JYX JYVÄSKYLÄN YLIOPISTO UNIVERSITY OF JYVÄSKYLÄ

This is a self-archived version of an original article. This version may differ from the original in pagination and typographic details.

Author(s): Lähdesmäki, Tuuli; Koistinen, Aino-Kaisa

Title: Explorations of Linkages Between Intercultural Dialogue, Art, and Empathy

Year: 2021

Version: Published version

Copyright: © 2021 the Authors

Rights: CC BY 4.0

Rights url: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/

Please cite the original version:

Lähdesmäki, T., & Koistinen, A.-K. (2021). Explorations of Linkages Between Intercultural Dialogue, Art, and Empathy. In F. Maine, & M. Vrikki (Eds.), Dialogue for Intercultural Understanding : Placing Cultural Literacy at the Heart of Learning (pp. 45-58). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71778-0_4

Chapter 4
Explorations of Linkages Between Intercultural Dialogue, Art, and Empathy

Tuuli Lähdesmäki and Aino-Kaisa Koistinen

4.1 Introduction: What is intercultural dialogue?

In the 2000s, European societies have transformed quickly due to the networked global economy, deepening a European integration process, forced and voluntary movement of people to and within Europe, and influence of social media on culture, communication, and society. Europe has become an increasingly diverse and pluricultural continent where many people simultaneously identify with multiple different cultural and social groups. In such "super-diversified" (Vertovec 2007) European societies diversity itself is broad, multidimensional, and fluid (ibid.; Blommaert and Rampton 2011). Different social locations and identities intersect within them—whether cultural, ethnic, national, social, religious, or linguistic. At the same time, however, European societies have faced the rise of diverse populist and radical right-wing movements promoting profoundly monoculturalist views and cultural purism. What are the means to confront this polarization of views and attitudes in Europe?

In this chapter, we examine the concept of intercultural dialogue in the context of the objectives of the DIALLS project (Chapter 1), focusing on the interconnections of intercultural dialogue, art, and empathy. We explore how intercultural dialogue has been defined as a concept, policy, and practice to tackle the various challenges that 'super-diversified' societies may face if cultural encounters within them are not based on mutual respect and aspiration to understand differences. We emphasize a core aspect in the definitions of intercultural dialogue, namely empathy. Besides agreeing that intercultural dialogue is important in today's societies, recent research includes criticism of its implicit meanings and uses in policy discourses and its implementation in practice. We continue our chapter by summarizing this criticism

T. Lähdesmäki (✉) · A.-K. Koistinen
University of Jyväskylä, Jyväskylä, Finland
e-mail: tuuli.lahdesmaki@jyu.fi

A.-K. Koistinen
e-mail: aino-kaisa.koistinen@jyu.fi

© The Author(s) 2021

F. Maine and M. Vrikki (eds.), *Dialogue for Intercultural Understanding*,
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-71778-0_4

and discussing the challenges scholars have identified in policies and practices of intercultural dialogue. Various previous studies have emphasized 'shared space' as a prerequisite for successful intercultural dialogue. Later in our chapter, we expand this idea using feminist scholarship. In addition to 'shared space', we argue that intercultural dialogue needs 'safe space' to overcome hierarchical positions that may hinder equal and emphatic encounters of people with different backgrounds. We end our chapter by discussing how art has been perceived in academia as "an evocative and emotionally drenched expression that makes it possible to know how others feel" (Barone and Eisner 2012, 7) and as offering a form of knowledge that deals with empathy (Eisner 2008, 11). As a result, we suggest that art offers a flexible arena and instrument to set up non-hierarchical 'safe shared space' for practising intercultural dialogue, especially through its wordless mode of expression that crosses language barriers and enables creativity that can enhance empathy.

The DIALLS project recognizes art's potential in teaching empathy and defines empathy as one of the core features of cultural literacy. The Cultural Literacy Learning Programme developed in the project utilizes art as means for teaching and learning cultural literacy. Using wordless picture books and short films—thus capable of crossing language barriers—the program encourages students to create cultural artefacts of their own, such as drawings, photographs, and collages, in order to recognize, negotiate, and empathize with cultural differences. To put it simply, art is used to teach cultural literacy defined as an individual's competence and skill to encounter cultural differences with an open mind, to become tolerant, empathetic, and inclusive of other positions and perspectives, and to gain awareness of one's own cultural identity and the identities of others (Maine et al. 2019). Moreover, teaching cultural literacy is seen as a means to promote intercultural dialogue.

