács-Behling et al., 2020).

Since the concept of global citizenship is built on different, sometimes even contradictory dimensions, understanding global citizenship education also means complexity and ambiguity (also Torres, 2017). These two concepts, depending on the contexts, can be understood in different ways (Marshall, 2011, 2015; Oxley & Morris, 2013) and there is also a series of partly overlapping concepts, such as global education, democratic education, education for cosmopolitan citizenship, peace education and human rights education or development education.

Bearing in mind the concept of global citizenship and its various dimensions, one can identify different ideas of global citizenship education. Dill (2013, p. 4) distinguishes between two main features of global citizenship education: on the one hand, education in a particular "global consciousness" comprising "an awareness of other perspectives, a vision of oneself as part of a global community of humanity as a whole, and a moral conscience to act for the good of the world". In this context, global citizenship education should raise awareness of issues related to (multiple) feelings of belonging and to participation in the world society and enable one to see oneself as a world citizen. On the other hand, Dill (2013, p. 4) sees that there is an education for "global competencies" in the sense of acquiring the necessary skills and knowledge to overcome the challenges of a global market. He also observes a tension between these two features, which could seem to be contradictory. In this context, Torres (2017, pp. 20-26) analyses the role which the concepts of solidarity and competitiveness play in global citizenship education and how this tension is in the concept itself. Swanson and Pashby (2016, p. 184) notice in this context "a dual agenda" for global citizenship education – the preparation of students for the global economy in acquiring appropriate skills and competencies and the agenda of educating citizens that contribute to a world of social justice – which "are often conflated, while they are arguably ideologically-divergent, contradictory" (see also Shultz, 2007; Marshall, 2009).

The focus on an education for global competencies is rooted in the vision of the "entrepreneurial self" (Bröckling, 2016) based on the ideology of liberal individualism. The references to cosmopolitan ideals function, in this case, as a distinction strategy for global elites, assuring their social reproduction with this strategy (e.g., Keßler et al., 2015; Schippling et al., 2020). These distinction strategies can be observed, for example, in the choice of international school models, such as the IB World Schools, which have experienced an explosive expansion in recent decades (e.g., Ball & Nikita, 2014; Hayden et al., 2015). In this sense, global citizenship education, when it is limited to education for acquiring global skills as a form of transnational capital (e.g., Weenink, 2008, 2014; Kenway & Koh, 2013; Keßler et al., 2018), can contribute to reinforcing structures of social inequality.

Therefore, we need critical approaches to global citizenship education that ask "how it [global citizenship; A.S.] might relate to the marginalised whose citizenship of their own nation-states is insecure" (Bates, 2012, p. 272). Oxley and Morris (2013, p. 313) emphasise that critical global citizenship focuses on a critical perspective on questions and problems related to inequalities and forms of oppression tending "to promote a form of 'counter-hegemony', emphasising the deconstruction of oppressive global structures". They associate critical global citizenship with a post-colonial agenda.

In this context, critical approaches on GCE (e.g., Andreotti, 2006, 2011; Andreotti & Souza, 2012; Abdi et al., 2015; Swanson & Pashby, 2016; Sant et al., 2018; Coelho et al., 2018) enter into direct opposition with some forms of global citizenship education that remain tied to a colonial paradigm, as these forms are closely related to the thinking of Western liberal individualism. There is the danger that GCE may reproduce colonial thinking and the power relations between and associated with the northern and southern hemispheres if one takes an uncritical approach to the project of modernity and Eurocentric thinking. Andreotti (2011, p.

392), in that sense, points out "that moving beyond Eurocentrism requires an account of the 'darker side of modernity' through an understanding of the coloniality of power".

Moving to a critical approach of global citizenship education also has significant consequences for its research and the corresponding analytical perspectives and tools. This article upholds that a transnational research stance that overcomes the paradigm of methodological nationalism contains a fecund potential for researching GCE from a critical perspective.

The next section will contain a methodological reflection on the potential but also the dangers of transcending the paradigm of methodological nationalism in researching GCE and work out its relevance for a critical research approach (3.1). Subsequently, we put critical research on GCE into action, drawing on a concrete research example of a study of student educational biographies from an international school in a large city in West Germany (3.2). The presentation of this study serves an as an example of how a critical research approach to GCE can be implemented in a qualitative empirical design: in this case, in an analysis of educational biographies. Finally, we conclude with the results and discuss some challenges for a critical approach for researching GCE (4).[1]

3 RESEARCHING GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION FROM A CRITICAL PERSPECTIVE

3.1 Transcending the paradigm of methodological nationalism

The research of educational phenomena has until recently been dominated by the paradigm of methodological nationalism, as was the case in many disciplinary traditions in social sciences (in more detail, e.g., Wimmer & Glick Schiller, 2002; Beck, 2006, 2007; Beck & Grande, 2010; Pries, 2010; Amelina et al., 2012). According to Beck (2007) the methodological nationalism paradigm has the nation state as the only unit of reference for analysing social phenomena. He concludes: "Systematically, methodological nationalism takes the following ideal premises for granted: it equates society with nation-state societies, and sees states and their governments as the cornerstones of a social sciences analysis" (Beck, 2007, p. 287). A research perspective anchored in the paradigm of methodological nationalism covers globalisation and transnationalisation phenomena in education for analysis: "the iron cage of nationalized states" had "confined and limited our own analytical capacities" (Wimmer & Glick Schiller, 2002, p. 302). Another critical voice characterises this paradigm as "the stubbornness in current sociological praxis" (Soysal, 1994, p. 164). Global and transnational phenomena in the educational field require a transnational research stance that overcomes this paradigm (e.g., Adick, 2005; Robertson & Dale, 2008; Resnik, 2012; Torres, 2017; Schippling, 2018; Keßler & Szakács-Behling, 2020).

