INTRODUCTION

Metaphor in education

A multilingual and Scandinavian perspective

Katrin Ahlgren[1], Anne Golden[2], and Ulrika Magnusson[1]
[1] Stockholm University | [2] University of Oslo

This special issue explores the use of metaphor in education from a multi-lingual perspective in two Scandinavian countries, Norway and Sweden. In this introduction, we include a brief overview of earlier research in the domain and identify common factors noteworthy to discuss in relation to the multilingual context, for instance, the notion of creativity and speaker legitimacy in a second language context. The issue includes six articles comprising multilingual school children, youth, university students, adult migrants, and indigenous minorities. Several of the articles focus on second language acquisition, use and assessment, while others deal more with social issues, including unequal power relations and prejudices that new-comers encounter in everyday life.

Keywords: Scandinavia, education, multilingualism, second language learning, creativity

1. Introduction

Metaphors are omnipresent and surround people throughout their lives. They exist as thoughts as well as expressions. We meet metaphors in different modalities and in different languages. They help us to better understand theoretical concepts, and they trigger feelings and enrich our everyday language. Sometimes we are conscious of them, but often not. Sometimes we misunderstand a meaning or stretch it somehow, and sometimes we twist an established figurative expression or simply create a new one – and more so in a language we are learning.

The awareness of metaphors in education has been raised over the past decades. Today, there is a widespread recognition of the important role played by metaphors in mediating learning (e.g. Cameron, 2003; Littlemore, 2001; Littlemore & Low, 2006; Mouraz, Pereira & Monteiro, 2013; Sfard, 2015). School textbooks introduce new knowledge – often abstract – frequently through

metaphors in order to make it easier to comprehend. How else will children understand what electricity is or how the blood flows in the body? Also, teachers use metaphorical expressions when they talk about subject issues as well as everyday matters. Children come across them when reading narratives as well as textbooks, and are expected to use them in their own writing as they expand their vocabulary (Cameron, 2003; Golden, 2010).

For young people and adults, the learning of a new language means that they need to be socialized in that language, to learn a new way of thinking, or new ways of doing things (also called culture, see e.g. Van Lier, 2004), and it certainly means learning a great number of words, the meaning of many being metaphorical. A common assumption has been that metaphorical expressions are hard to understand in a new language, but this does not have to be the case. Rather, comprehension is affected by a number of factors, like what kind of expression is being used (a simple word or a complex phrase) and if the same expression exists in the learner's first language (Golden, 2010). The context in which the expression is embedded is also important: some contexts help the interpretation, but others conceal the meaning, just like non-figurative words do (see e.g. Nacey, 2020). Producing complex metaphorical expressions, according to conventional or what is usually called idiomatic language use in a new language, might, however, be a challenge even for learners at an advanced level.

Despite this general recognition of the importance of metaphor in education, metaphorical language is not always taken into account in second language teaching nor in second language assessment. It has been observed (Nacey, 2013; Ahlgren, 2014) that metaphor is not prominent in the Common European Framework of References for Languages (CEFR), (Council of Europe, 2001). Metaphor is explicitly mentioned only once, in terms of "lexical competence" where it is equated with the terms "idiomatic expressions and colloquialisms" and do not appear on the CEFR assessment scales until the C1/C2 proficiency level. As Nacey (2013, pp. 43–55) interprets this, learners are not expected to utilize metaphors to any real extent before they become advanced users of a language (cf. also Alberta K–12 ESL Proficiency Benchmarks; The ESL Scope and Scales).[1] However, the idea that metaphor only appears at advanced proficiency levels has been refuted in research, as several studies (Littlemore & Low, 2006; MacArthur, 2010) have demonstrated that metaphor is an important communication strategy even in early stages of language learning (see also discussion in Ahlgren & Magnusson, this issue). Yet if there are no assessment criteria involving metaphor, students' use

---

1. http://www.learnalberta.ca/content/eslapb/search.html; https://ca4po2htfsc1lroaengrwddh -wpengine.netdna-ssl.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/07/ESL-Scopes-and-Scales-15-18-year- olds-John-Polias.pdf

of metaphor in language exams will not have any positive impact on evaluations, nor will students be actively encouraged to produce metaphor in their texts. The teaching of metaphorical competence in second language classrooms and the use of metaphors in exams are thus important issues to explore regarding metaphor in multilingual perspectives.

The objective of the current issue of *Metaphor and the social world* is to present different perspectives on metaphor in education in the Scandinavian countries from a multilingual perspective. Some of the articles focus on language learning and the linguistic outcomes of language learners with Norwegian and Swedish as a second language, while others relate to discursive constructions of identities and expressed experiences of migration. Furthermore, issues of social prejudice are discussed through the use of metaphor in a multilingual educational context. All articles explore "real world" data relating to different practices of language learning and teaching.