Intercultural dialogue is not a new concept but has an established trajectory in academic discussions and the policy discourses of several international institutions. The dialogical approach to the encounter of cultures was included in UNESCO's discourse as early as the 1980s (Wiesand et al. 2008). A similar approach started to characterize the Council of Europe's and the European Union's initiatives during the 1990s. The concept became more deeply rooted in European policy discourses at the beginning of the 2000s when the Council of Europe started a process that resulted in various declarations on intercultural dialogue, culminating in the "White Paper on intercultural dialogue" in 2008. In the same year, the EU celebrated the European Year of Intercultural Dialogue: one of its goals to raise awareness of this concept.

The concept of intercultural dialogue and policies seeking to implement it were warmly welcomed by many leading European politicians. A decade ago, several European societies faced what scholars have called 'backlash against multiculturalism' as many European heads of state accused 'multiculturalism' of creating social problems and controversies between people rather than solving them (Bauböck 2008; Vertovec and Wessendorf 2010; Modood and Meer 2012; Barrett 2013). Also in scholarly debates, multiculturalism was criticized for encouraging members of different cultures to live separately in parallel communities without any deeper interaction, for emphasizing instead of blurring boundaries, and for focusing mainly on ethnic and national issues rather than paying attention to the intersectional diversity

in societies (e.g., Rodríguez-García 2010; Taylor 2012; Barrett 2013). The critics of multiculturalism discussed contemporary intersectional diversities using the concept of interculturalism, emphasizing the need to create new opportunities across cultures and to support interaction between different cultural communities (Cantle 2013).

Intercultural dialogue as a practice is instrumental to implementing the aims of interculturalism, such as fostering understanding and empathy (Cantle 2013, 80). The Council of Europe's "Reference Framework of Competences for Democratic Culture" defines intercultural dialogue as:

> an open exchange of views, on the basis of mutual understanding and respect, between individuals or groups who perceive themselves as having different cultural affiliations from each other. It requires the freedom and ability to express oneself, as well as the willingness and capacity to listen to the views of others. Intercultural dialogue fosters constructive engagement across perceived cultural divides, reduces intolerance, prejudice and stereotyping, and contributes to political, social, cultural and economic integration and the cohesion of culturally diverse societies. It fosters equality, human dignity and a sense of common purpose. It aims to develop a deeper understanding of diverse world views and practices, to increase co-operation and participation (or the freedom to make choices), to allow personal growth and transformation, and to promote respect for the other. (CofE 2018, 74–75)

This definition does not explicitly mention empathy but deals with it implicitly by emphasizing engagement across cultural divides. In academia, empathy has been connected more directly to the concept of intercultural dialogue. Empathy has been seen as the very basis of intercultural dialogue (e.g. Ratzmann 2019, 1), an effect and outcome of this practice (e.g. Elias 2017, 270), and a particular skill and competence for practising it (e.g. Houghton 2012, 97–100; Barrett 2013, 26). For instance, Houghton (2012) discusses "intellectual empathy" as a bottom-up process and cognitive skill in intercultural dialogue helping us to focus on the information provided by the interlocutor in cultural encounters and releasing us from our assumptions and stock responses based on our prior knowledge.

The above-quoted definition does not explicitly refer to the creativity often raised in scholarly discussions on intercultural dialogue. The definition, however, does highlight the ability to express oneself, personal growth, and transformation but does not characterize intercultural dialogue through creative thinking or practices. Following Wiesand et al. (2008, xiii), we argue that intercultural dialogue requires and promotes creative abilities to encounter other people and to convert experiences from these encounters into new ideas, perspectives, and forms of expression.

4.2 Challenges of Intercultural Dialogue

Although intercultural dialogue as a concept, policy, and practice has been broadly accepted and welcomed in academia, several scholars have also expressed criticism for its discursive meanings and uses as a policy instrument. Next, we will summarize the core weaknesses and limitations of the concept addressed in academia during the past decade (see Lähdesmäki et al. 2020).

The concept of intercultural dialogue was developed to respond to increasing cultural diversity in Western societies and to promote interaction, mutual respect, and understanding between people with different cultural backgrounds. Despite these premises, the concept has been criticized in academia for treating cultures as internally homogeneous. The critics have perceived the concept as categorizing people into separate and clearly identifiable cultural units, although in 'super-diversified' societies cultural differences are intersectional and do not follow any clear demarcations (Barrett 2013, 30).

Most of the critical views on the concept of intercultural dialogue emphasize the power imbalances inherent in discourses, policies, and practices dealing with it. Intercultural dialogue has been perceived as a profoundly Western concept through which Western scholars and societies seek to deal with non-Western 'others', as Lee (2016) notes. For her, research on intercultural dialogue is Western-dominated as, irrespective of countries of origin, most researchers in the field have learned and internalized Western approaches to scholarship (Lee 2016, 240). Western interest in intercultural dialogue has also been critically related to the "Western 'civilising mission' of the past and hegemonic power over language, culture, finance and politics" (Silversti 2007, n.p.) as the concept has been utilized by European political institutions, such as the European Union, to promote European citizenship, belonging to Europe, and a 'new European narrative' as its shared basis.