Global citizenship education transcends national borders and is not subsumable under the nation-state reference frame. It transgresses citizenship education as it addresses global problems and comprises "educational practices or institutions which are situated 'beyond', 'above', 'besides' or 'across' the national ones" (Adick, 2005, p. 246; for an overview of empirical studies on GCE, see Goren & Yemini, 2017). For that reason – for researching GCE – there is a need for changing a research perspective that is anchored in the paradigm of methodological nationalism.

How can such a turn in the research perspective be implemented? There are some authors that propose alternative perspectives, such as methodological cosmopolitanism (Beck, 2006, 2007; Beck & Grande, 2010), methodological transnationalism (Levitt & Khagram, 2008; Keßler & Szakács-Behling, 2020) or transnationalism as a research programme (Pries, 2010; Schippling & Keßler, 2021). What do these approaches mean in concrete terms for researching GCE, especially with a critical approach?

Taking a transnational research stance in social sciences – and especially in researching GCE – means to "transnationalize our research practices" (Keßler & Szakács-Behling, 2020, p. 187).

Levitt and Khagram (2008, p. 2) describe this turn at a methodological level as "methodological transnationalism" which aims to revise data analysis processes "that are based on bounded or bordered units so that transnational forms and processes are revealed". In this context, Keßler and Szakács-Behling (2020, pp. 186-187) call attention to the fact that there is a danger that the perspective of "methodological transnationalism" may provoke dichotomist thinking in the sense that the 'national' is excluded or criticized and all observed data are interpreted as 'transnational' even in the absence of evidence. The problematic side of the transnational research stance is to fall into a dogmatic transnationalism that reads transnational dynamics into data. Subsequently, Keßler and Szakács-Behling (2020, p. 194) propose overcoming the paradigm of methodological nationalism through a reflexive research standpoint that is characterised by "a particular sensitivity to processes and practices beyond the national".

For this methodological turn into a transnational approach, adequate analytical instruments are needed.[2] In relation to researching international education, Resnik (2012, p. 292) points out: "[...] there is a feeling that something else is happening, and the analytical tools we possess are too narrow or imprecise to grasp the complex nature of sociology of international education". For researching global citizenship education, which we consider as a form of international education, we also claim that a revision of the analytical tools is necessary, especially when these tools are anchored in the paradigm of a methodological nationalism.

A transnational approach to researching GCE is particularly relevant for critical research. Transgressing a world model based on nation states as the only reference frame for analysis opens up space for research that is critical of established forms of Eurocentric thinking and related power structures. Keßler and Szakács-Behling (2020, p. 187) point out that a transnational approach to researching educational phenomena allows these to be analysed "in their constructedness and interconnections with other frames of experience [than the established ones, A.S.] as well as to enrich our understanding of social experience beyond unilateral perspectives". At the same time, critical research on GCE should pay greater attention to social factors and their impact on this education as "GCE could have different implications for different populations" (Goren & Yemini, 2017, p. 180).

Against this backdrop, we propose the application of the concept of transnational capital as a heuristic analytical tool to analyse educational biographies of students from an international school in a large city in West Germany. We understand the concept of transnational capital as a tool to analyse processes of the (re-)production of social and educational inequality based on overcoming the paradigm of methodological nationalism. Subsequently, in order to develop a critical approach for researching GCE, we consider the concept of transnational capital as a fecund tool. This will be shown in the example of international schools, in this case, as a segment of elite education.

3.2 Researching global citizenship education: Biographical case studies of students in an international school in a large city in West Germany

The field of international schools has grown in a worldwide perspective and a differentiation of international school models can be noticed, for example International Baccalaureate World Schools, European Schools, the UNESCO Associated Schools, the Cambridge International Schools, bilingual schools, etc. The research in international schools is predominantly developed in the anglophone space (e.g., Bates, 2010; Hayden & Thompson, 2011; Dill, 2013; Hayden et al., 2015). Aspects of global citizenship (education) related to the field of international schools have been recently studied, especially in a critical perspective in the context of the reproduction of global elites (e.g., Bates, 2012; Keßler et al., 2015; Dvir et al., 2018; Keßler & Schippling, 2019; Hughes, 2020; Woods & Kong, 2020).

