Dve
Domovini
Two
homelands

62 2025

A CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK FOR MULTI-WAY INTEGRATION (MUWI) WITH A FOCUS ON RESIDENTS' MULTIPLE IDENTITIES AND INTERSECTIONALITIES

Claudia Schneider[I]

ABSTRACT

A Conceptual Framework for Multi-Way Integration (MUWI) With a Focus on Residents' Multiple Identities and Intersectionalities

Conceptual frameworks on integration have moved from one to two-way integration, focusing on all residents in integration processes. This paper advocates a conceptual framework for "multi-way integration" (MUWI), which focuses explicitly on residents' multiple identities and intersectionality to enhance connectivity and mutual understanding between all residents. The discussion also addresses factors impacting this connectivity, including social structures, social mechanisms, artifacts, and environments. The above dimensions and interconnections are not only relevant for researching integration processes but also for developing effective integration strategies.

KEYWORDS: connectivity, migration, social mechanisms, artifacts, structures, environments

IZVLEČEK

Konceptualni okvir za večsmerno integracijo (MUWI) s poudarkom na večplastnih identitetah in presečnostih prebivalcev

Konceptualni okviri integracije so se premaknili od enosmerne k dvosmerni integraciji, pri čemer se osredotočajo na vse prebivalce v procesih integracije. Avtorica se v prispevku zavzema za konceptualni okvir za »večsmerno integracijo« (angl. *multi-way integration*, MUWI), ki se izrecno osredotoča na mnogovrstne identitete prebivalcev in njihovo presečnost, z namenom večje povezanosti in medsebojnega razumevanja med vsemi prebivalci. Pri tem obravnava tudi dejavnike, ki vplivajo na to povezanost, vključno z družbenimi strukturami, socialnimi mehanizmi, artefakti in okoljem. Navedene dimenzije in medsebojne povezave niso pomembne le za raziskovanje procesov integracije, temveč tudi za vzpostavljanje učinkovitih strategij integracije.

KLJUČNE BESEDE: povezanost, migracije, socialni mehanizmi, artefakti, strukture, okolja

---

[I] PhD in sociology (LSE), Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge; claudia.schneider@aru.ac.uk; ORCID https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8788-0164

INTRODUCTION

Over the past two decades, integration scholars have moved from one-way assimilationist to two-way models of integration which focus on all residents (Ager & Strang, 2008; Strang & Ager, 2010; Penninx & Garcés-Mascareñas, 2016; Spencer & Charsley, 2016; Spencer & Charsley, 2021; Ndofor-Tah et al., 2019). However, explicitly or implicitly, these approaches analyze social actors mainly in the context of the binary distinction and social constructs of migrants/non-migrants, insiders/outsiders, and newcomers/existing society. These dichotomies potentially perpetuate inequalities and exclusion in integration processes and contradict the aims of connecting all people (Foroutan, 2019). This paper argues that a multi-way integration (MUWI) framework, which emphasizes multiple identities and intersectionalities of all residents in integration processes, would address these contradictions and offer new opportunities for integration projects and research.[1] It contributes to Klarenbeek's (2021, p. 902) dimension of "integration with each other," which she views as under-researched.[2]

A few authors have explicitly discussed multiple identities and intersectionalities in migration and integration (e.g., Kaushik & Walsh, 2018; Manzi & Benet-Martinez, 2022). However, they mainly apply the above concepts to migrants rather than residents' integration with each other.[3] Although intersectionality was initially developed in the context of gender, it is applied here to relational processes associated with interconnections of categories such as migration background, heritage, gender, class, age, and disability (Anthias, 2013; Collins & Bilge, 2020). Intersectionality is often reflected as a value-laden concept associated with multiple disadvantages and inequalities, whereby multiple identities are seen as a "positive politics of recognition" (Werbner, 2013, p. 403). Both intersectionality and multiple identities are applied in this paper as *a priori* neutral analytical concepts which highlight the interrelations of residents with diverse migration, heritage class, gender, age, and disability backgrounds (intersectionalities), and the associations with the above categories at an individual level of residents (multiple identities). Processes of interconnecting people with multiple identities and intersectionalities occur in the wider social context, which is reflected by Bunge's (2003) framework of structures, social mechanisms, artifacts, and environments.

The article aims to present and discuss an analytical framework that emphasizes concepts and analytical connections that have not been (explicitly) addressed by previous integration frameworks. The discussion highlights gaps in primary research

---

1   The term multi-way integration was developed by the author for a workshop with community leaders in England (Schneider, 2020).
2   However, Klarenbeek (2021) applies her notion of "integrating with each other" to the limited binary of "insiders" and "outsiders."
3   The concept of residents does not relate to a legal definition of "resident" but refers to all people residing in a country for a shorter or longer period.

and practice regarding the role of multiple identities and intersectionalities in integration processes and their connections with artifacts, mechanisms, structures, and environments. The article, therefore, aims 1) to start a discussion of moving multiple identities and intersectionality into the center of integration research and practice and 2) to identify areas for further exploration by academics, practitioners, and policymakers. Following a review of integration frameworks in the context of multiple identities and intersectionalities, the paper develops the multi-way integration (MUWI) framework. The final section discusses the application of MUWI in the context of practice and research, followed by recommendations for multi-way integration strategies.