Scholars have also pointed out how policy discourses on intercultural dialogue include explicit and implicit power hierarchies based on Western or Eurocentric perspectives on diversity and cultural differences. Discourses, policies, and practices of intercultural dialogue have been seen as implicitly consolidating differences between Westerners or Europeans and their 'others'—and thus constructing the positions of 'us' and 'them'—rather than bringing different subjects together (Aman 2012). As Aman (2012, 1010) notes regarding the European Union's intercultural dialogue policies:

> Europeans are portrayed as having an a priori historical existence, while the ones excluded from this notion are evoked to demonstrate its difference in comparison to the European one. […] [S]ubjects not considered as Europeans serve as markers of the multicultural present of the space.

The research on European policy discourses regarding intercultural dialogue has also recognized power hierarchies between those who are expected to facilitate the dialogue and those expected only to participate in it (Lähdesmäki and Wagener 2015; Lähdesmäki et al. 2015). As Barrett (2013, 31) notes: "[I]t is those individuals who occupy positions of power and privilege who tend to determine the implicit rules by which dialogue occurs, and their decisions are typically based on their own cultural perspective." Even though policy discourses on intercultural dialogue might explicitly recognize the 'diversity of diversities' and seek to embrace manifold aspects of diversity in contemporary societies, these discourses often focus on migrant and minority ethnic groups, constructing them as 'others' and as the participants in intercultural dialogue. Moreover, the 'others' in these discourses often narrow to mean non-European, non-white, non-Christian, and non-educated migrants and

ethnic groups (Lähdesmäki et al. 2015). As intercultural dialogue policies commonly aim to tackle various challenges related to increased cultural diversity in Western societies, their discourses can unintentionally present the coexistence of cultures as a problem and source of conflict, which is contradictory to the fundamental principle of intercultural dialogue as a concept, policy, and practice (Lähdesmäki and Wagener 2015; Lähdesmäki et al. 2015).

One criticism of the practices of intercultural dialogue is that they can be elitist. Lee (2016) notes how various projects, research reports, and data sets on intercultural dialogue, as well as educational programs aiming at increasing it, are filtered through the lenses of the educated elites. She (2016, 239) points out: "Education, indeed, exists where there is money, and it is a privilege." She also criticizes the emphasis on talk over other means of expression and finding solutions in concepts of intercultural dialogue, as this privileges those who have the capacity and 'voice' to speak. Similarly, Barrett (2013, 27) shows how disadvantages in education and employment, poverty, marginalization, and discrimination represent structural barriers to practices of intercultural dialogue as people affected by these phenomena are less able to participate in these practices.

The writers of intercultural dialogue policies have been criticized for defining the concept vaguely and explaining it indistinctly and ambiguously (Näss 2010; Lähdesmäki et al. 2015, 2020; Elias 2017). Moreover, these shapers of policy approach intercultural dialogue in a universalizing manner and poorly recognize the societal or historical differences between societies (Lähdesmäki and Wagener 2015), casting doubt on whether the policies can be applied to varying social realities (Elias 2017, 259). Scholars have also noted how policy-makers may load far-reaching expectations on practices of intercultural dialogue and thus underestimate the structural inequalities and disadvantages in Western societies that cannot be solved with intercultural dialogue alone (Barrett 2013, 30). Solving these inequalities and disadvantages requires concrete structural measures and the economic resources to deliver them (Lähdesmäki and Wagener 2015, 27).

Even though researchers in the field often mention empathy as a core aspect of intercultural dialogue, policies on intercultural dialogue emphasize it less. Our previous research on discourses of intercultural dialogue in the Council of Europe's and the European Union's education policy documents indicates how rarely the authors of these documents explicitly address empathy (Lähdesmäki et al. 2020). Yet, empathy can be perceived as a crucial competence and attitude in building inclusive relationships with other people and constructing inclusive societies based on mutual respect and understanding.

4.3 Preconditions for Intercultural Dialogue: Shared and Safe Space

Both scholars and policy-makers often discuss intercultural dialogue in relation to space: it is seen as requiring a particular kind of space and physical place to succeed. The Council of Europe's "White Paper on intercultural dialogue" (2008) makes an early case for space for intercultural dialogue. It draws special attention to urban planning and design and the management of public space through its spatial agenda, which reaches from commercial to religious and from educational to leisure spaces. The White Paper crystallizes the Council's spatial agenda as follows:

> It is essential to engender spaces for dialogue that are open to all. Successful intercultural governance, at any level, is largely a matter of cultivating such spaces: physical spaces like streets, markets and shops, houses, kindergartens, schools and universities, cultural and social centres, youth clubs, churches, synagogues and mosques, company meeting rooms and workplaces, museums, libraries and other leisure facilities, or virtual spaces like the media. (CofE 2008, 33)

The discourse of the White Paper emphasizes 'openness' as the key character of space enabling intercultural dialogue. What 'open space' actually means, however, is not specified in the document (Lähdesmäki 2014).

