

Of Metaphors and Molecules: Figurative Language Bridging STEM and the Arts in Education

Danah Henriksen (researcher, educator, educational psychologist), Division of Educational Leadership & Innovation, Arizona State University, PO Box 37100, Mail Code 3151, Phoenix, AZ 85069-7100, U.S.A. Email: <danah.henriksen@asu.edu>. ORCID: 0000-0001-5109-6960

Punya Mishra (educator, researcher, designer, administrator), Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College, Arizona State University, Farmer Education Building, Suite 402, 1050 S. Forest mall, PO Box 871811, Tempe, AZ 85287-1811, U.S.A. Email: <punya.mishra@asu.edu>. ORCID: 0000-0002-9300-4996

© ISAST

Manuscript received 28 August 2017

Abstract: STEM education in the U.S. is often described in a downward spiral, via competency test scores, and student motivation for STEM disciplines. We suggest this arises from an overly instrumental view of STEM. While STEAM has arisen as a pushback paradigm, the application of STEAM in schools is challenging, and educators are often unclear about connecting STEM and arts. We suggest envisioning STEAM through natural disciplinary interconnections. We focus on the integration of language arts and figurative thinking, to blur the boundaries of STEM and arts. We offer examples of figurative language for framing STEM teaching and learning, illustrated in examples of metaphor, linguistic etymology, and synecdoche.

The limits of my language mean the limits of my world — Ludwig Wittgenstein

We must be clear that when it comes to atoms, language can be used only as in poetry. The poet, too, is not nearly so concerned with describing facts as with creating images and establishing mental connections — Niels Bohr

STEM to STEAM: The Differences Are More than a Letter

Common rhetoric suggests that STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering & Mathematics) education in the United States is in crisis, with waning student performance on standards and decreasing interest in these disciplines [1]. This is despite increased attention to and systemic glorification of STEM in education, often at the exclusion of the arts.

To explain this disconnect, scholars have pointed to the siloed structure of school disciplines [2]. The arts are often sidelined as frivolous or discretionary to STEM goals, and students believe that disciplines are disconnected from each other and from their world [3]. Interest in the sciences plummets—and with it goes science literacy, artistic sensitivity, and a sense of curiosity about the world.

The STEAM movement is an approach to integrating the arts into STEM. The common definition of STEAM is an educational approach where science, technology, engineering, the arts and mathematics are integrated for classroom learning and inquiry. The concept of STEAM is worthy. Yet STEAM application in schools is a mixed-bag, with educators often unclear as to what STEAM might look like. In practice it is often reduced to dropping some art into a science

lesson—in other words, popping an “A” in alongside the STEM [4]. There is nothing inherently wrong here, as putting the arts into science lessons is one strategy for interdisciplinarity in learning, but only *one*. Focusing on one strategy is limiting, and misses a chance to explore deep interrelationships and disciplinary links.

This is not a critique of teachers or STEAM scholars, but an acknowledgement that imagining disciplinary integration is not intuitive. The term “STEAM” may leave educators struggling with open-ended possibilities, or wondering how to integrate art into science if they have no arts background, or vice-versa. We suggest broadening STEAM beyond disciplines, to focus on areas of creative interconnections that span disciplines. While there are many areas, here we explore the use of figurative language in STEM.

Binding and Un-binding the Disciplines in Schools

Conventional STEM education often misses the richness of disciplinary intersections. Many learners go through mandated schooling failing to see the beauty in science [5]. They will not experience wonder at the clarity in an elegant geometric proof, or a moment of awe in peeking through a telescope to view the vividly-etched rings of Saturn. Science literature is full of beauty and wonder-driven approaches [6] but few of these make it into schooling. By denying the artistic and emotional components of STEM, we set the stage for student disengagement [7].