ANALYSIS OF EXISTING INTEGRATION FRAMEWORKS

This section will look at conceptual frameworks of integration developed by Ager & Strang (2008), Strang & Ager (2010), Penninx & Garcés-Mascareñas (2016), Ndofor-Tah et al. (2019), and Spencer & Charsley (2016; 2021). They will be analyzed in the context of residents' multiple identities and intersectionalities, social structures, social mechanisms, artifacts, and environments, and inform the development of the MUWI framework further below.

Social actors and their multiple identities and intersectionalities

As the introduction outlines, most integration frameworks use a binary understanding of social actors, focusing on labels such as migrants/non-migrants and outsiders/insiders. These binaries are problematic as they reflect exclusive categories and labeling processes that potentially contradict the process of bringing people together (Anthias, 2013; Foroutan, 2019). A recent framework developed by Ndofor-Tah et al. (2019) started to critique the dichotomy:[4]

> Integration is a process of "mixing" through interaction between people who are diverse in multiple ways, not only on the basis of ethnicity or countries of origin. This framework *does not* assume the existence of a homogenous society in which a minority group may be "inserted." (Ndofor-Tah et al., 2019, p. 20, emphasis in original)

Spencer & Charsley (2021) have also amended their original framework (2016) in their latest publication to focus on individuals in general. Although both Ndofor-Tah et al. (2019) and Spencer & Charsley (2021) try to avoid the migrant/non-migrant binary, they do not incorporate more explicit aspects of individuals' multiple identities and intersectionalities into their frameworks. They continue to associate specific

---

4   Ndofor-Tah et al.'s (2019) framework is based on Ager & Strang's (2008) original framework.

analytical dimensions with migrants or non-migrants. For example, Ndofor-Tah et al. (2019) use Ager and Strang's (2008) concept of facilitators (i.e., language, cultural knowledge, safety and stability, and digital skills) and associate these facilitators with migrants.[5] However, these facilitators are relevant for all residents to engage in integration processes. For example, Ager and Strang's facilitator of safety and stability can be associated with sufficient and continuous financial means for appropriate living standards. This aspect is relevant for all residents in integration processes as it might be linked, for example, to tolerance and openness. Paas & Halapuu (2012) argue that higher income levels are a potential factor for tolerance and openness (see discussion further below).

The emphasis on the agency of migrants is further reflected by the authors' discussions of "superdiversity" (Strang & Ager, 2010). Superdiversity is applied to migrants, while it is not acknowledged and discussed in the context of those labeled non-migrants. The acknowledgment of superdiversity, reflected in multiple identities and intersectionalities across all residents, is an important aspect of understanding how people connect to each other and which potential opportunities and barriers exist for these interconnections. Ager & Strang (2008) distinguish between social bridges and social bonds in integration processes. Social bonds are defined as social relations with family and co-ethnic, co-national, and co-religious groups, while social bridges reflect actors' relations with "other" communities. Applying concepts of multiple identities and intersectionalities can offer new opportunities for creating social bonds and bridges in the context of integration, which will be discussed in the framework below.

Linking actors with wider structures, social mechanisms, artifacts, and environments

The role of actors' multiple identities and intersectionalities needs to be embedded into the wider societal context of structures, social mechanisms, artifacts, and environments to analyze their enhancing or limiting effects on residents' connectivity. Although *structures* are mentioned in existing integration frameworks, they are mainly referred to as macrostructures (e.g., the labor market, education systems, and the housing market) and are primarily associated with the "receiving society" (Ager & Strang, 2008; Strang & Ager, 2010; Spencer & Charsley, 2016; Ndofor-Tah et al., 2019; Spencer & Charsley, 2021). Macro structures such as the media (print, broadcast, and online) and the arts are generally not discussed, although they play a crucial role in integration processes by enforcing or reducing stereotyping and discrimination (Van Doorslaer, 2021).

Penninx & Garcés-Mascareñas (2016) focus on institutional structures in their framework:

---

5   Digital skills are added to the 2019 framework.

> The first are the general public institutions of the receiving society in the three dimensions: institutional arrangements of the political system; institutional arrangements in the labour market, housing, education, and public health; and institutional arrangements for cultural and religious diversity. Laws, regulations, and executive organizations, but also unwritten rules and practices, are part of these institutions. […] The second type of institution that is particularly relevant for immigrants' integration is institutions specifically "of and for" immigrant groups, such as certain religious or cultural ones. (Penninx & Garcés-Mascareñas, 2016, pp. 17–18)

Penninx & Garcés-Mascareñas (2016) apply a binary distinction of "immigrant" and "receiving society" to their institutional analysis. Emphasizing the role of multiple identities and intersectionalities in these organizations can enhance integration research and practice. They offer a comprehensive discussion of the link between structures and social actors, mentioning explicitly the impact of institutions and organizations on individuals and *vice versa*:

> Institutions and organizations, in turn, together create the structure of opportunities and limitations for individuals. Conversely, individuals may mobilize to change the landscape of organizations and may even contribute to significant changes in general institutional arrangements. In view of the uneven distribution of power and resources noted above, such examples are scarce, but they are not non-existent. (Penninx & Garcés-Mascareñas, 2016, p. 18)

This paper argues that the link between actors and structures is important for social integration research and policies. MUWI's focus is not only on "bringing people together" but also on residents' development, maintenance, and change of structures and how structures reflect barriers and opportunities for all residents in the integration process. These points will be discussed further in the context of the MUWI framework.