The idea of 'open space' resonates with other spatial discussions on intercultural ideologue. One of the societal prerequisites often emphasized as key for intercultural dialogue is 'shared space'—whether a physical place or a virtual environment (Wiesand et al. 2008, 10; Barrett 2013, 28; Wilson 2013, 61). Stemming from UNESCO's report 'Our Creative Diversity' (1996), the concept of shared space has been explained as an arena where new ideas and values can be publicly recognized in a dialogue. The ERICart report explains this as follows:

> ICD [Intercultural Dialogue] can only take place in an environment where a person is guaranteed safety and dignity, equality of opportunity and participation, where different views can be voiced openly without fear, where there are shared spaces for exchanges between different cultures to take place. (Wiesand et al. 2008, iii)
>
> The main prerequisite to establish a dialogic climate is the attitude that no part/side/partner in the dialogue stays in the center of the world or in an absolute position. On the contrary, the 'center' must be emptied for the sake of dialogue in order for the majority-minority discourse to be overcome (Wiesand et al. 2008, 10).

A non-hierarchical space emptied of power imbalances sounds like an ideal that may be difficult to achieve in practice: space is always determined by complex and transforming social relations, as the long tradition of studies in the sociology of space shows (e.g. Foucault 1984; Lefebvre 1991; Soja 1996; Massey 2005). Recent discussions on intercultural dialogue have recognized this challenge and sought to see differences in how space enables or hinders equal, non-hierarchical encounters. For instance, the European Commission's "Report on the role of public arts and cultural institutions in the promotion of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue" (2014) categorizes shared spaces as "traditional" or "neutral". The former are determined by established social, cultural, and behavior norms, such as normative dress codes,

while codes are co-created by people participating and acting in the latter (EC 2014, 62, 78). Recognizing the impact of social relations on space increases the credibility of policy discourses on intercultural dialogue. Interlocutors in these discourses still struggle to explain how spaces become 'shared' and what in fact is shared by people within these spaces.

We argue that the discussion on shared space as a precondition for intercultural dialogue should now focus on the feeling of safety in space. The concept of 'safe space' stems from the 1970s women's movement, feminism and queer activism and was originally used to refer to and discuss physical places where women and sexual minorities could meet and share their experiences in a safe environment (Flensner and Von der Lippe 2019, 276). More recently, various governmental and public institutions have adapted 'safe-space policies' to protect vulnerable and oppressed groups and minorities from discrimination, harassment, hatred, and threats (see Kyrölä 2018). The core idea of safe space is not only to delimit a place where violations are not accepted but to foster social relations between people in a place to make them feel that they can speak freely as all kinds of perspectives and positions are welcomed in the delimited place, whether physical or virtual. However, 'openness' to and 'acceptance' of perspectives and positions has to be structured by rules shared by all to make everyone in the space feel that they can safely exchange ideas and be themselves. The aim of these rules is to ensure an inclusive and respectful atmosphere in terms of civility and sensitivity (Jackson 2014, 48). In reality, these two requirements—openness and regulation—create an inherent tension in the idea of safe space (Flensner and Von der Lippe 2019, 276; see Kyrölä 2018).

Academic discourses on intercultural dialogue have often utilized the concept of safe space when dealing with encounters of religious and non-religious world views in public space and intercultural education (e.g. Jackson 2014; Knauth and Vieregge 2019; Flensner and Von der Lippe 2019). Several studies on classrooms as safe spaces have recognized challenges in making spaces safe and criticized the concept for smoothing controversies that might actually lead to learning, the development of student's world views, and personal growth (e.g. Holley and Steiner 2005; Flensner and Von der Lippe 2019; Halberstam 2018; see also Kyrölä 2018). Callan (2016, 65) has even suggested that education should make students feel "intellectually unsafe" to advance learning and critical thinking (see also Halberstam 2018). Even if this is the case, all education should be based on "dignity safe space" that is "free of any reasonable anxiety that others will treat one as having an inferior social rank to theirs" as Callan (2016, 65) describes.