2.   Metaphor and the notion of creativity

An important aspect of metaphor from a multilingual and second language perspective is the notion of creativity. Recent studies have found that some individuals exhibit a more flexible semantic memory structure compared to others, which may facilitate both their production and comprehension of novel metaphors (Kenett, Gold & Faust, 2018; Wang & Cheng, 2016). Research has also shown that multilingualism can enhance the capacity to produce original, creative ideas, mainly in verbal domains, something that may be related to a high degree of cognitive flexibility (Fürst & Grin, 2018). However, the disposition to use metaphorical language depends on personal preferences, style and language knowledge (Kenett, Gold & Faust, 2018).

The notion of creativity is thus a complex aspect of metaphor, related to our personality and cognition (including our emotions and imagination), but also to the cultural and linguistic context in which the figurative expressions are embedded (e.g. Kohl, Bolognesi & Werkmann Horvat, 2020, p. 29). Traditionally, a creative metaphor is described as an original juxtaposition of a source and a target domain that calls the receiver's attention. Creative metaphors are also known as novel, vivid, innovative, poetical, creative or living metaphors – as opposed to conventional metaphors, that are so commonly used that people may often not conceive of them as metaphors (sometimes they are also referred to as "dead" metaphors). A further issue is that the space to be creative is unevenly distributed, and that some writers might not have the legitimacy to create new metaphors or

alter existing ones. Hence the second language perspective also brings issues of ownership and power to the fore: who is allowed to be creative?

It has often been observed that language learners frequently use metaphor as a compensatory communication strategy (Littlemore & Low, 2006) since they may not otherwise be able to express abstract concepts in their new language. Further, the use of metaphor is related to a learner's proficiency level in the target language (Wang & Cheng, 2016). Another important aspect is that the metaphors that second language users and multilinguals produce are not always in accordance with the standardized norms of the target language. An example is the use of prepositions, characterized as a "recurring nightmare" for learners of English (Littlemore & Low, 2006, p. 284). The same goes for learners of other languages with prepositions (like Norwegian and Swedish) whether or not the learners have prepositions in their first language, as their choice might depend on the conceptualizations of the phenomenon in their first language which might be different than in their second language. In a study of texts written by learners of Norwegian (Malcher, 2011), the Spanish learners tended to use the preposition *i* [Eng. 'in'] in some cases where *på* [Eng. 'on'] was expected in Norwegian. This was explained as transfer from Spanish: some items were conceptualized as positioned in space (hence required "in") when it was conceptualized as on a surface in Norwegian (hence required "on"). Also, many prepositions are used in a metaphorical sense, and some of them have a metaphoricity of close to 100% (Nacey & Jensen, 2017). The results of such studies support Pritzl's (2012) observation that creativity is related to the existence of norms and conventions, without which "any creative use would be inappropriate, meaningless, unintelligible and therefore ultimately useless" (p. 34). Creativity depends, according to Pritzl (ibid.) on potentialities of language as it is a re-creation where the producer relies on existing norms. This fact is essential in relation to metaphoricity in a second language perspective, when the learner's objective is (usually) to speak and write in line with the norms of the target language.

Another approach to the notion of creativity is provided by Berthelin (2020). She argues for considering the use of metaphors from multiple languages in second language writing as translanguaging (García, 2009) since multilinguals often use all their languages as an integrated communication system. This perspective allows for studying how multilinguals use their linguistic repertoires in order to make themselves understood, and how they play with words and lexicogrammar, including metaphors. Such approach may lead to new perceptions of evaluation of second language competence (see further Ahlgren & Magnusson, this issue; Golden, this issue). Further, linguistic creativity can be related to the notion of legitimacy, e.g. whether all speakers are assumed valid creators of new metaphorical expressions and able to extend the meaning of

existing ones (see e.g. Pitzl, 2017). This question of norm-transcending creativity is addressed in the present issue.

3.   A Scandinavian perspective

Since a great deal of research on metaphor in education has been conducted in relation to English-speaking countries, we propose that it is time to turn our gaze to different shores. In this special issue, we focus on the Scandinavian context, and more specifically on Sweden and Norway. The point of departure is that Scandinavia – being a cultural-linguistic region with a common history – is characterized by having a high degree of linguistic diversity. There are several indigenous minority languages (i.a. Sami, Kven and Meänkieli) as well as a large number of immigrant minority languages (i.a. Arabic, Bosnian-Croatian-Serbian, Somalian, Spanish, Polish and Urdu). This diversity tended to be overlooked in the past but has, to a certain extent, started to be recognized to a greater extent. Moreover, English is often used as the medium of communication in different contexts in Scandinavia, having the function of a *lingua franca* shared between speakers of different language backgrounds. In some contexts, such as business and certain schools where English is the medium of instruction, English has a more or less dominant position, and is used on a daily basis in various situations (for a discussion, see Salö, 2016; Toth, 2018). Further, both countries have framed educational provisions to cater to multilingual students and adult learners: competing discourses can be observed in both Sweden and Norway, where minority languages are variously considered as a right, a problem, or a resource (cf. Ruiz, 1984; see for example Karrebaek, Salö, Ganuza & Hedman, 2018; Paulsrud, Zilliacus & Ekberg, 2020). For example, in Sweden multilingual students' right to study their mother tongue is contested and legitimized in complex ways (ibid.; Ganuza & Hedman, 2015). Similarly, competing discourses surround the provision of second language instruction in Sweden (Hedman & Magnusson, 2018, 2020). And, as in most western countries, monolingual norms are considered predominant by researchers, contrasting with the multilingual realities (Lindberg, 2007; Gogolin, 1997; Graedler, 2014; Vukotić, 2014).