The case studies of Charlotte and Gwyn, students in an IB World School in a large city in West Germany, are part of a wider project which includes a qualitative longitudinal study focusing on

educational biographies and orientations of young people at exclusive schools in Germany, entitled "Exclusive educational careers of young people and the role of peer cultures".[3] The longitudinal case studies took place at this school between 2011 and 2014 and after the transition of the students into higher education between 2015 and 2018. The data analysis was based on the documentary interpretation method, which is a reconstructive qualitative method developed by Ralf Bohnsack (Bohnsack, 2014; Bohnsack et al., 2010; Nohl, 2017). This method is founded on elements of the sociology of knowledge of Karl Mannheim (1964, 1980), the ethnomethodologic approach of Harold Garfinkel (1967) and the praxeological theory of Pierre Bourdieu (1990). The aim of this method is to overcome "a classical dilemma of qualitative research, which either remains on the level of common sense knowledge or claims to offer a privileged access to information on social structure beyond the knowledge of the actors themselves" (Bohnsack et al., 2010, p. 20). It consists of a two level analysis: (1) a reconstruction of the communicated knowledge in a "formulating interpretation" and (2) a reconstruction of the implicit knowledge which underlies the habitualised social action – Mannheim (1964, p. 100) designates it as "atheoretical knowledge" – in a "reflecting interpretation" (Bohnsack, 2010, pp. 110-111, see also Nohl, 2017). Especially the second level focuses on a reconstruction of knowledge in "conjunctive space of experience" (Mannheim, 1980, p. 220), marked by a "common socialization history" (Bohnsack, 2005, p. 119). If this socialisation history took place in transnational social and educational contexts, the "conjunctive space of experience" can be understood as a transnational space of experience. For that reason, the documentary interpretation method as a reconstructive qualitative approach provides fertile analytical tools for researching educational contexts from a transnational research stance. As Scheunpflug et al. (2016, p. 20) underline, "the potential of these approaches is far from exhausted".

The following secondary analysis shows a possible way to analyse aspects related to global citizenship (education) with a critical approach based on an analysis of two contrasting educational biographies of students of an IB World School in West Germany: the case study of Charlotte and Gwyn (see in more detail: Keßler et al., 2015; Keßler & Krüger, 2018; Keßler & Schippling, 2019).

In this secondary analysis, the concept of transnational capital (e.g., Weenink, 2008, 2014; Kenway & Koh, 2013; Keßler et al., 2018; Keßler & Schippling, 2019) is applied as a tool for analysing global citizenship (education), especially for deconstructing ideological discourses around GCE and revealing underlying processes of the (re-)production of global elites. The concept of transnational capital was developed based on a critical reference to the capital theory of Pierre Bourdieu (1986, 1990). In that way, Kenway & Koh (2013, p. 287) confirm that Bourdieu "[…] did not conceive fields that extend beyond the nation state or capitals with exchange value around the world". In this critique, the concept of transnational capital is characterised as a capital "that crosses borders" (Keßler et al., 2018, p. 234) and that allows social actors to engage in global social fields (also Weenink, 2008, 2014).

Biographical case studies of students at an IB World School – Charlotte and Gwyn

Charlotte and Gwyn attend an IB World School in a large city in West Germany. This school, situated in a economically thriving region, offers the IB Diploma and has students from almost 50 different nationalities. The school is mostly attended by mobile families that have management positions in global enterprises in this region. These pay the school fees for the children of these families (around 1000-1500 euros per month).

Charlotte is part of a group of students of German origin that have no mobility experience and families that seek an international education for their children in order to prepare them to study in an international university and enter the global market in the future (Keßler & Krüger, 2018, p. 218). Charlotte's family has the economic resources to finance her schooling. Her father has his own company and her mother works in a fashion shop.

The educational biography of Charlotte is marked by the idea of global citizenship and international mindedness. In tune with the school's educational claim, she points out that, more than the academic dimension, "they really want to teach us how to er cope as a citizen of the world" (interview 1 with Charlotte).[4] Contrary to German state schools where, in Charlotte's eyes, only the academic dimension is taken into account, she emphasises that there are more important things than having excellent marks: "I find that it's better when you are open and er know how to go about in the world than when you are clever but cannot cope with others at all" (interview 1 with Charlotte).

Charlotte shows relative strategic educational orientation for pursuing her aims and ambitions, namely studying film, international relations or business management in Great Britain or France. She organised her educational trajectory so that she could study abroad:

> "[...] well I would like to go abroad and I've actually already chosen my IB subjects so that I can only go abroad because Germany is not a point of discussion for me, I don't know, I just want to get out of here." (interview 1 with Charlotte)

The reasons for her choice for the international school are, one the one hand, "the English, the international" that gives her an international understanding that she considers "the best for any job". Secondly, she appreciates the reputation of her school. She sees it as an advantage for having a good CV and studying in an international context: "er it's always good to have it in your curriculum vitae if you want to study abroad or something" (interview 1 with Charlotte). Also, during her educational trajectory and after leaving school (interview 2 and 3 with Charlotte) she sees English as a necessary condition to be successful in the global labour market (in more detail Keßler & Krüger, 2018, pp. 220-221; Keßler & Schippling, 2019, pp. 148-150).

Applying the concept of transnational capital to this case, we can see that Charlotte's reference to the international dimension and to global citizenship is closely linked to her strategic orientation for being successful in studying in an international university and in the global labour market. Learning English and being able to understand other cultures and interact with them can be understood as the acquisition of an incorporated form of transnational cultural capital. Furthermore, attending an international school of good repute functions as an institutionalised form of transnational cultural capital (also Keßler et al., 2018).

Gwyn, in contrast to Charlotte, is embedded in a more transnational orientated biographical context, due to the migration history of his family. He was born in the United States where he spent the first five years of his life before moving to Germany, where he currently lives. He holds non-German dual citizenship; his parents are from Southern Europe. They have a consolidated economic and cultural background; for example, his father has a professorship at a German university, so that they are able to finance Gwyn's schooling.