Although the integration literature does not explicitly discuss the concept of social mechanisms, it mentions several of them in different frameworks. Bunge (2004) does not view causation as the only mechanism but also identifies spontaneity, random processes, goals, and utility as potential mechanisms. He emphasizes that "most mechanisms are non-mechanical," especially in the context of the social sciences (Bunge, 2004, p. 203). Pickel (2004) emphasizes mechanisms at the sociopsychological level and critiques Bunge's (2004) view of mechanisms as solely existing at the structural level. MUWI explicitly addresses mechanisms both at the structural and the sociopsychological level. Some particular social mechanisms are mentioned in integration frameworks. Spencer & Charsley (2016; 2021) cite, for example, the social mechanisms of responsibility, transnationalism, racism, and discrimination in integration processes. Power is discussed by Penninx & Garcés-Mascareñas (2016), who highlight the imbalance of power which favors the "receiving society." Social

mechanisms are often discussed as negative factors impacting integration, and the role of positive mechanisms, such as tolerance and openness (Shady & Larson, 2010), will be discussed further below.

Artifacts are another dimension that Bunge (2003) highlights in social processes. He defines them as man-made objects, which refer to a wide range of objects in the context of private and public spaces, including signs, sculptures, clothes, food, and buildings. Many integration projects in communities focus on exhibitions of artifacts and, especially, objects associated with different migration and heritage backgrounds (Migration Museum, n.d.). It is, therefore, surprising that none of the conceptual frameworks for integration mention the role of artifacts. Miller (1987) argues that "the human subject cannot be considered outside the material world within which and through which it is constructed" (1987, p. 86). Another underrepresented area in integration frameworks is the influence of local, regional, national, and international environments on integration processes. They will be discussed further in the context of the MUWI framework.

A FRAMEWORK FOR MULTI-WAY INTEGRATION PROCESSES

Figure 1: A conceptual framework for multi-way integration (MUWI) processes

At the center of Figure 1 is connectivity between residents via their multiple identities and intersectionalities. Multiple intersectionalities refer to the interrelations of residents with diverse migration, class, gender, age, disability, and heritage backgrounds, whereas multiple identities refer to residents' associations with the above categories at an individual level (Anthias, 2013; Manzi & Benet-Martinez, 2022). Although intersectionality is often discussed in the context of inequalities, Anthias (2013, p. 4) argues that "[a]t a very broad level, and put simply, intersectionality posits that social divisions interrelate in terms of the production of social relations and in terms of people's lives." The focus on residents' multiple identities and intersectionalities offers opportunities for increased connectivity between residents, which can enhance mutual understanding and reduce prejudice and exclusion. For example, integration events can specifically focus on connectivity by bringing people together across different classes, genders, or age divisions, whereby migration becomes one of many aspects relating to residents' identities and intersectionalities, which are reflected in residents' dialogues. Connectivity is here understood as connections and meaningful social interactions between residents. The MUWI approach, therefore, reflects intergroup contact theory, which argues that increased contact and meaningful encounters between people reduce prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2013). Pettigrew & Tropp (2013) argue that increasing knowledge, reducing anxiety, and encouraging perspective-taking and empathy can mediate the link between contact and reducing prejudice.

By focusing on multiple identities and intersectionalities, MUWI addresses several shortcomings in the literature and in practice. Firstly, it avoids the sole emphasis on the migrant/non-migrant binary, which reflects limited and divisional integration processes and contradicts integration processes focusing on connectivity. Secondly, by emphasizing residents' multiple identities, MUWI increases opportunities for residents' connectivity across similar and/or different identities. The wider focus on multiple identities aims to enhance residents' engagement in integration processes, as it speaks to residents who do not necessarily emphasize the migration/non-migration categories in their identities and/or are keen to focus on other identities with which they associate. Thirdly, MUWI goes beyond individual associations with different identities and aims to develop and enhance social relations between all residents by emphasizing their intersectionalities across different social categories. By encouraging social relations that reflect multiple intersectionalities between residents, MUWI aims to offer more opportunities for contact and meaningful encounters between residents. These contacts can improve mutual understanding and reduce prejudice, as advocated by intergroup contact theory. However, "meaningful" contact needs to be carefully organized to avoid potential conflict in encounters (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2013), as discussed in the context of practice examples below.

By going beyond the migrant/non-migrant dichotomy, MUWI addresses questions such as: to what extent can integration strategies, which emphasize multiple

identities of all residents, enhance residents' motivation to engage in integration processes? How does contact among residents that emphasizes multiple identities and intersectionalities improve mutual understanding and reduce prejudice between all residents?