Obviously, the Scandinavian languages are in different processes of change at various levels. An ongoing debate in Norway and Sweden concerns the interpretation of the expressions *å gjøre noen en bjørnetjeneste* (Norwegian) / *att göra någon en björntjänst* (Swedish). These expressions are literally translated to English as "to do someone a bear-service", and means 'to do someone a disservice'. In both Norwegian and Swedish, the meaning of the expression is currently changing from a negative connotation (as in La Fontaine's fable "The bear

and the gardener") to a positive one. More specifically, many people now believe the expression refers to doing someone a huge favor, along the same lines as giving someone a "bear hug" (Uri, 2020). Such shift of metaphorical meaning can depend on cultural and linguistic references of the speakers, as well as their age. Further, there are plenty of examples in the Scandinavian context when norms change with multilingual encounters: one historical example concerns the heavy influence of German on the Scandinavian languages during the Hanseatic period (appr. mid 12th to mid 17th century). This influence is visible in most levels of language, including metaphorical expressions. A salient example is the Swedish idiom *ont krut förgås inte*, which in English would mean 'ill weed grows apace'. The idiom stems from the German idiom "Unkraut vergeht nicht", literally 'weed does not vanish easily'. However, in the transfer to Swedish, the German *Unkraut* ('weed') has been taken over on a phonological basis and become "krut", which semantically makes little sense, as "krut" means 'gunpowder'. The illogical wording thus literally means 'gunpowder does not vanish easily', whereas the pragmatic meaning is similar to the English and German versions. Further, several novels have been published in Sweden that use sociolects spoken among multilingual youth, for example the novels *One Eye Red* by Jonas Hassen Khemiri (2003), or *Call It Whatever You Like* by Marjaneh Bakhtiari (2005), in which, *inter alia*, the linguistic creativity, including metaphors that deviate from standard use, has received much attention.

An interest in metaphor from a multilingual perspective is thus relevant, along with the great increase in research on language in education, second language learning and multilingualism in society in general. In the Scandinavian countries, research related to metaphors and multilingualism has had different starting points and aims, such as research on *comprehension* (Golden, 2005, 2010; Golden & Larsen, 2005; Prentice, 2010) *conceptualization* (Golden & Lanza, 2013), *reflections and creativity* (Ahlgren, 2014, 2020, 2021), *school books* (Askeland, 2008; Golden, 2005), *teaching* (Strzelecka & Vogel, 2012), *production* (Golden 2012; Nacey, 2013), and *interpretation* (Nacey, 2020).

Studies on *comprehension* have been conducted in upper primary, lower secondary and upper secondary schools in multilingual urban settings in Norway and Sweden with the use of multiple-choice surveys (Golden, 2005; Prentice, 2010). The results from different groups of students and/or different types of metaphors are compared and various aspects are taken into consideration. Golden's (2005) study showed that the context in which the metaphor is embedded is important: whether it relates to the students' (presumed) interests, whether the imageability of the metaphorical expression is high and whether the expression has an equivalent in the student's L1. Prentice (2010) also investigated the *production* of conventionalized expressions and figurative language and found

second language students to use less conventionalized expressions than first language students. Moreover, she found that second language students frequently produce novel (or creative) constructions with regard to both lexicogrammatical constructions and semantics.

Golden and Lanza (2013) have studied how metaphors are used to *conceptualize* abstract concepts such as culture by adult migrants, in relation to agency and identity constructions. Data were collected in a small focus group and the participants came from African countries, and worked as doctors in Norway at the time of the study. Their narratives revealed different views on culture, as a location that constrains (roots that are hard to move) or as an object that gives possibilities (a backpack with practical items).