Gwyn's educational orientation is less strategic than in Charlotte's case (see in more detail Keßler & Schippling, p. 151). His orientation is anchored in his personal interests and the fact that he enjoys what he is learning. Some of his interests are anthropology, linguistics and music and he is developing these interests in a very creative way. He likes to compose and reflect on other cultures and languages; for example he wants to write a book about a world that he invented:

> "I want to create a world in which they speak a language, because in the lang- in linguistics (.) you also research where the languages come from and how they develop, and also the people wander and so on and I'm interested in this [...] if you create this yourself then you know all about this and if want to know more about it you simply create this too [...]" (interview 2 with Gwyn)

His ideas and plans for his future are based on these interests: he wants to study something related to music, as he plays clarinet, piano and composes, or study linguistics or anthropology as he is interested in other cultures. He plans to study at a university in the United States and his choice of university depends of the offer of disciplines that best match his personal interests (in more detail Keßler & Krüger, 2018, p. 222). These interests come into conflict with the plans of his father, who wants him to study a discipline in the natural sciences – in this case biology – which his father considers as a secure economical basis for a future life: "my father started to get angry [...] that I'm doing something with music, he said that this would be a hobby [...] he has always said er that without biology you can't afford a life [...]" (interview 1 with Gwyn).

Gwyn, like Charlotte, perceives himself as a global citizen, which is manifest more in his incorporated practices, for example, his integration in transnational family networks, his fascination for other cultures and languages, or his plans to study at an American university and less in a direct reflection on that, as Charlotte did. His interests in other cultures and his own transnational family context enable him to reflect on inequalities in education from a global perspective:

> "[...] that's not fair for the people that have to be for example in a *Southern European country* [country of origin of Gwyn's family] or in a *Hauptschule* [secondary school in Germany preparing for an apprenticeship] because they- and and there they don't learn anything useful, they do not have a future just because they do not attend a good school." (interview 1 with Gwyn)

Approaching the concept of transnational capital, the case study of Gwyn makes the incorporation of transnational cultural capital visible in the form of his language competencies and also his knowledge about different cultures and languages. Differently from Charlotte, Gwyn doesn't enact this capital for putting a strategic future career plan into action as in the case of Charlotte, but for following his personal interests even against the plans of his father, who strives for a successful career for Gwyn. His choice of university is focused in a natural way on the United States as he was born there and has personal contacts to this place – which can be understood as a form of transnational social capital. Overall, Gwyn's identification as a global citizen is less related to a strategic reflection on a future international career than in the case of Charlotte. It is, however, more embedded in his daily habitual practices and corresponding personal preferences and interests in other cultures and global world problems (in more detail Keßler & Schippling, 2019, pp. 152-153; Keßler & Krüger, 2018, pp. 221-222).

4 TOWARDS A CRITICAL APPROACH: CONCLUSION AND CHALLENGES FOR RESEARCHING GLOBAL CITIZENSHIP EDUCATION

Considering the actual ever more intense processes of inter- and transnationalisation and globalisation in education, one can see the danger of the concepts of global citizenship and global citizenship education becoming 'catch-all' concepts, which function as an empty buzzword. This is also related to the awareness that global citizenship (education) cannot be considered homogenous and can be composed of various, even contradictory elements (e.g., Dill, 2013; Oxley & Morris, 2013; Swanson & Pashby, 2016).

The biographical case studies of Charlotte and Gwyn as students at an exclusive IB World School in a large city in West Germany – which function here as an example how a research on GCE can be put into action – show different ways in which students can enact global citizenship (education) in their educational biographies: the case study of Charlotte shows a way of creating global citizens in which the contact with the "international" is mostly oriented to the acquisition of diverse competencies, which are a form of transnational capital, in order to be prepared for

the challenges of a global labour market. Charlotte's case can be seen as a case that represents the vision of an "entrepreneurial self" (Bröckling, 2016). The reference to international mindedness and global citizenship can be more associated with neoliberal ideologies "as strategies of self-mobilisation" (Keßler et al., 2015, p. 124) for the global market. Gwyn, on the other hand, also mobilises transnational capital, but more in the form of an active confrontation with world problems and global aspects as he is very interested in other cultures and languages, an interest that also determines his study choice. He has a critical awareness of his own privilege in attending an international school and reflects on educational inequalities from a global perspective (in more detail Keßler & Schippling, 2019, p. 153).

Applying the typology of Oxley and Morris (2013), we can relate the educational biography of Gwyn to forms of cultural, social and critical global citizenship, whereas the biographical case study of Charlotte is more characterised by elements of cultural and economical citizenship. Referring to the "dual agenda" for global citizenship education of Swanson and Pashby (2016) and the differentiation of GCE by Dill (2013), Charlotte's biography is more orientated towards an education for acquiring competencies for the global market. The case of Gwyn, on the other hand, is more characterised by an interest in other cultures and an awareness of global problems and also social and educational inequalities in the world (also Dill, 2013).

We consider the analysis of these two biographical case studies at an international school to be an example of how critical research on aspects of global citizenship (education) can be put into action based on a qualitative empirical research design. In order to take a transnational research stance, we applied the concept of transnational capital in this biographical analysis to research aspects of global citizenship (education) under the perspective of the reproduction of a "transnational capitalist class" (e.g., Sklair, 2001). We see a fecund potential in the application of the concept of transnational capital for a critical research approach, as it allows a deconstruction of discursive ideologies around GCE – as they appear in the field of exclusive international schools that we have seen in this example – and a critical reflection on related mechanisms of the reproduction of social inequalities in education.