Discussions on safe space rarely refer to empathy as the basis for social relations that create such spaces. We argue that empathy could be seen as the foundation and defining element of safe shared space. This space is about non-hierarchical social relations that allow agency for all who share the space. In it, individuals should be able to feel safe but they are required to try to ensure that others feel so too. In this, empathy becomes crucial. Empathy has been defined in scholarly literature as a complex concept including different modes of caring for others' viewpoints and 'feeling with' them (for different modes of empathy see e.g. Smith 2006; Aaltola and Keto 2017; Velasco 2019). These studies commonly distinguish cognitive from

affective or emotional empathy: the former deals with an ability to understand others' perspectives and feelings, while the latter refers to an ability to share others' emotions based on emotional cognition. Scholars have also identified compassionate empathy that moves beyond understanding others and sharing their feelings to make people take action to help those who need it. What safe shared spaces enable empathy in all its modes? We argue that art has a capacity to function as such space (see a further discussion on psychological safety and group creativity in Chapter 9 in this volume).

4.4 Art as Safe Shared Space and Enabler of Empathy

During the last few years, various projects seeking to increase intercultural dialogue have done so using art. In their book *Art and Intercultural Dialogue*, Gonçalves and Majhanovich (2016) note how art not only crosses language barriers but is also a wordless mode to express emotions and communicate. They emphasize how doing art is a creative process that fosters imagination, innovation, and problem solving that they see as key for intercultural dialogue. For them, art "masters and joins the languages of thought and emotion" and can therefore function as "a tool to better understand otherness and to communicate with the Other" (Gonçalves and Majhanovich 2016, vii). They claim (ibid.): "In fact, art initiates, fosters and protects diversity and so it can be a universal tool to initiate, nourish and protect intercultural dialogue, while celebrating cultural diversity." Art, thus, seems to have a lot of potential to promote intercultural dialogue. However, art does not automatically offer any non-hierarchical shared space or simple tool to promote respect for the other. It may nevertheless enable creative interaction, imagination, and empathy with others: this should be better recognized in policies and practices of intercultural dialogue.

Let us look more closely at empathy as one of the key components for intercultural dialogue and art. It is often claimed that art and literature can help people to learn empathy or identify with diverse others. The understanding of art's potential to influence and transform people's views, notions, and experiences is nothing new. As Fialho (2019, 3–4) points out: "The question of the transformative purpose of the arts and of literature […] has been present since human beings realized that they could influence others through discourse." Scholars from various fields have arg2006ued that art and literature have transformative, or even radical, qualities that raise empathy and awareness of self and others (e.g. Keen 2006; Leavy 2017, 195; Fialho 2019, 6–8) and strengthen the ability to identify with others or step into someone else's shoes, so to speak (Stout 1999; Venäläinen 2019, 255). In literature, this has often been discussed in terms of readers' engagement with characters (Keen 2006). Leavy, for example, notes that "[a]s readers engage with fiction and develop emotional connections with the characters, they are constructing intimate relationships with 'the imagined other'" (2017, 199). Discussing literary fiction, Polvinen and Sklar (2019, 11) suggest: "The possible benefits of fiction to empathy and sympathy could be seen to reside not in the characters themselves, but in readers' cognitive action in

imagining those characters." Art can serve as a space in which to imagine the experiences of others (Stout 1999)—and, as we argue, function as a safe space to deal with these experiences. Moreover, it has been claimed that fictional narratives can invite us to care for nature and nonhuman animals (e.g. Weik von Mossner 2017, 1–16). In the DIALLS project, art's potential for teaching us to relate to people, the environment, and animals is also taken into account, as lessons in the Cultural Literacy Learning Programme deal with themes such as climate change and sustainable development.

Worried that the call for trigger warnings to ensure that everyone in a learning environment feels safe may hinder the teaching of difficult subjects, Halberstam (2018, 57) asks: "Can we still dare to be surprised, shocked, thrilled into new forms of knowing?" Kyrölä nevertheless reminds us that, in a safe space, discomfort does not necessarily have to be erased, but it should be safe to experience (2018, 43–44). One may also argue that the transformative and imaginative capabilities of art open "the door for multiple forms of knowing" (Eisner 2008, 5). Barone and Eisner (2012, 3) claim that "the arts make […] empathic participation possible because they create forms that are evocative and compelling." Eisner argues elsewhere that art influences our knowledge production in three ways. Firstly, art evokes awareness of the nuances of qualitative situations (Eisner 2008, 10). In other words, art can broaden our awareness of the situated nature of knowledge and the experiences of others. Secondly, "[i]mages rendered in artistically expressive form often generate a kind of empathy that makes action possible" (Eisner 2008, 11). Thirdly, art provides us with "a fresh perspective so that our old habits of mind do not dominate our reactions with stock responses" (ibid.). In this sense, art can help us understand knowledge as situated and positional, depending on one's position in a society, for instance in terms of gender, class, or ethnicity (on 'situated knowledges', see Haraway 1988). Through this emphasis on situatedness, art can also help create a (feminist) safe space where intercultural dialogue between 'us' and 'others' may flourish (see Kyrölä 2018, 37).