Ahlgren (2014, 2021) has investigated how adult migrants in Sweden use metaphors to *reflect on* their lived experiences of language learning and language use. The study shows that the participants are frequently using innovative metaphorical expressions to describe affective and existential experiences. These "living metaphors" (cf. Ricœur, 1975), such as *sinking under the water* or *flying with new wings*, provide contradictory perspectives on reality and can be considered as a linguistic creativity that permits expression of voice. In a later longitudinal case study, Ahlgren (2020) applied a critical sociolinguistic framework to investigate linguistic *mudas* (i.e. turning points) in the process of becoming a "new speaker" (Pujolar, 2019) of Swedish. In particular, imaginative metaphors were employed by the focus participant to express emotive and embodied experiences, often in linked chains of metaphors in which language use was seen as a struggle. Systematic metaphors such as SPEAKING SWEDISH IS A SPORT, e.g. a physical and competitive activity, were observed recurrently over the years (2001–2018) in the participant's language trajectory.

The frequent appearance of metaphorical expressions in *school textbooks* was revealed in an investigation of books in social sciences by Golden (2005), in Askeland's (2008) study of school books about the Norwegian language, and in Askeland's (2015, 2017) studies of old and modern textbooks in history and geography. Askeland (2008) found that books in lower secondary school have a rather outdated view of learning and communication. The metaphors that were used reveal a conception of learning as transmittance of objects, as in Reddy's CONDUIT-metaphor, with the specification SUCCESSFUL COMMUNICATION IS SENDING A CLEAR MESSAGE. Askeland's (2015, 2017) more recent research point to ideological discourses about Sami issues. These studies reveal the use of derogatory and condescending metaphors about the Sami people and questioning of their rights as indigenous people in Norway (see also this issue).

The use of metaphors in *second language teaching* in Scandinavian countries (Norway and Sweden) has been investigated by Strzelecka and Vogel (2012).

They define different areas where teachers use knowledge that is compatible with insights from cognitive linguistics (Lakoff & Johnson,1980). One example is that teachers frequently referred to their bodies as well as the students' bodies when explaining new words. This way of teaching is linked to conceptual schemas in cognitive linguistics, and it demonstrates how bodily anchored experiences can help us to structure spatial relations and abstract phenomena.

As for *production* of metaphors, Nacey has explored metaphor in learner language from a variety of perspectives. An in-depth corpus-based comparison of the metaphors employed in argumentative texts written by adult first language speakers of English and those written by Norwegian adult second language English speakers is presented in Nacey (2013). In terms of numbers, Nacey found striking parallels, with both sets of texts proving the ubiquity of metaphor, also in novice English. However, the second language learners produced more metaphors than their first language peers. And while both groups mostly produced highly conventional metaphors (codified in dictionaries), the second language learners employed more novel metaphors. Nacey (2020) has also studied metaphors in learner language from a cross-sectional, pseudo-longitudinal perspective, by examining metaphors produced by Norwegian second language learners of English in grades 5–13 (ages 10–19). She observed a steady proportional increase in production through the grades both in terms of frequency and function of metaphors. She also found that all texts in the highest grades contain metaphor clusters, indicative of a qualitative change that is needed to discuss abstract topics (cf. Magnusson, 2013, who found a significant increase in the use of *grammatical metaphor* between students in secondary and upper secondary school).

Furthermore, a study of the use of the highly frequent verb *ta* [Eng: 'take'] with its metaphorical and basic meaning, was carried out by Golden (2012) with the data from the Norwegian learner corpus ASK (AndreSpråksKorpus: Second language learner corpus). This study revealed that the proportions of "take" in its metaphorical or basic meaning depends on the topic the learners write about. Nacey (2020) also used this corpus to study language learners' *interpretation* of a Norwegian poem that is highly metaphorical in nature (a particular task in the language test). In this study, she discusses the legitimacy of *interpretations* which are at odds with more normative first language interpretations. Moreover, she discusses the notion of creativity in relation to the language learners' use of metaphor and touches on questions of legitimate language use, which also is actualized in several of the contribution to this special issue.

4.   Contributions to the special issue

This issue comprises six contributions within the overall framework of multilingualism and education, dealing with the areas of *translation studies*, multilingual students' *language use*, second language *writing* and *assessment, representation* of an indigenous minority group in educational material, and multilingual peoples' *conceptions* of the phenomenon "language". The contributions take on different theoretical approaches to metaphor: cognitive linguistic approaches, grammatical metaphor theory, as well as discourse-oriented metaphor theory. The relation between conventional language use and linguistic creativity is foregrounded in several of the contributions, and interpreted in relation to second language use and the multilingual setting.