Against this backdrop, how can the complex and often ambiguous reality of global citizenship education be researched? We see three main challenges for this research:

(1) As the first challenge we see a need to move from normative research on GCE to more critical and reflexive research approaches. The ideology deconstruction process should be more focused on empirical discourses and practices of GCE, where there is still a research deficit. Focussing on the deconstruction process of the established knowledge, discourses and practices – as we demonstrated in the case studies at an international school – should contribute to avoiding GCE reproducing ideologies, such as neoliberal-oriented forms of global citizenship education.

(2) Subsequently, critical research on GCE has to adopt an auto-reflexive perspective in order not to reproduce the existing social inequalities and power structures within the different education fields but also related to the North-South problem and colonial thinking (e.g., Santos, 2007; Andreotti, 2011; Andreotti & Souza, 2012; Weiß, 2017). Therefore it is necessary to overcome the paradigm of methodological nationalism which still dominates research in education as it is focused on formal education systems established by the nation state. The reworking of capital theory based on transgressing this paradigm has fertile potential for researching GCE from a critical perspective, as we have shown in the analysis of our biographical case studies.

(3) To take a transnational research stance in the analysis of educational phenomena, it is necessary to "transnationalize our research practices" (Keßler & Szakács-Behling, 2020, p. 183). Critical research on global citizenship education needs a revision of traditional analytic tools and the development of innovative research designs that transcend the nation-state paradigm. The use of the concept of transnational capital as such an analytical tool is an important contribution for developing critical-oriented research on GCE. This is the case especially when it is applied for analysing different educational fields and contexts — not only the exclusive fields like the international schools — and developing comparative perspectives. It allows us to analyse and

deconstruct interconnections between global citizenship education and processes of social inequalities and power structures within and beyond national educational systems.

REFERENCES

Abdi, A. A., Shultz, L., & Pillay, T. (Eds.). (2015). *Decolonizing Global Citizenship Education.* Sense Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-277-6

Adick, C. (2005). Transnationalisierung als Herausforderung für die International und Interkulturell Vergleichende Erziehungswissenschaft [Transnationalisation as a Challenge for International and Intercultural Comparative Educational Sciences]. *Tertium Comparationis. Journal für International und Interkulturell Vergleichende Erziehungswissenschaft, 11*(2), 243–269.

Amelina, A., Nergiz, D. D., Faist, T., & Glick Schiller, N. (Eds.). (2012). *Beyond methodological nationalism. Research methodologies for cross-border studies*. Routledge.

Andreotti, V. (2006). Soft versus critical global citizenship education. *Policy & Practice: A Development Education Review, 3*, 40–51.

Andreotti, V. (2011). (Towards) decoloniality and diversality in global citizenship education. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 9*(3-4), 381–397. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2011.605323

Andreotti, V., & Souza, L. M. (Eds.). (2012). *Postcolonial perspectives on global citizenship education.* Routledge.

Appadurai, A. (1991). Global ethnoscapes: notes and queries for a transnational anthropology. In R. G. Fox (Ed.), *Interventions: Anthropologies of the Present* (pp. 91–210). School of American Research.

Appadurai, A. (1996). *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization.* University of Minnesota Press.

Appiah, K. A. (2006). *Cosmopolitanism: ethics in a world of strangers.* Norton.

Balarin, M. (2011). Global citizenship and marginalisation: contributions towards a political economy of global citizenship. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 9*(3–4), 355–366. https://doi.org/10.1080/14767724.2011.605321

Ball, S., & Nikita, D. (2014). The global middle class and school choice: A cosmopolitan sociology. *Zeitschrift für Erziehungswissenschaft, 17*(3), 81–93. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11618-014-0523-4

Bates, R. (Ed.). (2010). *Schooling Internationally: Globalisation, Internationalisation and the Future for International Schools.* Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203834800

Bates, R. (2012). Is global citizenship possible, and can international schools provide it? *Journal of Research in International Education, 11*(3), 262-274. https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240912461884

Beck, U. (1998). *World Risk Society.* Polity Press.

Beck, U. (2006). *Cosmopolitan Vision.* Polity Press.

Beck, U. (2007). The cosmopolitan condition. Why methodological nationalism fails. *Theory, Culture and Society, 24*(7–8), 286–290. https://doi.org/10.1177/02632764070240072505

Beck, U., & Grande, E. (2004). *Das kosmopolitische Europa [Cosmopolitan Europe].* Suhrkamp.

Beck, U., & Grande, E. (2010). Jenseits des methodologischen Nationalismus: Außereuropäische und europäische Variationen der Zweiten Moderne [Beyond Methodological Nationalism: Extra-European and European Varieties of Second Modernity]. *Soziale Welt, 61*(3/4), 187–216. https://doi.org/10.5771/0038-6073-2010-3-4-187

Benhabib, S. (2007). Twilight of Sovereignty or the Emergence of Cosmopolitan Norms? Rethinking Citizenship in Volatile Times. *Citizenship Studies, 11*(1), 19–36. https://doi.org/10.1080/13621020601099807

Benhabib, S. (2009). Kosmopolitismus und Demokratie. Von Kant zu Habermas [Cosmopolitanism and democracy. From Kant to Habermas]. *Blätter für deutsche und internationale Politik, 6*, 1–10. https://www.eurozine.com/kosmopolitismus-und-demokratie

Bloemraad, I., Korteweg, A., & Yurdakul, G. (2008). Citizenship and Immigration: Multiculturalism, Assimilation and Challenges to the Nation-State. *Annual Review of Sociology, 34*, 153–179. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.34.040507.134608

Bohnsack, R. (2005). "Social Worlds" und "Natural Histories". Zum Forschungsstil der Chicagoer Schule anhand zweier klassischer Studien ["Social Worlds" and "Natural Histories". On the research style of the Chicago School based on two classical studies]. *Zeitschrift für qualitative Bildungs-, Beratungs- und Sozialforschung, 6*(1), 105–127.