Figure 1 highlights that the processes of enhancing residents' connectivity are linked to the wider social context represented by social structures, social mechanisms, artifacts, and environments. Social structures offer opportunities and barriers to residents' agency and social interaction and are developed, maintained, and changed by residents. Authors focus, in particular, on macro structures and discuss, for example, migrants' access to the employment market and the education system (Coletti & Pasini, 2023; Sandberg et al., 2023). Migrants' access to structures is an important dimension of integration. However, further investigation into how macro structures impact residents' connectivity could highlight further opportunities and barriers in integration processes. Relevant structures in integration processes relate not only to macro structures but also to organizational, normative, and power structures. Structures within schools, workplaces, and governmental and non-governmental organizations play a crucial role in enhancing or limiting connectivity between residents. Mechanisms for organizational change are relevant in this context. Dacin et al. (2002, p. 49) highlight, for example, that new personnel or "agents of change" who question existing interpretations and justifications of organizational practices may trigger organizational change at the micro level. Increased workforce diversity also impacts change (Dacin et al., 2002, p. 49), and the reflection of multiple identities across organizations is an important aspect of developing MUWI. These processes can positively impact normative structures, defined as longstanding behavior patterns and norms (Wiener, 2008). In particular, the media (especially social media) and the political debate play a crucial role in creating normative structures that divide or bring people together (Van Doorslaer, 2021). The author is aware that, in a political climate of an increasing influence of the far right, MUWI approaches will potentially encounter numerous critiques and barriers, and conducting evidence-based research into effective strategies to address these barriers will be crucial in developing MUWI. Ideas about integration are a key aspect of normative structures influencing integration processes. Recent studies in schools and communities have shown that ideas about one-way integration and assimilation are widely held by teachers and representatives of governmental and non-governmental organizations (Hellgren, 2016; Schneider & Arnot, 2018; Schneider, 2020).

In the context of social interaction and change, MUWI is interested in identifying social mechanisms that can enhance or limit residents' interconnectivity. Social mechanisms are reflected at the individual and the structural level (Bunge, 2004; Pickel, 2004). As mentioned above, Pettigrew & Tropp (2013, p. 11) relate meaningful contact to different social mechanisms such as increasing knowledge, reducing anxiety, and encouraging perspective-taking and empathy. Shady & Larson (2010) highlight the role of openness in integration processes, which plays an important

role in MUWI. They introduce three aspects of fostering openness: "(1) tolerance, a neutral openness to the other's position; (2) empathy, a complete absorption of the other's position; and (3) inclusion, genuine dialogue about one's own position and the other's" (Shady & Larson, 2010, p. 81). Key strategies for enhancing openness and tolerance at an agency level, which potentially changes normative structures regarding integration, include, for example, the transfer of information regarding individuals' experiences to increase mutual understanding, the reduction of misinformation (especially via social media), and contact and dialogue between diverse groups (UNDP, n. d.; Up2Europe, 2016). The school context is particularly relevant, and Vižintin (2022) has developed and analyzed concrete strategies for schools to enhance tolerance and openness among staff, parents, and pupils via intercultural education. Integration means openness toward difference and finding sameness, e.g., common humanity, common experiences, and commonalities (Balint, 2011). MUWI's rejection of having the migrant/non-migrant binary in the center of integration and its focus on multiple identities and intersectionalities create new opportunities for residents to find these commonalities, as illustrated further in the context of MUWI strategies outlined below.

Figure 1 highlights the importance of analyzing the role of artifacts in integration processes. How can artifacts enhance or hinder the connectivity of residents and reflect their multiple identities and intersectionalities? There is a lack of research that analyzes the impact of artifacts on integration. Following Miller (1987), human interaction cannot be analyzed outside the material world, and artifacts have a relevant role in MUWI. However, artifacts should not just be associated with migrants or non-migrants, as is often seen in exhibitions and events. Instead, MUWI emphasizes using artifacts to find commonalities and represent a shared humanity, using themes that potentially apply to all residents (e.g., childhood memories, different hobbies). The current discussion regarding the association of certain sculptures with colonialism, racism, and inequality reflects the significance of artifacts in integration processes (Goes, 2022). Ghanbari (2019) and Meriç (2023) have recently researched the role of architecture and music in the context of bringing residents with diverse backgrounds together.

Wider environments (cultural, political, legal, historical, etc.) at the local, regional, national, and international levels are relevant to understanding residents' connectivity. There is a clear gap in the literature to research the impact of environments in the context of MUWI. The few studies on integration and the environment exclusively focus on migrants' experiences and perspectives. For example, Phillips & Robinson (2015) investigate the impact of the local neighborhood on integration processes, whereas De Coninck & Solano (2023) analyze the impact of different national contexts on local integration. The former research is important. However, MUWI adds another focus and raises questions about the extent to which such wider environments enhance or limit the interconnectivity between all residents.

AN EVALUATION OF EXISTING INTEGRATION PROJECTS IN THE CONTEXT OF MUWI

Before discussing how the MUWI framework (Figure 1) can be transferred into practice, this section will briefly overview existing integration projects and to what extent they already reflect aspects of MUWI. A specific example relating to the educational context will be examined in more detail. Most integration projects implemented worldwide emphasize advice, language training, and employment and focus exclusively on migrants (see Schneider, 2020). Increasingly, integration projects go beyond the focus of migrants and emphasize dialogue between all residents. For example, projects that focus on bringing young people with and without a refugee background together in the context of theatre, hobbies, and leisure (Cherri, 2019) or projects that connect longer-term residents with newly arrived refugee families (Bee4change e.V., 2023). However, the above projects are characterized by the migrant/non-migrant binary. Projects which are not explicitly structured around the binary are less frequent. For example, the "Walking School Bus" in New Zealand, where parents and pupils walk together to school, offers potential opportunities for connectivity between parents with multiple identities and intersectionalities (NZ Transport agency Waka Kotahi, 2023).[6] Libraries and museums are also increasingly used to connect residents across multiple identities and intersectionalities at the local level (Council of Europe, 2025; Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, 2016). Various longitudinal projects have researched strategies to enhance school integration (Evans et al., 2020; Vižintin, 2022). The following is an in-depth analysis of a school program that reflects several aspects of MUWI.