The issue opens with Susan Nacey and Siri Fürst Skogmo's analyses of metaphor in Norwegian *learners' translations* into English in the MUST corpus (Multilingual Student Translation Corpus), combining translation theory and educational perspectives on metaphor. Their findings show that the students (who were second language speakers of English) adopted a variety of translation strategies. Metaphors from the Norwegian-language source text tended to be translated as metaphors, with vivid Norwegian metaphors often rendered through vivid English metaphors in the target texts, and conventional Norwegian metaphors translated into equally conventional English metaphors. Students infrequently translated metaphors into non-metaphorical expressions, and only rarely did they translate non-metaphorical expressions into metaphor. Nacey and Skogmo further expand their analysis of the students' translation strategies by analyzing student group discussion and reflection notes to shed light on the students' rationale for their translation choices. The authors conclude that, contrary to what one might expect, translation of metaphor was perceived as an exciting challenge rather than a problem.

In the next article, Julia Prentice addresses young multilingual adolescents' *use of figurative language* in Swedish from a usage-based perspective by revisiting the data from a previous large-scale study (Prentice, 2010). In this article, figurative expressions are reanalyzed as *constructions*, i.e. instances of recurring patterns (instead of fixed, non-predictable phrases with opaque meaning as in the original study). These constructions are compared to instances in large Swedish corpora, implying that phrases that were analyzed as novel in the original study can be analyzed as instances of regular, more general patterns. The analysis shows that multilingual students' creative use of figurative language and use of conventionalized patterns do not have to be opposites, but can be rather intertwined. This approach allows Prentice to discuss the cognitive challenges involved in using and developing figurative expressions in a new language, as well as the possible educational

gains in teaching these kinds of expressions as constructions, i.e. as predictable and transparent units.

The two following articles deal with metaphor in *adult second language writing*, and both use data collected in language tests by learners at same linguistic proficiency level (B1) according to the Common European Framework of Reference for Languages (CEFR), (Council of Europe, 2001), one from Norway and the other from Sweden. Both articles are, to different extents, framed in migration perspectives. Anne Golden presents a corpus study that aims to examine the relationship between topic and metaphor in the learner corpus ASK (previously mentioned), which is compiled of texts from an authentic language test. The texts studied were written in response to two different prompts, one related to nature and the other to friendship. Close examination of these texts reveals differences in the variety of metaphors applied. Consequently, Golden underscores that different topics give learners unequal chances of writing texts that positively impress teachers and even more importantly, might affect the evaluation by assessors of high stake exams. The awareness of the different possibilities afforded by the choice topic should thus be taken into consideration both when giving assignments and constructing tests. This is also important in vocabulary research when comparing how different groups use figurative language.

Similarly, Katrin Ahlgren and Ulrika Magnusson explore the topic of friendship and metaphor use in second language writing. Friendship is a topic that often involves expressions of emotion and favors the use of novel and creative metaphor. In this article, the occurrence and function of metaphor is explored with respect to the writers' discursive constructions of identity. Metaphors were investigated as systematic metaphors that emerged into three thematic categories: *guidance and help, belonging and inclusion* and *sharing and solidarity*. Ahlgren and Magnusson discuss various aspects of friendship evolving through imagery related to the writers' experiences of being newcomers in Sweden, as well as dimensions of agency that the metaphors reveal.

Both Golden's as well as Ahlgren and Magnusson's articles highlight the importance of emphasizing figurative language in second language instruction. Both articles also discuss figurative language in relation to second language assessment in high-stakes tests, as well as the need for criteria for evaluating creative language use. This context is especially interesting since exams relate both to second language acquisition and to societal issues with their function to open or close doors for people with respect to job opportunities or college admission (e.g. Kahn, 2019).

Norunn Askeland's article investigates metaphors about and by Sami in *Norwegian textbooks*, from 1850 until today. This time frame comprises a period of cultural and linguist assimilation, referred to as Norwegianization (1850–1980).

In addition, she examines metaphors in Sami testimony *literature* that looks back at this era. Askeland uses a discourse-oriented metaphor theory, related to a post-colonial framework. A number of metaphorical themes that contribute to Sami construction of self and culture are identified. These themes reappear in contemporary testimony literature, revealing an emergent need of "writing back" in order to "answer the charge" and speak on behalf of the Sami people who have been discriminated against due to their ethnicity. An important aspect in the analysis is whether the identified metaphors are signalled or not, interpreted as either open to negotiation or taken for granted and self-evident.

Anne Golden and Guri Bordal Steien present an analysis of the *narrated linguistic biographies* of multilingual migrants from the Democratic Republic of Congo who reside in Norway. The authors explore the arguments, narratives and metaphors that emerge when discussing the topic of languages. Particular focus is placed on how the participants use metaphorical expressions when they talk about their linguistic repertoire, and how these metaphors align with different conceptual metaphors that have emerged within the cognitive linguistics paradigm related to language. They find that LANGUAGE AS AN OBJECT, with the specifications LANGUAGE AS A TOOL and LANGUAGE AS POSSESSION occur in the data along with LANGUAGE AS A PERSON, and LANGUAGE AS AIR. These findings of conceptual metaphors are related to the legitimacy of language policy in (a multilingual) society and the authors underscore the need for teachers to gain a deeper understanding of emic aspects of the experience of being multilingual, not only in the actual classroom, but also related to their linguistic trajectories across time and space. Moreover, they also remind us of the multitude of languages that many migrants already have experience with before coming to Scandinavia, not least those from the Global South.