Conventional schooling has ignored these aesthetic, creative perspectives for many reasons. To find efficient ways of teaching STEM, schools often adopt a functional, instrumental rationale for STEM. Science education has tried to emphasize science literacy—as in the 1989 “Science for All Americans,” [8] or across educational benchmarks like the recent Next Generation Science Standards [9]. Still, instrumental approaches prevail in practice. This happens partly because of the structure and origins of U.S. schools, which historically originated through an industrial revolution learning model. Conformity and rigidity are designed into the system. Conventional structures of U.S. schooling more closely resemble the narrow, scripted principles of behaviorist Edward Thorndike, rather than the creative constructivism of educational philosopher John Dewey [10].

Instrumental reasoning positions science as a tool, rather than a personally motivating, beautiful subject. This happens when we push participation in STEM fields due to high-paying, stable professions, or because it feeds a patriotic rhetoric where STEM helps nations dominate international competition. Such rhetoric was ingrained during the US-USSR space race in the 1960s, where STEM was a tool to win international competition [11]. Influential reports, such as *A Nation at Risk*, affirmed a sense of war and competition as the true value of education, by opening with, “If an unfriendly foreign power had attempted to impose on America the mediocre educational performance that exists today, we might well have viewed it as an act of war” [12]. Even well-intended approaches, like President Obama’s STEM for All, consistently emphasize STEM in instrumental ways—e.g. to “land a good-paying job,” or “offering every student the hands-on computer science and math classes that make them job-ready on day one” [13].

STEAM emerged as pushback to instrumentalism. To design creative, real-world lessons across the sciences and arts, education must emphasize interdisciplinary interconnections. Some STEAM scholarship gives examples of such connections. For example, one strategy may be

using design as a framework for problem framing across the arts and sciences [14]. Another is to build a rhetoric of aesthetics in classrooms to forefront curiosity, awe, and wonder [15]. Other scholars suggest active-learning approaches, with a focus on art-studio models of instruction [16]. One of the most consistently suggested STEAM strategies is project-based learning, using real-world examples where students engage in work that naturally crosses disciplines [17]. Here, we suggest taking a linguistic turn. Figurative language illuminates ideas in the arts—but is also fundamental to how creative and influential scientists operate.

Figurative Language in Thinking

Educational psychology emphasizes how prior knowledge builds mental connections for new knowledge [18]. Language is the symbol system through which we understand new ideas or connect them to prior knowledge. As Lakoff and Johnson note, “our ordinary conceptual system, in which we both think and act, is fundamentally metaphorical in nature” [19]. Figurative language, which is common to the arts, is also important to STEM. Linguistic tropes can provide educators another learning bridge across art and science. This includes metaphors and analogies, and other aspects of language.

Tropes of Language in Arts and STEM

Figures of speech extend beyond language arts courses to help us make sense of our world. Expressions like “falling in love,” or “time is money,” are metaphors that pervade our everyday understanding. Similes make comparisons like “quiet as a mouse.” Hyperbole highlights a point, like emphasizing hunger with, “I’m starving!”

Every work of art involves figurative thinking, because art is always a representation. In poems or fictional stories, one object or idea often communicates something else. In movies, sculptures, or paintings, artists rarely replicate reality exactly as it is. Instead they demonstrate something new or interesting about an idea, scene, or object, by viewing it through the lens of something else. For example, Rene Magritte probed the nature and process of representation of the world, across both language and art.

In STEM, Isaac Newton’s analogy comparing our moon to a ball thrown so hard that its descent misses the earth and passes into orbit, allowed him to diverge from the Aristotelian notion that a body has one kind of motion. This generated the idea of a forward-falling composite motion of objects in orbit [20]. Figurative language allows the creative, interdisciplinary learning that students need.

Drawing on Language Arts for STEM

We share a few illustrative examples, starting with *metaphor* (in multiples), then expanding to less common language tropes, such as *synecdoche*, and finally exploring the power of *etymology*, to connect the arts and the sciences.

Multiple Metaphoric Meanings

Metaphors abound in science and mathematics. The number line is itself a metaphor. Numbers have no inherent need to be placed on a straight-line heading to infinity from left-to-right. Yet this is a fruitful mapping that allows us to understand relationships and manipulate numbers.