Bohnsack, R. (2010). Documentary Method and Group Discussions. In R. Bohnsack, N. Pfaff, & W. Weller (Eds.), *Qualitative Analysis and Documentary Method in International Educational Research* (pp. 99–124). Budrich.

Bohnsack, R. (2014). *Rekonstruktive Sozialforschung. Einführung in qualitative Methoden [Reconstructive social research. Introduction to qualitative methods]* (9th ed.). Budrich.

Bohnsack, R., Pfaff, N., & Weller, W. (Eds.). (2010). *Qualitative Analysis and Documentary Method in International Educational Research.* Budrich.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). The Forms of Capital. In J. G. Richardson (Ed.), *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education* (pp. 241–258). Greenwood.

Bourdieu, P. (1990). *The Logic of Practice.* Polity Press.

Bröckling, U. (2016). *The Entrepreneurial Self: Fabricating a New Type of Subject.* SAGE Publications. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781473921283

Brown, E. (2006). Hellenistic Cosmopolitanism. In M. L. Gill, & P. Pellegrin (Eds.), *A Companion to Ancient Philosophy* (pp. 549–558). Blackwell.

Brown, C., & Lauder, H. (2010). The political economy of international schools and social class formation. In R. Bates (Ed.), *Schooling internationally. Globalisation, internationalisation and the future for international schools* (pp. 39–58). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203834800

Cabrera, L. (2010). *The Practice of Global Citizenship.* Cambridge University Press.

Coelho, D. P., Caramelo, J., & Menezes, I. (2018). Educação para o desenvolvimento na era global. Possibilidades de uma leitura pós-colonial [Education for development in the global era. Possibilities for a post-colonial reading]. *Educação, Sociedade & Culturas, 53*, 97–119.

Dill, J. S. (2013). *The longings and limits of global citizenship education. The moral pedagogy of schooling in a cosmopolitan age*. Routledge.

Dower, N., & Williams, J. (Eds.). (2002). *Global Citizenship – A Critical Reader*. Edinburgh University Press.

Dvir, Y., Shields, R., & Yemini, M. (2018). Three faces of global citizenship education: IB Schools' self-representations in four local contexts. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 66*(4), 455–475. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2018.1533102

Firmino da Costa, A. (2012). *Desigualdades sociais contemporâneas [Contemporary social inequlities]*. Editora Mundos Sociais.

Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Prentice-Hall.

Glick Schiller, N., & Irving, A. (Eds.). (2015). *Whose cosmopolitanism? Critical perspectives, relationalities and discontents*. Berghahn Books. https://doi.org/10.1111/1469-8676.12207

Goren, H., & Yemini, M. (2017). Global citizenship education redefined – A systematic review of empirical studies on global citizenship education. *International Journal of Educational Research, 82*, 170–183. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijer.2017.02.004

Gosewinkel, D. (2010). Citizenship. In H. K. Anheier, S. Toepler, & R. List (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Civil Society* (pp. 140–145). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-0-387-93996-4_83

Hartmeyer, H., & Wegimont, L. (Eds.). (2016). *Global education in Europe revisited. Strategies and structures. Policy, practice and challenges.* Waxmann.

Hayden, M., & Thompson, J. (2011). *International schools: growth and influence.* UNESCO/IIEP.

Hayden, M., Levy, J., & Thompson, J. (Eds.). (2015). *The Sage Handbook of Research in International Education* (2nd ed.). SAGE Publications. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781473943506

Hughes, C. (2020). International Schools and Global Citizenship Education. In A. Akkari, K. Maleq (Eds.), *Global Citizenship Education. Critical and International Perspectives* (pp. 177–190). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-44617-8_13

Kant, I. (1991). To perpetual peace: a philosophical sketch. In I. Kant, *Political Writings*. Cambridge University Press. (Original work published in 1795)

Kenway, J., & Koh, A. (2013). The elite school as 'cognitive machine' and 'social paradise': Developing transnational capitals for the national 'field of power'. *Journal of Sociology, 43*(2/3) 272–290. https://doi.org/10.1177/1440783313481525

Keßler, C. I., & Krüger, H.-H. (2018). Being international. Institutional Claims and Student Perspectives at an Exclusive International School. In C. Maxwell, U. Deppe, H.-H. Krüger, & W. Helsper (Eds.), *Elite Education and Internationalisation. From the Early Years to Higher Education* (pp. 209–228). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-59966-3_13

Keßler, C. I., & Schippling, A. (2019). "Sie lehren uns wirklich Bürger in der Welt zu werden". Bildungsverläufe und Internationalitätsentwürfe junger Erwachsener einer IB World School ["They really teach us to become citizens of the world". Educational pathways and concepts of internationality of young adults at an IB World School]. In H.-H. Krüger, K. Hüfner, C. I. Keßler, S. Kreuz, P. Leinhos, & D. Winter (Eds.), *Exklusive Bildungskarrieren von Jugendlichen und ihre Peers am Übergang in Hochschule und Beruf. Ergebnisse einer qualitativen Längsschnittstudie* (pp. 141–158). Springer VS. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-23175-0_5

Keßler, C. I., & Szakács-Behling, S. (2020). Researching the Transnational and Transnationalizing the Research. Towards a Methodological Turn in Education. In C. Machold, A. Messerschmidt, & S. Hornberg (Eds.), *Jenseits des Nationalen? Erziehung und Bildung im Spannungsverhältnis von Entgrenzung und Begrenzung nationaler Ordnungen* (pp. 183–199). Budrich.