Art education and art-based research are often considered as dealing with teaching and learning empathy (e.g. Barone and Eisner 2012, 7; Jeffers 2009, 19). This is echoed in philosopher Martha Nussbaum's (2010) work. For her, art should be used to foster empathy, dialogue, and the understanding and acceptance of otherness in education (2010, 13–16, 95–120). Numerous empirical studies and educational experiments support the claims of art as an effective pedagogical tool for teaching empathy and respect for difference (e.g. Stout 1999; Jeffers 2009; Fialho 2019, 10; Venäläinen 2019, 42). However, the idea that art can teach empathy has also been critiqued as too simplistic. Polvinen and Sklar (2019, 12) argue that instead of evoking sympathetic or empathetic responses, "fiction may, in fact, also offer us a very different kind of cognitive-emotional benefit—one that depends on our engagement with the literary artefact as a whole, and with the fictional characters specifically as fictions."

Teaching and learning empathy through art requires rigorous attention to the pedagogical tools used (Stout 1999; Jeffers 2009; Fialho 2019). Fialho asserts that if literature is to be used to teach empathy, "a formalist, knowledge-oriented approach" needs to be supplemented by forms of education that "encourage students to explore their personal responses in dialogic interactions with and about literary texts" (2019,

10). Moreover, writing on art-based research projects, Pauwels notes that "there is nothing intrinsically or automatically empowering in using pictures", meaning that art does not automatically cause empathetic or empowering experiences in the participants, but the researcher must actively steer them towards these kinds of experiences (2015, 108). These studies establish that art should by no means be overlooked in the teaching and learning of intercultural dialogue, but emphasis must be placed on pedagogical tools.

4.5 Conclusions

In this chapter, we have discussed intercultural dialogue as a concept, policy, and practice aimed at fostering mutual understanding and empathy towards others. We have noted how empathy is often defined as a key element of intercultural dialogue in scholarly texts but it is seldom mentioned in policies on the subject (see Lähdesmäki et al. 2020). Discussion is needed to find concrete ways of implementing empathy as a core feature of intercultural dialogue. In this chapter, we have suggested artistic creation and art education as such concrete tools.

Developing previous research that has identified shared space as a precondition for successful intercultural dialogue, as well as on feminist theorizations on safe space, we claim that intercultural dialogue needs to serve as safe shared space that allows for equal and empathic encounters between people from different hierarchical positions and backgrounds. Art can bring about a greater awareness of self and others and the situated nature of knowledge, as well as fostering mutual understanding. As gaining awareness of the experiences of others is important for empathic relationships to develop, art can also help in fostering empathy towards others and thus create a safe shared space for intercultural dialogue.

Nevertheless, we need to remember that art as such does not automatically evoke empathy or function as a safe shared space to learn empathy or intercultural dialogue. As discussed in our chapter, the linkages between art and empathy have been actively addressed in recent scholarship. Some of these studies claim that engagement with art, particularly reading literature, increases receivers' or readers' social awareness (David Dodell-Feder and Diana Tamir 2018) and understanding of others' minds (Kidd and Castano 2013), and, thus, enhances their ability for empathy. Some other scholars have criticized or been more reserved for such direct causality. Currie (2020, 211) notes, for instance, that empathizing with fictional characters does not equate with the exercise of empathy in response to the plights of other, real people and that" [f]iction can spread ignorance, prejudice, and insensitivity as effectively as it provides knowledge and openness" (Currie 2020, 204).

In this chapter, we have emphasized pedagogy as a key to using art to teach empathy and intercultural dialogue. In order for intercultural dialogue to flourish in

the classroom and beyond, forms of education that encourage empathic interaction should therefore supplement formalist approaches to teaching art.

A broad consortium of scholars and educators from various backgrounds have developed these pedagogical tools in the DIALLS project. The Cultural Literacy Learning Programme thus offers useful tools for teachers and researchers interested in the practice of teaching empathy and intercultural dialogue through art.

References

Aaltola, E., and S. Keto. 2017. *Empatia—myötäelämisen tiede*. Helsinki: Into.

Aman, R. 2012. The EU and the recycling of colonialism: Formation of Europeans through intercultural dialogue. *Educational Philosophy and Theory* 44 (9): 1010–1023.

Barone, T., and E.W. Eisner. 2012. *Arts based research*. London: Sage.

Barrett, M. 2013. Introduction—Interculturalism and multiculturalism: Concepts and controversies. In *Interculturalism and multiculturalism: Similarities and differences*, ed. M. Barrett, 15–42. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Bauböck, R. 2008. Beyond culturalism and statism: Liberal responses to diversity. *EUROSPHERE Working Paper Series* 6. https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:erp:ewpxxx:p0030. Accessed 8 May 2020.