5.   Concluding remarks and future directions

In this special issue we have pulled together articles on metaphor in education related to multilingualism in Sweden and Norway. Yet, because our research findings are also relevant to areas beyond the Scandinavian context, we expect to encourage new debates about the relevance of metaphor in relation to language learning and language use in different domains of educational practice.

Most of the articles touch upon second language speakers' (or writers') encounters with metaphors in the target language – be these speakers multilingual schoolchildren and youth, university students, novice translators or adult migrants. Among the issues raised is the extent to which metaphor allows language learners to construct essential meanings, as well as the extent to which

metaphor can be considered a successful communication strategy. Another perspective on second language speakers' usage of metaphor is concerned with the lexicogrammatical form of the metaphors, and the extent to which it adheres to the target language norm. Yet another topic concerns how creative language may be translated into another, i.e. the linguistic correspondence between creative metaphors in two languages. Finally, the use of metaphors as a tool to reveal conceptualizations, also important in (adult) language classrooms, is actualized. Questions discussed: To what extent are language learners' creative metaphors considered to be a successful communication strategy? Or to put it another way: Who decides what is within a norm? Where are the borders? Consequently, one question that is a pertinent issue for further research is when a particular (new and creative) use of a metaphor stops being considered misuse (cf. Pitzl, 2018) and becomes accepted in the wider community. Recently, there has been a discussion in the domains of applied linguistics and sociolinguistics about alternative models of "speakerhood" (Márquez Reiter & Martín Rojo, 2019) that to a greater extent reflect peoples' multilingual backgrounds (cf. the discussion on monolingual norm in education above). Such a way of considering linguistic creativity could pave the way for more inclusive views on what is to be considered as a "good" and legitimate language. What we actually ask in this issue – among other questions – is to what extent linguistic creativity, which differs from a standard language use, positions the language learners as non-competent or as legitimate speakers of their new language? The contributions provide insights that may inform further research.

Funding

References

Ahlgren, K. (2014). *Narrativa identiteter och levande metaforer i ett andraspråksperspektiv.* (Narrative identities and living metaphors from a second language perspective). (PhD thesis.) Stockholm: Stockholm University.

Ahlgren, K. (2020). "Un voyage sans fin": expressions métaphoriques et *mudes* linguistiques de nouveau locuteurs suédois. *Language et société*, *170*(2), 209–128. https://doi.org/10.3917/ls.170.0109

Ahlgren, K. (2021). Poetic representations of migration narratives: A process of writing nearby. *Journal of sociolinguistics. 00*: 1–20. https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12493

Askeland, N. (2008). Lærebøker og forståing av kommunikasjon: om forståing av begrepet kommunikasjon gjennom metafor og metaforsignal i seks læreverk i norsk for ungdomstrinnet 1997–99. (School books and comprehension of communication: on comprehension of the term communication through metaphor and metaphor signal in six secondary schools 1997–99.) (PhD thesis.) Oslo: University of Oslo.

Askeland, N. (2015). Omtalen av Alta-Kautokeino-konflikten i norske, svenske og samiske lærebøker. (The Alta-Kautokeino conflict in Norwegian, Swedish and Sami textbooks.) *Norsk pedagogisk tidsskrift*, *03-04*, 268–281.

Askeland, N. (2017). Text types and "othering" in Norwegian geography and history textbooks (1860-2006). In B. Aamotsbakken, E. Matthes, & S. Schütze (Eds.), *Heterogeneity and educational media* (pp. 332–341). Bad Heilbrunn: Julius Klinkardt.

Bakhtiari, M. (2005). *Kalla det vad fan du vill.* (Call it whatever you like.) Stockholm: Ordfront.

Berthelin, S. R. (2020). Facilitating metaphorical creativity in multilinguals' Norwegian writing. Paper at the 13th conference for the Association for Researching and Applying Metaphor (RaAM). Høgskolen i Innlandet; Hamar. June 2020.

Cameron, L. (2003). *Metaphor in Educational Discourse.* London: Continuum.

Council of Europe (2001). *Common European framework of reference for languages: learning, teaching, assessment.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fürst, G., & Grin, F. (2018). Multilingualism and creativity: a multivariate approach. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, *39*(4), 341–355. https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2017.1389948

Ganuza, N., & Hedman, C. (2015). Struggles for legitimacy in mother tongue instruction in Sweden. *Language and Education*, *29*(2), 125–139. https://doi.org/10.1080/09500782.2014.978871

García, O. (2009). *Bilingual education in the 21st century: a global perspective.* Malden, MA: Blackwell Pub.