The Schools Linking Programme in England connects pupils across different schools in their location to enhance meaningful encounters between pupils with multiple identities and intersectionalities (Akhtar et al., 2017).

> The structured year-long Schools Linking Programme brings together pairs of classes or groups who would otherwise not meet, and in so doing, contributes to integration in the local area. This process supports integration by facilitating meaningful encounters between people from different backgrounds to one-another (Akhtar et al., 2017. p. 40).

Pupils participating in the program explore four key questions with pupils from another school.
- Who am I? Exploring identity, including faith, as part of multiple identity
- Who are we? Celebrating diversity, including exploring similarity and difference, developing awareness

---

6   Thank you to Ana Gonzalez-Quintero who identified several of the international projects on integration as part of a small, university-funded research project.

- Where do we live? Promoting community, broadening perspectives, and a sense of belonging for all, locally, nationally, globally
- How do we all live together? Championing equality, challenging prejudice in all its forms and promoting active citizenship and empathy (Akhtar et al., 2017, p. 41).

The above questions encourage meaningful contact between pupils, focusing on multiple identities, prejudice, community, and environments. The program's qualitative and quantitative evaluation highlights increased interaction and understanding: "a positive impact on many aspects of pupils' skills, attitudes, perceptions and behaviours, particularly their respect for others, their self-confidence and their self-efficacy, as well as broadening the social groups with whom pupils interact" (Akhtar et al., 2017, p. 40).

The authors emphasize the careful planning of organizing meaningful contact, involving additional teacher training and a safe, neutral place, which is used for the first encounter between pupils of different schools to address the "deep dynamics of power and belonging that can come up in exchanges" (Akhtar et al., 2017, p. 42). These considerations are necessary to avoid increased contact, which could lead to conflict (Akhtar et al., 2017, p. 42). The program explicitly addresses social mechanisms, such as increasing knowledge and perspective-taking, to foster the avoidance of prejudice from an early age. The project reflects many elements of MUWI, and the next section further discusses its implementation.

MUWI IN PRACTICE AND RESEARCH

The key focus of MUWI is to enhance meaningful connectivity (in-person and digital) between residents, emphasizing their multiple identities and intersectionalities. The online sphere already offers opportunities for connectivity, e.g., via Google meet-up groups and neighborhood support groups. However, online networks often reflect and reinforce divisions regarding class, gender, and age (Wessels, 2015). Implementing MUWI would involve connectivity across different age, gender, class, heritage, and other divisions, whereby migration is potentially one dimension of many characterizing residents' social identities and intersectionalities, which are reflected in residents' dialogues and conversations. In-person and meaningful interaction of residents across divisions will be especially difficult to organize due to barriers, including residents' availability at a specific time, travel and cost to reach the location, and potential stereotypes. MUWI might, therefore, focus on places that residents with diverse backgrounds already frequent, e.g., schools, employment, and leisure facilities. To emphasize human commonality and to motivate all residents to engage with each other, generic themes relating to hobbies (e.g., fishing, gardening, photography, crochet), stories of kindness, and "arriving at a new place" can be focused on,

rather than themes which relate explicitly to the migration/non-migration binary (Van de Vyver & Abrams, 2017; Schneider, 2020).

As analyzed further above, MUWI is not only interested in the connectivity between residents but also highlights its links to social structures, social mechanisms, artifacts, and environments. How macro structures can have enhancing or limiting effects on connectivity and residents with multiple identities and intersectionalities potentially maintain or change these macro structures is a key aspect of further primary research related to MUWI. At a more concrete level, MUWI should address organizational structures (e.g., schools, employment, leisure, and health and social care) and how such structures can enhance residents' connectivity and represent their multiple identities. MUWI challenges normative structures, especially those produced by the media and political and public debate, which continue to reflect integration as a one-way process whereby migrants should adapt or assimilate into the receiving country (Ehrkamp, 2006). Normative structures incorporate different social mechanisms, and MUWI actively encourages social mechanisms, such as openness and tolerance. Intergroup contact theory has shown that meaningful dialogue between people can enhance these social mechanisms (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2013). Artifacts also play an important role in enhancing social interaction, mutual understanding, and commonalities. Focusing on "migrant" objects or "local history" is relevant but risks reinforcing the binary between "migrants" and the "existing community." Rather than one group "displaying" their objects and the other "observing," artifacts that relate to all residents could be used in community exhibitions to encourage social interaction between residents who normally might not interact. The effective role that artifacts can play in connecting residents with diverse backgrounds was reflected in an integration project organized for the Being Human Festival 2019 (Schneider et al., 2019.; Hardin et al., 2023). Residents with diverse backgrounds were invited to exchange stories of "arriving at a new place" (at a new school, workplace, or country). They were encouraged to bring an object representing their arrival to initiate their conversation. The speed with which residents with multiple identities began in-depth dialogues, reflecting personal and emotional aspects relating to their object and their experiences of arrival, was genuinely surprising for the participants and the researchers: *I was worried that talking to a person I didn't know wouldn't work, but it worked very well. If you talk to anybody, you will always find a connection* (Participant). The project not only highlights the facilitative role of artefacts in integration processes but also the increase of residents' mutual understanding via a relatively brief encounter.