Other examples include seeing the heart as a pump, or energy conservation as akin to balancing account-books, or DNA as the “code of life” to be “translated” into building proteins.

Yet there are problems in taking classroom metaphors too far. They are imperfect vehicles for knowledge, because abstractions may miss details or overemphasize similarities. A solution is to enrich concepts with *multiple* metaphors. For example, the concept of energy is fundamental across multiple science disciplines. In biology, energy is part of photosynthesis/nutrition, while in chemistry it relates to chemical bonds, and in physics it involves kinetic/potential energy. Students viewing the same idea in different disciplines may not understand or connect multiple uses of the same word for conceptual richness [21].

Rachael Lancor suggests the value in using multiple metaphors [22]. She notes six key conceptual metaphors for energy, including: (a) Energy, like money, can be accounted and tracked; (b) Energy can take different forms and changes from one to another; (c) Energy can flow like water through a pipe; (d) Energy can be carried by organisms as well as inanimate entities like electrons; (e) Energy, like oil in a faulty machine, can be lost; and (f) Energy can be stored in devices like a battery or a wound spring.

Using multiple metaphors allows students to appreciate the richness of the construct and the complex relationships where it occurs. Figure 1 contains an artistic representation, showing how multiple metaphors can enhance STEM through language arts, with opportunities to create visuals through artistic representation. Having students do their own representations of metaphor offers natural art and language hooks to STEM education.



Figure 1: Multiple metaphors for energy. Illustration by Punya Mishra. (© Punya Mishra)

Synecdoche Across Scales

Synecdoche is a figure of speech in which a part of something describes the whole. For instance, we say “ABCs” for the alphabet, or “set of wheels” to represent a car. This part-whole relationship is also key to understanding mathematical and scientific ideas on complex systems and self-similarity. Synecdoche or self-similarity have always been an aspect of human thinking,

with examples spanning biology (the tree-like growths of broccoli and cauliflower), geography (the structures of coastlines), mathematics (fractals), and physics (atomic energies) [23]. Self-similarity, or a pattern across scales of magnitude, is common in the world. Examples may include everything from an ant colony to a rainforest; from the human brain to the contemporary mega-city. Science has discovered that although these systems may exist at extremely different scales, they maintain certain properties—so that parts of the system may resemble the whole. Interestingly, ideas of self-similarity are present in literature and art as well (for example in the stories of Jorge Luis Borges, or the art of M. C. Escher).

In teaching fractals or complex systems, educators may find it useful to start with everyday examples (such as broccoli and tree-branching), and then let students zoom in or out across different scales of magnitude, from twigs to branches to trees, to demonstrate how the part represents the whole. Similarly, complex systems such as the networks in ant colonies can be compared, by zooming in, to the circulatory system in our bodies—or by zooming out, with the streets and physical networks in cities. Making visual creations, like figure 2, allows students to play with ideas, considering how synecdoche occurs across scales, with opportunities to re-see the world.



Figure 2: Complex systems are dynamic, self-organizing, evolving networks that can operate without central control (e.g. ant colonies, rainforests, human brains, or cities). Illustration by Punya Mishra. (© Punya Mishra)

Etymology of Language

There are opportunities in STEM to uncover connections in the etymology of language. This unpacks language as an art to enrich understanding of science. For example, in mathematics, the term “radical” describes the root of a number. In traditional math, students receive a basic textbook definition such as, “The n th root of a number x , where n is usually assumed to be a

positive integer, is a number r which, when raised to the power n yields x .” They might learn such basic terminology stripped of context—and proceed to the next operation.

However, bridging the concept of a radical into language arts, a teacher might ask students to conduct an investigation into the etymological meaning. This reveals definitions involving the idea of a “root.” One definition of radical is, “relating to or affecting the fundamental nature of something.” This goes beyond math, to the idea of a “root” issue—in mathematics, but also more broadly. Students might discuss how a person described as a “radical,” is one who wants fundamental change at the “root” of something.