Keßler, C. I., Kotzyba, K., & Schippling, A. (2018). Biografieanalyse und transnationales Kapital. Theoretische und methodologische Reflexionen [Biographical analysis and transnational capital. Theoretical and methodological reflections]. *Tertium Comparationis. Journal für International und Interkulturell Vergleichende Erziehungswissenschaft, 24*(2), 226–243.

Keßler, C., Krüger, H.-H., Schippling, A., & Otto, A. (2015). Envisioning world citizens? Self-presentations of an international school in Germany and related orientations of its pupils. *Journal of Research in International Education, 14*(2), 114–126. https://doi.org/10.1177/1475240915593844

Krüger, H.-H. (2018). Exklusive Bildungskarrieren von Jugendlichen bzw. jungen Erwachsenen und ihre Peers am Übergang in Hochschule und Beruf. Eine Einleitung [Exclusive educational careers of adolescents or young adults and their peers in the transition to higher education and work. An introduction]. In H.-H. Krüger, K. Hüfner, C. Keßler, S. Kreuz, P. Leinhos, & D. Winter (Eds.), *Exklusive Bildungskarrieren von Jugendlichen und ihre Peers am Übergang in Hochschule und Beruf* (pp. 1–27). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-23175-0_1

Laertius, D. (1925). *The Lives and Opinions of the Ancient Philosophers* (transl. by R. D. Hicks). Loeb Classical Library. (Original work published in 1622)

Levitt, P., & Khagram, S. (2008). Constructing Transnational Studies. In S. Khagram, & P. Levitt (Eds.), *The Transnational Studies Reader. Intersections and Innovations* (pp. 21–39). Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203893692

Mannheim, K. (1964). *Wissenssoziologie [Sociology of Knowledge].* Luchterhand.

Mannheim, K. (1980). *Strukturen des Denkens [Structures of Thinking].* Suhrkamp.

Marshall, H. (2009). Educating the European citizen in the global age: Engaging with the postnational and identifying a research agenda. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 41*(2), 247–267. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220270802642002

Marshall, H. (2011). Education for global citizenship: reflecting upon the instrumentalist agendas at play. In R. Bates (Ed.), *Schooling internationally. Globalisation, internationalisation and the future for international schools* (pp. 182–200). Routlegde. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203834800-14

Marshall, H. (2015). The global education terminology debate: exploring some of the issues. In M. Hayden, J. Levy, & J. Thompson (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Research in International Education* (2nd ed., pp. 108–121). Sage Publications. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781848607866.n4

Marshall, T. H. (1992). *Citizenship and social class.* Cambridge University Press. (Original work published in 1950)

Morais, D., & Ogden, A. (2011). Initial development and validation of the global citizenship scale. *Journal of Studies in International Education, 15*(5), 445–466. https://doi.org/10.1177/1028315310375308

Nohl, A.-M. (2017). *Interview und Dokumentarische Methode. Anleitungen für die Forschungspraxis [Interview and documentary method. Instructions for research practice]* (5th ed.). Springer VS. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-16080-7

Nussbaum, M. C. (1996). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For Love of Country: Debating the Limits of Patriotism* (pp. 2–17). Beacon Press.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing Citizenship: Democracy and Inclusion in Education.* Open University Press.

Oxley, L., & Morris, P. (2013). Global Citizenship: A Typology for Distinguishing its Multiple Conceptions. *British Journal of Educational Studies, 61*(3), 301–325. https://doi.org/10.1080/00071005.2013.798393

Peters, M. A., Britton, A., & Blee, H. (Eds.). (2008). *Global citizenship education: philosophy, theory and pedagogy.* Sense Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789087903756

Pries, L. (2010). *Transnationalisierung: Theorie und Empirie grenzüberschreitender Vergesellschaftung [Transnationalisation: Theory and empiric analysis of cross-border socialisation].* VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-531-92595-0

Resnik, J. (2012). Sociology of international education – an emerging field of research. *International studies in Sociology of Education, 22*(4), 291–310. https://doi.org/10.1080/09620214.2012.751203

Robertson, S. L., & Dale, R. (2008). Researching Education in a Globalising Era Beyond Methodological Nationalism, Methodological Statism, Methodological Educationism and Spatial Fetishism. In J. Resnik (Ed.), *The Production of Educational Knowledge in the Global Era* (pp. 17–32). Sense Publishers. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789087905613_003

Robinson, W. (2004). *A Theory of Global Capitalism.* John Hopkins University Press.

Sant, E., Davies, I., Pashby, K., & Shultz, L. (2018). *Global citizenship education: a critical introduction to key concepts and debates.* Bloomsbury.