Gogolin, I. (1997). The "monolingual habitus" as the common feature of in teaching in the language of the majority in different countries. *Per Linguam*, *13*(2), 38–49.

Golden, A. (2005). *Å gripe poenget. Forståelse av metaforiske uttrykk fra lærebøker i samfunnskunnskap hos minoritetselever i ungdomsskolen.* (Grasping the point. The understanding of metaphorical expression in social science texts in minority students.) (PhD thesis.) Acta Humaniora, *227*. Oslo: UniPub.

Golden, A. (2010). Grasping the point: A study of 15 years old students' comprehension of metaphorical expressions in schoolbooks. In A. Deignan, L. Cameron, G. Low, & Z. Todd (Eds.), *Researching and Applying Metaphor in the Real World* (pp. 35–62). Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.26.04gol

Golden, A. (2012). Metaphorical expressions in L2 production: The importance of text topic in corpus research. In F. MacArthur, J.-L. Oncins-Martínez, M. Sánchez-García, & A. M. Piquer-Píriz (Eds.), *Metaphor in Use: Context, Culture, and Communication* (pp. 135–148). Amsterdam: John Benjamins.https://doi.org/10.1075/hcp.38.11gol

Golden, A., & Lanza, E. (2013). Metaphors of culture: Identity construction in migrants' narrative discourse. *Intercultural Pragmatics*, *2*, (Special issue: Metaphor and Culture: A Relationship at a Crossroads?), 295–314. https://doi.org/10.1515/ip-2013-0013

Golden, A., & Larsen, V. (2005). Egenvurdering av språkferdigheter og metaforforståelse blant minoritetselever i videregående skole. *NOA*, *31*(1–2).

Graedler, A-L. (2014). Attitudes towards English in Norway: A corpus-based study of attitudinal expressions in newspaper discourse. *Multilingua*, *33*(3–4), 291–312. https://doi.org/10.1515/multi-2014-0014

Hedman, C., & Magnusson, U. (2018). Lika eller lika möjligheter? Diskurser om skolämnet svenska som andraspråk inom det akademiska fältet i Sverige. (Similar or similar opportunities? Discourses on the school subject Swedish as a second language within the academic field in Sweden). *Acta Didactica Norge*, *12*(1), article ID 7. https://doi.org/10.5617/adno.5569

Hedman, C., & Magnusson, U. (2020). Student ambivalence toward second language education in three Swedish upper secondary schools. *Linguistics and Education*, *55*, article ID: 100767. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2019.100767

Kahn, K. (2019). *Becoming a Citizen. Linguistic Trials and Negotiations in the UK.* London: Bloomsbury.

Karrebaek, M., Salö, L., Ganuza, N., & Hedman, C. (2018). Mother tongue instruction in Sweden and Denmark: Language policy, cross-field effects, and linguistic exchange rates. *Language Policy*, *17*(4), 591–610. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10993-018-9472-8

Kenett, Y. N., Gold, R., & Faust, M. (2018). Metaphor Comprehension in Low and High Creative Individuals. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *9*(482). https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00482

Khemiri, Jonas Hassen (2003). *Ett öga rött.* (One eye red.) Stockholm: Norstedt.

Kohl, K., Bolognesi, M., & Werkmann Horvat, A. (2020). The Creative Power of Metaphor. In K. Kohl, R. Dudrah, A. Gosler, S. Graham, M. Maiden, W. Ouyan, & M. Reynolds (Eds.), *Creative Multilingualism: A Manifesto* (pp. 25–29). Cambridge, UK: Open Book Publishers. https://doi.org/10.11647/obp.0206.01

Lakoff, G., & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lindberg, I. (2007). Multilingual education: a Swedish perspective. In M. Carlson, A. Rabo, & F. Gök (Eds.), *Education in 'multicultural' societies – Turkish and Swedish perspectives* (pp. 71–90). Stockholm: Swedish research institute in Istanbul.

Littlemore, J. (2001). The use of metaphor in university lectures and the problem it causes for overseas students. *Teaching in Higher Education*, *6*, 333–349. https://doi.org/10.1080/13562510120061205

Littlemore, J., & Low, G. (2006). *Figurative thinking and foreign language learning.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9780230627567

MacArthur, F. (2010). Metaphorical competence in EFL: Where are we and where should we be going? A view from the language classroom. *AILA Review*, *23*(1), 155–173. https://doi.org/10.1075/aila.23.09mac

Magnusson, U. (2013). Grammatical metaphor in Swedish monolingual and multilingual upper secondary school students' writing. *Functions of Language*, *20*(2), 250–281. https://doi.org/10.1075/fol.20.2.05mag

Malcher, J. (2011). Jeg liker å treffe folk i café. Man må nyter de fine tingene på verden! Preposisjoner og morsmålstransfer – en korpusbasert studie med i og på i fokus. (I like to meet people. You have to see the good things! Prepositions and mother tongue transfer – a corpus studie on *i* and *på*.) (MA-thesis.) Oslo: University of Oslo.