Blommaert, J., and B. Rampton. 2011. *Language and Superdiversity. Diversities* 13 (2): 1–21.

Callan, E. 2016. Education in safe and unsafe spaces. *Philosophical Inquiry in Education* 24 (1): 64–78.

Cantle, T. 2013. Interculturalism as a new narrative for the era of globalisation and super-diversity. In *Interculturalism and multiculturalism: Similarities and differences*, ed. M. Barrett, 69–92. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

CofE (Council of Europe). 2008. White paper on intercultural dialogue. 'Living together as equals in dignity.' Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

CofE (Council of Europe). 2018. Reference framework of competences for democratic culture. Vol. 1: Context, concepts and model. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Currie, G. 2020. *Imagining and knowing: The shape of fiction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dodell-Feder, D., and D.I. Tamir. 2018. Fiction reading has a small positive impact on social cognition: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General* 147 (11): 1713–1727.

EC (European Commission). 2014. Report on the role of public arts and cultural institutions in the promotion of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue. Open Method of Coordination (Omc) Working Group of EU Member States Experts. Brussels: European Commission. https://ec.europa.eu/assets/eac/culture/library/reports/201405-omc-diversity-dialogue_en.pdf. Accessed 8 May 2020.

Eisner, E.W. 2008. Art and knowledge. In *Handbook of the arts in qualitative research*, ed. J.G. Knowles and A.L. Cole, 3–12. London: Sage.

Elias, A. 2017. Racism, anti-racism and intercultural dialogue. In *Interculturalism at the crossroads: Comparative perspectives on concepts, policies, and practices*, ed. F. Mansouri, 257–276. Paris: Unesco.

Fialho, O. 2019. What is literature for? The role of transformative reading. *Cogent Arts & Humanities* 6: 1–16.

Flensner, K.K., and M. Von der Lippe. 2019. Being safe from what and safe for whom? A critical discussion of the conceptual metaphor of 'safe space.' *Intercultural Education* 30 (3): 275–288.

Foucault, M. 1984. Of other spaces: Utopias and heterotopias. *Architecture /Mouvement/ Continuité* 5: 46–49.

Gonçalves, S., and S. Majhanovich. 2016. *Art and intercultural dialogue*. Leiden: Brill.

Halberstam, J. 2018 [2016]. Trigger happy. From content warning to censorship. In *The power of vulnerability. Mobilising affect in feminist, queer and anti-racist media cultures*, ed. A. Koivunen, K. Kyrölä, and I. Ryberg, 51–58. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Haraway, D.J. 1988. Situated knowledges: The science question in feminism and the privilege of partial perspective. *Feminist Studies* 14 (3): 575–599.

Holley, L.C., and S. Steiner. 2005. Safe space: Student perspectives on classroom environment. *Journal of Social Work Education* 41 (1): 49–64.

Houghton, S.A. 2012. *Intercultural dialogue in practice: Managing value judgement through foreign language education*. Bristol: Channel View Publications.

Jackson, R. 2014. *Signposts—policy and practice for teaching about religions and non-religious world views in intercultural education*. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Jeffers, C.S. 2009. Within connections: Empathy, mirror neurons, and art education. *Art Education* 62 (2): 18–23.

Kidd, D.C., and E. Castano. 2013. Reading literary fiction improves theory of mind. *Science* 342 (6156): 377–380.

Knauth, T., and D. Vieregge. 2019. Researching religion-related dialog in schools—theoretical and methodological considerations. *Religion & Education* 46 (1): 20–39.

Keen, S. 2006. A Theory of Narrative Empathy. *Narrative* 14 (3): 207–236.

Kyrölä, K. 2018. Negotiating vulnerability in the trigger warning debates. In *The power of vulnerability. Mobilising affect in feminist, queer and anti-racist media cultures*, ed. A. Koivunen, K. Kyrölä, and I. Ryberg, 29–50. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Lähdesmäki, T. 2014. The Role of Space in the Politics of Intercultural Dialogue. In *Cultural encounter. The mosaic of urban identities*, ed. E.-N. Burdușel, O. Matiu, D. Preda, and A. Tomuș, 28–42. Sibiu: University Network of the European Capitals of Culture.

Lähdesmäki, T., P.C.C.A. Heynderickx, A. Wagener, and S.M.F. Dieltjens. 2015. Negations and negativity as linguistic devices in policy discourse of intercultural cities. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 10 (3): 332–348.