Integration processes involving social actors, social structures, social mechanisms, and artifacts take place in the closer or wider social, political, media, economic, historical, and geographical environment. In practice and research, these environments must be considered when connecting people with multiple identities and intersectionalities. The Schools Linking Programme has shown that these environments could be, for example, incorporated into participants' dialogues with other

residents so that they can reflect upon environmental impacts on their identities and connectivity (Akhtar et al., 2017). However, this area of MUWI requires further exploration, as there is a lack of existing primary research.

Overall, the MUWI approach reflects a holistic approach to integration, addressing dimensions relating to social actors' multiple identities and intersectionalities and their link to social structures, social mechanisms, artifacts, and environments. Research and community projects might focus on the holistic aspects of the framework or look at specific areas of the framework in the context of connectivity of all residents.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Reflecting the above discussion, the following will summarize a range of recommendations for implementing and researching MUWI processes and strategies:
- Encouraging connectivity (digitally and in-person) across different age, gender, class, heritage, etc. divisions, whereby migration is potentially one dimension of many characterizing residents' social identities and intersectionalities, which are reflected in residents' dialogues and conversations.
- Enhancing structures (e.g., macro, organizational, normative, and power structures) to increase residents' connectivity and offering opportunities for residents with multiple identities and intersectionality to influence these structures.

At a more practical level, the following strategies are recommended:
- Using existing places of social interaction for MUWI projects (e.g., schools, workplaces, sports centers, libraries, care homes, allotments) to overcome potential problems of bringing diverse residents together.
- Developing projects that emphasize shared themes of humanity that all residents can potentially relate to, e.g., different hobbies, childhood memories, stories of kindness, and arriving at a new place.
- Implementing smaller integration events, focusing on multiple identities and intersectionalities across different localities in communities throughout the year.
- Schools play an important role in establishing MUWI in communities, and MUWI could become part of teacher training.

CONCLUSION

The paper advocates the concept of multi-way integration (MUWI), which explicitly addresses residents' multiple identities and intersectionalities and their interconnections with social structures, social mechanisms, artifacts, and environments. Multiple identities and intersectionalities go beyond the migration category and relate to dimensions such as class, gender, age, heritage, and disability at the individual and relational level. The paper argues that the emphasis on the above aspects addresses potentially exclusionary processes relating to the migrant/non-migrant binary, which is widely used in integration research and practice. MUWI aims to increase opportunities for contact and connectivity between all residents to enhance mutual understanding and reduce prejudice in integration processes. Connectivity between residents occurs in the wider context of social structures, social mechanisms, artifacts, and environments. The MUWI framework raises questions about how the above dimensions can enhance or limit the connectivity of residents with multiple identities and intersectionalities and how residents may develop, maintain, or change these aspects. Overall, opportunities and barriers, which are associated with the connectivity of residents with multiple identities and intersectionalities, need to be targeted more explicitly in integration research, practice, and policy.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS AND ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

REFERENCES

Ager A., & Strang A. (2008). Understanding Integration: A Conceptual Framework. *Journal of Refugee Studies*, *21*(2), 166–191. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/fen016

Akhtar Y., Henry M., & Longson S. (2017). The Schools Linking Programme. In Laurence, J. (Ed.), *"If you could do one thing…". 10 Local Actions to Promote Social Integration* (pp. 39–46). British Academy.

Anthias, F. (2013). Intersectional what? Social divisions, intersectionality and levels of analysis. *Ethnicities*, *13*(1), 3–19.

Balint, P. (2011). Education for tolerance: Respecting sameness, not difference. In P. Balint (Ed.), *Religious tolerance, education and the curriculum* (pp. 41–51). Brill.

Beach, D., & Pedersen, R. B. (2012). Case selection techniques in process-tracing and the implications of taking the study of causal mechanisms seriously. *APSA 2012 Annual Meeting Paper*. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2131318

Bee4change e.V. (2023) *Get involved as a mentor for refugee families Hamburg*. Vostel.de. https://vostel.de/en/volunteering/projects/3163_bee4change-e-V_Get-involved-as-a-mentor-for-refugee-families_Hamburg

Bunge, M. (2003). *Emergence and convergence: Qualitative novelty and the unity of knowledge*. University of Toronto Press.

Bunge, M. (2004). How Does It Work? The Search for Explanatory Mechanisms, *Philosophy of the Social Sciences, 34*(2), 182– 210. https://doi.org/10.1177/0048393103262550

Coletti, P., & Pasini, N. (2023). Relaunching labour-market integration for migrants: What can we learn from successful local experiences? *Journal of International Migration and Integration 24*(1), 67–90.

Collins, P. H., & Bilge, S. (2020). *Intersectionality*. John Wiley & Sons.

Council of Europe. (2025). *The role of libraries as drivers of integration and intercultural interaction*. https://www.coe.int/eu/web/interculturalcities/-/the-role-of-libraries-as-drivers-of-integration-and-intercultural-interaction

Dacin, M., Goodstein, J., & Scott, W. (2002). Institutional theory and institutional change: Introduction to the special research forum. *Academy of Management Journal*, *45*(1), 45–56. https://doi.org/10.2307/3069284

De Coninck, D., & Solano, G. (2023). Integration policies and migrants' labor market outcomes: a local perspective based on different regional configurations in the EU. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *11*(1), 23. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-023-00347-y

Ehrkamp, P. (2006). "We Turks are no Germans": assimilation discourses and the dialectical construction of identities in Germany. *Environment and Planning A, 38*(9): 1673–1692. https://doi.org/10.1068/a38148

Evans, M., Schneider, C., Arnot, M., Fisher, L., Forbes, K., Liu, Y., & Welply, O. (2020). *Language development and social integration of students with English as an additional language. Cambridge Education Series*. Cambridge University Press.