Márquez Reiter, R., & Martín Rojo, L. (2019). Introduction: Language and speakerhood in migratory contexts. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *257*, 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2019-2018

Mouraz, A., Pereira, A. V., & Monteiro, R. (2013). The Use of Metaphors in the Processes of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education International. *Online Journal of Educational Sciences*, *5*(1), 99–110

Nacey, S. (2013). *Metaphors in learner English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. https://doi.org/10.1075/milcc.2

Nacey, S. (2020). Metaphors in high-stakes language exams. In G. B. Steien, & L. A. Kulbrandstad (Eds.), *Språkreiser – festskrift til Anne Golden på 70-årsdagen 14. juli 2020* (pp. 287–308). Oslo: Novus forlag.

Nacey, S., & Jensen, B. U. (2017). Metaphoricity in English L2 learners' prepositions. In F. Ervas, E. Gola, & M.G. Rossy (Eds.), *Metaphors in communication, science and education* (pp.283–304). Berlin: De Gruyter. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110549928-016

Paulsrud, B., Zilliacus, H., & Ekberg, L. (2020). Spaces for multilingual education: language orientations in the national curricula of Sweden and Finland. *International Multilingual Research Journal*, *14*(4), 304–318. https://doi.org/10.1080/19313152.2020.1714158

Pitzl, M. L. (2012). Creativity meets convention: Idiom variation and re-metaphorization in EFL. *Journal of English as a lingua franca*, *1*(1), 27–55. https://doi.org/10.1515/jelf-2012-0003

Pitzl, M. L. (2017). Communicative 'success', creativity and the need for de-mystifying L1 use: Some thoughts on ELF and ELT. *Lingue e Linguaggi*, *24*, 37–46. https://doi.org/10.1285/i22390359v24p37

Pitzl, M. L. (2018). *Creativity in English as a lingua franca. Idiom and metaphor*. Berlin and Boston: De Gruyter Mouton. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781501510083

Prentice, J. (2010). *På rak sak: Om ordförbindelser och konventionaliserade uttryck bland unga språkbrukare i flerspråkiga miljöer*. (Word combinations and conventionalized expressions among adolescent language users in multilingual environments.) (PhD thesis.) Gothenburg: Gothenburg University.

Pujolar, J. (2019). Linguistic mudes: An exploration over the linguistic constitution of subjects. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, *257*, 165–189. https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl-2019-2024

Ricœur, P. (1975). *La métaphore vive*. Paris: Seuil.

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. *Journal of the National Association for Bilingial Education*, *8*(2), 15–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/08855072.1984.10668464

Salö, L. (2016). *Languages and linguistic exchanges in Swedish academia: Practices, processes, and globalizing markets*. (PhD thesis). Stockholm: Stockholm University.

Sfard, A. (2015). Metaphors for learning. In R. Gunstone (Ed.), *Encyclopedia for Science Education* (p. 1–4). Dordrecht: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-2150-0_123

Strzelecka, E., & Vogel, A. (2012). Andraspråksundervisning i ett kognitivt lingvistiskt perspektiv. (Second language teaching from a cognitive linguistic perspective.) *Nordand*, *7*(1), 85–105.

Toth, J. (2018). *English-medium instruction for young learners in Sweden: a longitudinal case study of a primary school class in a bilingual English-Swedish school*. (PhD thesis.) Stockholm: Stockholm University.

Uri, H. (2020). *Hoppe etter ruccola. Om godt språk, dårlig språk, klart språk og språklig bråk*. (On good language, bad language, clear language and language quarrels) Oslo: Kagge Forlag.

Van Lier, L. (2004). *The ecology and semiotics of language learning: a sociocultural perspective* (Vol. 3). Boston: Kluwer Academic. https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-7912-5

Vukotić, V. (2014). Conflicting notions of language in metalinguistic discourses in Lithuania, Norway and Serbia. *Taikomoji kalbotyra*, 5, 1–32.

Wang, H., & Cheng, Y. (2016). Dissecting language creativity: English proficiency, creativity, and creativity motivation as predictors in EFL learners' metaphoric creativity. *Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity and the Arts*, *10*(2), 205–213. https://doi.org/10.1037/aca0000060

Address for correspondence

Ulrika Magnusson
Department of Language Education
Stockholm University
SE-106 91 Stockholm
Sweden
ulrika.magnusson@svenska.gu.se

Co-author information

Katrin Ahlgren
Department of Language Education
Stockholm University

katrin.ahlgren@isd.su.se

Anne Golden
Center of Multilingualism in Society across the Lifespan (MultiLing)
University of Oslo

anne.golden@iln.uio.no