Lähdesmäki, T., A.-K. Koistinen, and S. Ylönen. 2020. *Intercultural dialogue in the European education policies: A conceptual approach*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Lähdesmäki, T., and A. Wagener. 2015. Discourses on governing diversity in Europe: Critical analysis of the White Paper on intercultural dialogue. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 44: 13–28.

Leavy, P. 2017. *Research design: Quantitative, qualitative, mixed methods, arts-based, and community-based participatory research approaches*. New York: Guilford Publications.

Lee, E.L. 2016. Intercultural dialogue in theory and practice: A review. *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 11 (2): 236–242.

Lefebvre, H. 1991. *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Maine, F., V. Cook, and T. Lähdesmäki. 2019. Reconceptualizing cultural literacy as a dialogic practice. *London Review of Education* 17 (3): 382–391.

Massey, D. 2005. *For space*. London: Sage.

Modood, T., and N. Meer. 2012. How does interculturalism contrast with multiculturalism? *Journal of Intercultural Studies* 33 (2): 175–196.

Näss, H. E. 2010. The ambiguities of intercultural dialogue: Critical perspectives on the European Union's new agenda for culture. *Journal of Intercultural Communication* 23. https://www.immi.se/intercultural/nr23/nass.htm. Accessed 8 May 2020.

Nussbaum, M. 2010. *Not for profit. Why democracy needs the humanities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Ratzmann, N. 2019. *Intercultural dialogue. A review of conceptual and empirical issues relating to social transformation*. Paris: UNESCO.

Pauwels, L. 2015. 'Participatory' visual research revisited: A critical-constructive assessment of epistemological, methodological, and social activists tenets. *Ethnography* 16 (1): 95–117.
Polvinen, M., and H. Sklar. 2019. Mimetic and synthetic views of characters: How readers process "people" in fiction. *Cogent Arts & Humanities* 6 (1): 1–15.
Rodríguez-García, D. 2010. Beyond assimilation and multiculturalism: A critical review of the debate on managing diversity. *Journal of International Migration and Integration* 11 (3): 251–271.
Silvestri, S. 2007. *Policy brief: Islam and the EU: The merits and risks of intercultural dialogue.* Brussels: European Policy Centre.
Smith, A. 2006. Cognitive empathy and emotional empathy in human behavior and evolution. *the Psychological Record* 56 (1): 3–21.
Soja, E. 1996. *Thirdspace: Journeys to Los Angeles and other real-and-imagined places.* Oxford: Blackwell.
Stout, C.J. 1999. The art of empathy: Teaching students to care. *Art Education* 52 (2): 21–34.
Taylor, C. 2012. Interculturalism or multiculturalism? *Philosophy and Social Criticism* 38 (4–5): 413–423.
UNESCO. 1996. *Our creative diversity.* Paris: UNESCO.
Velasco, J. S. 2019. In search of empathy in prehistoric times: Evolution and revolution. In *Empathy: Emotional, ethical and epistemological narratives*, ed. R. Gutiérrez Aguilar, 7–27. Leiden: Brill.
Venäläinen, P. 2019. *Nykytaide oppimisen ympäristönä. Näkemyksiä nykytaiteesta, oppimisesta ja niiden kohtaamisesta.* Dissertation. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä Press.
Vertovec, S. 2007. *New complexities of cohesion in Britain: Super-diversity, transnationalism and civil-integration.* Wetherby: Communities and Local Government Publications.
Vertovec, S., and S. Wessendorf. 2010. Introduction: Assessing the backlash against multiculturalism. In *The multiculturalism backlash: European discourses, policies and practices*, ed. S. Vertovec and S. Wessendorf, 1–31. New York: Routledge.
Weik von Mossner, A. 2017. *Affective ecologies: Empathy, emotion, and environmental narrative.* Columbus: The Ohio State University Press.
Wiesand, A., I. Heiskanen, R. Mitchell, D. Cliché, M. Fisher, and L. Marsio. 2008. *Sharing diversity. National approaches to intercultural dialogue in Europe.* Bonn: European Institute for Comparative Cultural Research.
Wilson, R. 2013. The urgency of intercultural dialogue in a Europe of insecurity. In *Interculturalism and multiculturalism: Similarities and differences*, ed. M. Barrett, 53–68. Strasbourg: Council of Europe.

Tuuli Lähdesmäki (PhD in Art History and DSocSc in Sociology) is an Associate Professor at the Department of Music, Art and Culture Studies, University of Jyväskylä, Finland (JYU). She has led JYU's consortium partnership in the DIALLS project.

Aino-Kaisa Koistinen (PhD in Contemporary Culture Studies) is a Postdoctoral Researcher at the Department of Music, Art and Culture Studies, University of Jyväskylä, Finland. Her research in the DIALLS project has focused on education policies and pupils' visual creations.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/), which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.