Further, a student-led search into this etymology demonstrates that the word is grounded in the Latin “radix” or “radic”—again meaning “root”—and in late Middle English (in “forming the root” and “inherent”). This explains another familiar connection to a common vegetable—the radish, a root vegetable. In one example, we unpacked the creative linguistics underlying the etymology of a term, to show connections across disciplines.

A similar connection exists between a linguistic arrangement called a chiasmus, and chromosome division. Linguistically, an example of a chiasmus was in President Kennedy’s inaugural speech where he famously said, “Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.” President Kennedy (or his speech-writers) loved phrasing sentences in this way. In the same speech he stated, “Let us never negotiate out of fear. But let us never fear to negotiate.” In a later speech to the United Nations he said, “Mankind must put an end to war, or war will put an end to mankind.” The root of the word “chiasmus” is the Greek term meaning *diagonal arrangement*. In linguistics, it describes two successive clauses or sentences where key words or phrases are repeated in reverse order, sometimes known as criss-cross figure of speech.

In cell-biology, a chiasmata is the contact point between two chromatids of a chromosome during meiosis. There is an exchange of genetic material between chromosomes, in what is known as a chromosomal crossover. Chiasma also comes from the Ancient Greek *khiazein* which means “to mark with the letter chi.” The greek letter chi’s (χ) shape captures the linguistic structure of chiasmus, and also the physical connection between two chromatids of a chromosome. A specific form of chiasmata is a “chi structure.” Thus etymology, linguistics, and biology intersect, allowing deeper understanding of word meanings and richer connections in learning.

Such examples afford teachers an entry point to connect language arts (and more) to the sciences. Figure 3 is one simple visual example of how one could represent these ideas, though students might create a multitude of visuals of their own.




Figure 3. Chiasmus, Chi and chiasmata. Illustration by Punya Mishra. (© Punya Mishra)

STEM disciplines are grounded in linguistic moves with creative connections. Such playfulness and experimentation with language offers a path to more meaning and connectivity in STEM learning.

Conclusion

Whether teachers use the more common metaphor or analogy, or expand to possibilities like synecdoche, hyperbole, pun, personification, or others, the key is to make transdisciplinary connections, and take STEM out of a narrow box.

During a research interview, National Teacher of the Year finalist and STEM educator June Teisan [23] described this idea in her teaching:

When creating a lesson I ask, what do I want kids to walk away with? What's the essential kernel of truth?...For example, germination is important for them to know, but I'm going to talk about it as sprouting. I might frame it so that a seed itself is like a baby; and it has its lunch and the mother plant wrapped it up and sent it off. It's going to travel out into the world, through the air, or on the water, or on somebody's fur. So kids can see that as a picture in their head...Those kinds of abstractions, they help you file away the rust and get down to the gold. Everybody loves a story.

Enactment of language arts moves in STEM learning may “file away the rust to get down to the gold” of an idea. In other disciplines, we use such abstractions or explorations to understand complicated things. The purpose is the same here. STEM domains are richer and more connected than school curricula often recognize—and figurative language or other transdisciplinary conceptual hooks may reveal this to students.

References and Notes

1. K. Barcelona, “21st Century Curriculum Change Initiative: A Focus on STEM Education as an Integrated Approach to Teaching and Learning,” *American Journal of Educational Research* 2, No. 10, 862-875 (2014).
2. M. Gottfried, R. Bozick, & S. Srinivasan. “Beyond Academic Math,” *Teachers College Record* 116, No. 7, 1-35 (2014).