Santos, B. de S. (2007). Beyond abyssal thinking: From global lines to ecologies of knowledges. *Revista Crítica de Ciências Sociais, 78*, 1–42. https://www.eurozine.com/beyond-abyssal-thinking

Sassen, S. (1991). *The Global City: New York, London, Tokyo.* Princeton University Press.

Scheunpflug, A., Krogull, S., & Franz, J. (2016). Understanding learning in world society: Qualitative reconstructive research in global learning and learning for sustainability. *International Journal of Development Education and Global Learning, 7*(3), 6–23. https://doi.org/10.18546/IJDEGL.07.3.02

Schippling, A. (2018). Researching international schools: Challenges for comparative educational research. *Revista Lusófona de Educação, 41*(41), 193–204. https://doi.org/10.24140/issn.1645-7250.rle41.12

Schippling, A., & Keßler, C. I. (2021). Internationalisierung im deutschen Schulsystem [Internationalisation in the German school system]. In T. Hascher, T.-S. Idel, & W. Helsper (Eds.), *Handbuch Schulforschung.* Springer VS [in press].

Schippling, A., Abrantes, P., & Lopes, J. M. T. (2020). Educação de elites e a dimensão da internacionalização em Portugal [Education of elites and the internationalisation dimension in Portugal]. *Sociologia, Problemas e Práticas, 94*, 119–137. https://doi.org/10.7458/SPP20209415891

Shultz, L. (2007). Educating for global citizenship: Conflicting agendas and understandings. *The Alberta Journal of Educational Research, 53*(3), 248–258.

Sklair, L. (2001). *The transnational capitalist class.* Basil Blackwill.

Soysal, Y. N. (1994). *Limits of Citizenship: Migrants and Postnational Membership in Europe.* Chicago University Press.

Swanson, D. M., & Pashby, K. (2016). Towards a Critical Global Citizenship?:A Comparative Analysis of GC Education Discourses in Scotland and Alberta. *Journal of Research in Curriculum & Instruction, 20*(3), 184–195. https://doi.org/10.24231/rici.2016.20.3.184

Szakács-Behling, S., Bock, A., Kessler, C. I., Macgilchrist, F., & Spielhaus, R. (2020). Global Citizenship in Motion: Comparing Cross-Border Practices in German Schools Abroad. In S. Carney, & E. Klerides (Eds.), *Identities and Education. Comparative Perspectives in Times of Crisis.* Bloomsbury [in press].

Torres, C. A. (2017). *Theoretical and Empirical Foundations of Critical Global Citizenship Education.* Routledge.

Verger, A., Novelli, M., & Kosar Altinyelken, H. (Eds.). (2018). *Global Education Policy and International Development. New Agendas, Issues and Policies* (2nd ed.). Bloomsbury. http://doi.org/10.5040/9781472544575

Weenink, D. (2008). Cosmopolitanism as a form of capital: Parents preparing their children for a globalizing world. *Sociology, 42*(6), 1089–1106. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038508096935

Weenink, D. (2014). Pupils' plans to study abroad: Social reproduction of transnational capital? In J. Gerhards, S. Hans, & S. Carlson (Eds.), *Globalisierung, Bildung und grenzüberschreitende Mobilität* (pp. 111–126). Springer VS. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-658-02439-0_6

Weiß, A. (2017). *Soziologie globaler Ungleichheiten [Sociology of Global Inequalities]*. Suhrkamp.

Wimmer, A., & Glick Schiller, N. (2002). Methodological nationalism and beyond. Nation-state building, migration and the social sciences. *Global Networks, 2*(4), 301–334. https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-0374.00043

Woods, O., & Kong, L. (2020). The spatial subversions of global citizenship education: Negotiating imagined inclusions and everyday exclusions in international schools in China. *Geoforum, 112*, 139–147. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2020.04.005

ENDNOTES

[1] This article is based on a cooperation project between the Centro de Investigação e Estudos de Sociologia (CIES-Iscte) in Lisbon and the University of Göttingen, titled "Learning to be a Global Citizen. Theoretical Perspectives and Methodological Approaches", funded by the Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia (FCT) and the Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD), which started on 01/01/2018 and ended on 31/12/2019.

[2] Concepts for breaking up the equation of society, nation and state were developed in various disciplines, such as sociology, anthropology, ethnology, geography or political sciences and based on empirical research, for example, the concept of "global city" (Sassen, 1991), the concept of "scapes" (Appadurai, 1991, 1996) or the idea of a "cosmopolitan Europe" (Beck & Grande, 2004, 2010).

[3] The research project is included in the research unit "Mechanisms of Elite Education within the German Educational System" (FOR 1612), financed by the German Research Foundation (DFG) (project duration: 2011-2019). This research project mainly focuses on the (educational) biographies of young people at five German upper secondary schools with different claims to exclusivity: one of them an IB World School where the case studies of Charlotte and Gwyn took place. In total, 56 young people in five schools (ca. ten cases per school), participated in a longitudinal qualitative study in which qualitative biographical interviews and group discussions were conducted at four time points beginning in the tenth school grade. Additionally, the school directors of all five schools were interviewed and a quantitative survey of different features related to the student took place (in more detail Krüger, 2019). The author of this article was an associated researcher of this research unit.

[4] The longitudinal case studies of Charlotte and Gwyn comprise four interviews: the first when they were in the tenth grade, the second in the twelfth grade, the third interview two years after they left school and the fourth interview five years after they left school. All quotations from the interviews were translated from German into English.