Foroutan, N. (2019). The post-migrant paradigm. In: J-J Bock & S. Macdonald (Eds.), *Refugees Welcome? Difference and Diversity in a Changing Germany* (pp. 121–142). Berghahn.

Ghanbari, J. (2019). Psychological role of architecture in social integration of immigrants in multicultural cities *Journal of International Migration and Integration*, *20*, 577–592. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-018-0616-7

Goes, D. (2022). Contemporary Iconoclasm: Anti-Racism Between the Decolonisation of Art and the (Re) Sacralisation of Public Space. *Comunicação e sociedade*, *41*, 105–129. https://doi.org/10.17231/comsoc.41(2022).3691

Hardin, M., Schneider, C., & Patel, S. (2023). The Arriving Storybook: Bidirectional Storytelling through Creative Practice and Interactive Media Design. *The International Journal of New Media, Technology and the Arts*, *18*(1–2). https://doi.org/10.18848/2326-9987/CGP/v18i01/1-16

Hellgren, Z. (2016). Immigrant Integration as a Two-way Process? Stakeholder Discourses and Practices in Stockholm and Barcelona. *Psychosociological Issues in Human Resource Management, 4*(1), 143–167. https://doi.org/10.22381/PIHRM4120167

Kaushik, V., & Walsh, C. A. (2018). A critical analysis of the use of intersectionality theory to understand the settlement and integration needs of skilled immigrants to Canada. *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, *50*(3), 27–47. https://doi.org/10.1353/ces.2018.0021

Klarenbeek, L. M. (2021). Reconceptualising "integration as a two-way process." *Migration Studies, 9*(3), 902–921. https://doi.org/10.1093/migration/mnz033

Manzi, C., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2022). Multiple identities juggling game: types of identity integration and their outcomes. *Self and Identity*, *21*(5), 501–505. https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2022.2067222

Meriç, S. (2023). Participation in an Outdoor Music Festival Effects on Social Integration. *Tourism Culture & Communication*, *23*(4), 323–331. https://doi.org/10.3727/109830422X16600594683535

Migration Museum. (n. d.). *Keepsakes*. https://www.migrationmuseum.org/exhibition/keepsakes

Miller, D. (1987). *Material Culture and Mass Consumption*. Basil Blackwell.

Ndofor-Tah, C., Strang, A., Phillimore J., Morrice L., Michael L., Wood P., & Simmons, J. (2019). *Home Office Indicators of Integration Framework 2019*. University of Sussex. Report. https://hdl.handle.net/10779/uos.23468528.v1

NZ Transport agency Waka Kotahi. (2023). *Walking School Bus*. https://education.nzta.govt.nz/teacher-resources/school-community-partnerships/walking-school-bus

Paas, T., & Halapuu, V. (2012). Attitudes towards immigrants and the integration of ethnically diverse societies. *Eastern Journal of European Studies, 3*(2), 161–176.

Penninx, R., & Garcés-Mascareñas, B. (2016). The Concept of Integration as an Analytical Tool and as a Policy Concept. In B. Garcés-Mascareñas & R. Penninx

(Eds.), *Integration Processes and Policies in Europe* (pp.11–29). IMISCOE Research Series. Springer.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2013). *When groups meet: The dynamics of intergroup contact*. Psychology Press.

Phillips, D., & Robinson, D. (2015). Reflections on migration, community, and place. *Population, Space and Place 21*(5), 409–420. https://doi.org/10.1002/psp.1911

Pickel, A. (2004). Systems and mechanisms: A symposium on Mario Bunge's philosophy of social science. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences 34*(2), 169–181. https://doi.org/10.1177/0048393103262549

Sandberg, J., Fredholm, A., & Frödin, O. (2023). Immigrant Organizations and Labor Market Integration: The Case of Sweden. *International Migration and Integration, 24*, 1357–1380. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-022-00999-2

Schneider, C., & Arnot, M. (2018). An exploration of school communication approaches for newly arrived EAL students: applying three dimensions of organisational communication theory. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, *48*(2): 245–262. https://doi.org/10.1080/0305764X.2017.1329399

Schneider, C., Baxter, J., Guha, M., Hardin, M., Johnson, J., Kaziukonyte, G., Patel, S., & Preston, C. (2019). "Discoveries and Secrets." https://www.beinghumanfestival.org/about-us/our-work/past--festivals#_019-discoveries-and-secrets

Schneider, C. (2020). *Multi-way Integration*. Presentation at Integration Workshops (25 and 26 June 2020). Rainbow Services.