3. D. Zeidler, "STEM education: A deficit framework for the twenty first century? A sociocultural socioscientific response." *Cultural Studies of Science Education* 11, No. 1, 11-26 (2016).
4. Anne Jolly, "STEM vs. STEAM: Do the arts belong?." *Education Week* 18, 16 November 2014, <<http://arcataschooldistrict.org/wp-content/uploads/STEM-vs.-STEAM-Do-the-Arts-Belong-Education-Week-Teacher.pdf>> accessed, 21 December, 2017.
5. D. Wong. "Beyond control and rationality: Dewey, aesthetics, motivation, and educative experiences," *Teachers College Record* 109, No. 1, 192-220 (2007).
6. Subrahmanyam Chandrasekhar, *Truth and beauty: Aesthetics and motivations in science* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1987).
7. M. Girod, "A conceptual overview of the role of beauty and aesthetics in science and science education." *Studies in Science Education* 43, No. 1, 38-61 (2007).
8. Floyd Rutherford, *Science for all Americans: Summary* (American Association for the Advancement of Science, 1989).
9. National Research Council. *Next generation science standards: For states, by states.* (2013).
10. R. Levin, "The debate over schooling: Influences of Dewey and Thorndike," *Childhood Education* 68, No. 2, 71-75 (1991).
11. N. DeJarnette, "America's children: Providing early exposure to STEM (science, technology, engineering and math) initiatives," *Education* 133, No. 1, 77-84 (2012).
12. David Gardner, "A Nation At Risk: The Imperative For Educational Reform. An Open Letter to the American People. A Report to the Nation and the Secretary of Education." (National Commission on Excellence in Education, 1983, p.5).
13. Barack Obama, "State of the Union," 2016, <<https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/the-press-office/2016/01/12/remarks-president-barack-obama-%E2%80%93-prepared-delivery-state-union-address>>, accessed, 21 December 2017.
14. Anne Jolly, *STEM by Design: Strategies and Activities for Grades 4-8* (New York: Routledge, 2016).
15. R. Mehta, S. Keenan, D. Henriksen & P. Mishra, "Developing a rhetoric of aesthetics: The (often) forgotten link between art and STEM," in press manuscript.
16. A. Connor, S. Karmokar, & C. Whittington. "From STEM to STEAM: Strategies for enhancing engineering & technology education," *International Journal of Engineering Pedagogy*, 5, No. 2, 37-47 (2015).
17. David Sousa & Tom Pilecki, *From STEM to STEAM: Using brain-compatible strategies to integrate the arts* (Corwin Press, 2013).
18. David Ausubel, *The acquisition and retention of knowledge: A cognitive view* (New York: Springer Science & Business Media, 2012).
19. George Lakoff & Mark Johnson. *Metaphors we live by.* (Chicago: Chicago University 1980).
20. Robert Root-Bernstein & Michele Root-Bernstein, *Sparks of genius: The thirteen thinking tools of the world's most creative people* (Boston, Houghton Mifflin Harcourt, 2013).
21. K. Mashood, R. Mehta, & P. Mishra, "To see a world: Using multiple metaphors in science education," in press manuscript.

22. R. Lancor, “The many metaphors of energy: Using analogies as a formative assessment tool.” *Journal of College Science Teaching* 42, No. 3, 38-45 (2013).

23. Dirk Vanderbeke, “Of parts and wholes: self-similarity and synecdoche in science, culture and literature,” (2014), <http://www.academia.edu/download/32945187/Dirk_Vanderbeke_-_Of_Parts_and_Wholes__Self-Similarity_and_Synecdoche_in_Science__Culture_and_Literature.pdf>, accessed 21 December 2017.

24. D. Henriksen & P. Mishra, “We Teach Who We Are: Creativity in the Lives and Practices of Accomplished Teachers,” *Teachers College Record* 117, No. 7, 1-46 (2015).

Bios

Danah Henriksen is an Assistant Professor of Educational Leadership & Innovation in Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. Her research has focused on creativity and design thinking in teaching and learning contexts. Learn more about her work at <http://danah-henriksen.com>

Punya Mishra is Associate Dean of Scholarship & Innovation and Professor in Mary Lou Fulton Teachers College at Arizona State University. His research has focused on teacher creativity, the role of aesthetics in education, and bringing designerly approaches to educational innovation. Learn more about his scholarship at <http://punyamishra.com>