Shady, S. L., & Larson, M. (2010). Tolerance, empathy, or inclusion? Insights from Martin Buber. *Educational Theory*, *60*(1), 81–96. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1741-5446.2010.00347.x

Spencer, S., & Charsley, K. (2016). Conceptualising integration: A framework for empirical research, taking marriage migration as a case study. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *4*(1), 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-016-0035-x

Spencer, S., & Charsley, K. (2021). Reframing "integration": acknowledging and addressing five core critiques. *Comparative Migration Studies*, *9*(18). https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-021-00226-4

Staatliche Museen zu Berlin. (2016, May 23). *Culture as a stimulus for integration: The Multaka Projekt receives an award*. https://www.smb.museum/en/whats-new/detail/culture-as-a-stimulus-for-integration-the-multaka-projekt-receives-an-award/

Strang, A., & Ager, A. (2010). Refugee integration: Emerging trends and remaining agendas. *Journal of Refugee Studies, 23*(4), 589–607. https://doi.org/10.1093/jrs/feq046

UNDP. (n. d.). *Promoting Tolerance and Respect for Diversity*. https://www.undp.org/thailand/projects/promoting-tolerance-and-respect-diversity

Up2Europe. (2016). *From Integration to Tolerance*. https://www.up2europe.eu/european/projects/ from-integration-to-tolerance_78889.html

Van de Vyver, J., & Abrams, D. (2017). Community Connectedness Through the Arts. In Laurence, J. (Ed.), *"If you could do one thing…". 10 Local Actions to Promote Social Integration* (pp. 58–68). British Academy.

Van Doorslaer, L. (2021). Stereotyping by default in media transfer. In: Barkhoff J. & Leerssen J. (Eds.), *National Stereotyping and Identity Politics in Times of European Crises* (pp. 205–220). Brill.

Vižintin, M. A. (2022). *The Role of Teachers in the Successful Integration and Intercultural Education of Migrant Children*. Cambridge Scholars.

Werbner, P. (2013). Everyday multiculturalism: Theorising the difference between "intersectionality" and "multiple identities." *Ethnicities, 13*(4), 401–419. https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796813483728

Wessels, B. (2015). Digital Divide| Authentication, Status, and Power in a Digitally Organized Society. *International Journal of Communication 9*, 2801–2818.

Wiener, A. (2008). *Contestation and Constitution of Norms in Global International Relations*. Cambridge University Press.

POVZETEK

KONCEPTUALNI OKVIR ZA VEČSMERNO INTEGRACIJO (MUWI) S POUDARKOM NA VEČPLASTNIH IDENTITETAH IN PRESEČNOSTIH PREBIVALCEV
Claudia Schneider

Avtorica v prispevku vzpostavi analitični okvir za raziskovanje in izvajanje procesov integracije, ki izpostavlja priložnosti večplastnih identitet in presečnosti prebivalcev v teh procesih. V zadnjih dveh desetljih so raziskovalci integracije prešli od enosmernih asimilacijskih k dvosmernim modelom integracije, ki se osredotočajo na vse prebivalce (Ager & Strang, 2008; Spencer & Charsley, 2016; Spencer & Charsley, 2021; Penninx & Garcés-Mascareñas, 2016; Ndofor-Tah et al., 2019). Vendar pa ti pristopi, bodisi eksplicitno ali implicitno, obravnavajo družbene akterje predvsem z vidika binarnega razlikovanja in družbenih konstruktov »migranti/nemigranti«, »insajderji/avtsajderji« ter »prišleki/obstoječa družba«. Takšne dihotomije potencialno ohranjajo neenakosti in izključevanje v procesih integracije in so v nasprotju s cilji povezovanja vseh ljudi (Foroutan, 2019). Avtorica v prispevku zagovarja stališče, da bi s prenehanjem razlikovanja med migranti in nemigranti ter poudarjanjem večplastnih identitet in presečnosti vseh prebivalcev v procesih integracije lahko odpravili ta protislovja ter omogočili nove priložnosti za strategije in raziskave integracije.

Zato avtorica zagovarja koncept večsmerne integracije (angl. *multi-way integration*, MUWI), ki izrecno upošteva raznolike identitete in presečnosti prebivalcev ter njihovo prepletenost s strukturami, družbenimi mehanizmi, artefakti in okoljem. Večplastne identitete in presečnosti presegajo migracijske kategorije in poudarjajo dodatne vidike v procesih integracije na individualni in relacijski ravni, kot so razred, spol, starost, nasledstvo in invalidnost. V prispevku zagovarja tezo, da se je mogoče s poudarkom na navedenih vidikih izogniti potencialno izključevalnim procesom, povezanim z binarnima kategorijama migrant/nemigrant, ki sta pogosto uporabljani v raziskavah in praksi na področju integracije. Cilj koncepta MUWI je omogočiti več priložnosti za povezovanje med vsemi prebivalci z namenom boljšega medsebojnega razumevanja in zmanjšanja predsodkov v procesih integracije. Povezavo med smiselnimi stiki, večjo odprtostjo in zmanjšanjem predsodkov zagovarja teorija medskupinskih stikov (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2013). Prebivalci se povezujejo v širšem kontekstu družbenih struktur, mehanizmov, artefaktov in okolij. Koncept MUWI opozarja, da lahko navedeni vidiki krepijo ali omejujejo povezanost prebivalcev z raznolikimi identitetami in presečnostmi ter da lahko prebivalci te vidike razvijajo, ohranjajo ali spreminjajo. Na splošno je treba v praksi, politiki in raziskavah na področju integracije konkretneje nasloviti priložnosti in ovire na področju povezanosti prebivalcev z večplastnimi identitetami in presečnosti. Namen tega konceptualnega okvira je spodbuditi razpravo o pomenu in povezavah med zgoraj opisanimi koncepti za procese integracije ter spodbuditi nadaljnje raziskave posameznih vidikov predstavljenega okvira.

TWO
o m e l a n d s
622025

DVE
d o m o v i n i
Inštitut za slovensko izseljenstvo in migracije ZRC SAZU

Založba ZRC