



Constructing Terminology and Defining Concepts for Gender Studies in Norway and Sweden

Ann Werner, Amund Rake Hoffart, Anna Lundberg & Jorunn Økland

To cite this article: Ann Werner, Amund Rake Hoffart, Anna Lundberg & Jorunn Økland (2018) Constructing Terminology and Defining Concepts for Gender Studies in Norway and Sweden, NORA - Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research, 26:2, 142-153, DOI: [10.1080/08038740.2018.1477177](https://doi.org/10.1080/08038740.2018.1477177)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/08038740.2018.1477177>



© 2018 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 19 Jun 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)




Article views: 560



View Crossmark data [↗](#)

Constructing Terminology and Defining Concepts for Gender Studies in Norway and Sweden

Ann Werner^a , Amund Rake Hoffart^b, Anna Lundberg^c and Jorunn Økland^d

^aLinnaeus University, Kalmar, Sweden; ^bÖrebro University, Örebro, Sweden; ^cLinköpings University, Linköping, Sweden; ^dNorwegian Institute at Athens, Athens, Greece

ARTICLE HISTORY Received 28 February 2018; Accepted 11 May 2018

This position paper is written by four key researchers from two projects (one in Norway and one in Sweden) aiming to define and discuss terms and concepts in Gender Studies. It is inspired by the concept of dialogue as a method of academic writing and discusses the methods, results, challenges, and choices made in the two projects. While they both aimed to create and discuss a vocabulary for Gender Studies and gender research, the projects took shape from different approaches, and produced different results. In this position paper, we want to discuss the meaning of doing conceptual work and deciding on definitions of terms. Our aim is not to determine which approach is “better”, but rather to understand how the field of Gender Studies and gender research is being built.

Two parallel projects in Norway and Sweden¹ have recently been discussing the terminology, language, and concepts of Gender Studies and have published definitions of terms and genealogies of concepts and fields. Both projects were initiated by Gender Studies scholars and funded by government bodies: the Language Council of Norway (in Norway) and the National Secretariat for Gender Research (in Sweden). Aiming to critically investigate the meanings and uses of words and concepts related to Gender Studies research and debate, and to provide students, scholars, and the public with accessible definitions and explanations of these words and concepts in the countries’ official languages, the two projects had a lot in common. But the results—an online list of terms, or “term bank” (Norway), and a short book (Sweden)—and the methods employed in the respective projects have been different. This position paper investigates how the different approaches and choices shaped the projects.

We aim to provide an in-depth discussion on how Gender Studies terms and concepts in Norway and Sweden are defined and discussed in ongoing scholarly work, taking the two projects as examples. The similarities and differences in the projects’ approaches are here understood as signifying material, pragmatic, and epistemological varieties existing *within* Gender Studies. Without evaluating which method or result is “better”, we discuss the advantages of and problems with the respective approaches by drawing on our own experiences of the projects. We do this through investigations of our own methods, language, and concepts, along with the disciplinary borders encountered, and the way in which power relations have influenced the work process. First, we describe the two projects. Next,

CONTACT Ann Werner  ann.werner@lnu.se

we describe the approach we have used in writing this paper, creating a dialogue between the two research teams. After these introductory sections, we discuss methods, language, concepts, disciplines, and power in the project work in Norway and Sweden. Finally, we sum up the paper by concluding and listing the main differences.

Descriptions of the two projects

The project *Fagtermer i kjønnsforskning* [Academic terms in Gender Research] was carried out between 2015 and 2017 and resulted in the publication of an online database of academic terms, launched in November 2017. It was sponsored by the Language Council of Norway, and the internet facilities for making and keeping the database publicly accessible are owned and hosted by the Council. In the Language Council's view, a good and adequate official language (or in Norway's case, languages) and appropriate linguistic tools are great assets for the cohesiveness of public discussion in a country, and there are also other online term banks on their website, e.g. for chemistry, astronomy, statistics, linguistics, and more. The Language Council's database was intended as a resource for researchers, teachers, and students, but the online format means that it is also available to the general public. Like other terminological projects funded by the Language Council of Norway, our project was part of an effort to develop, strengthen, and support academic discourse in Norwegian in its relevant field of research. Norwegian should remain an adequate language for academic teaching, learning, and writing gender research in this age of "internationalization", with sufficiently nuanced, comprehensive—and easy-to-use—vocabulary. It should not be necessary to resort to the global language of English in order to express advanced new insights.

A major motivation for launching the project was pedagogical. Norwegian gender researchers tend to write in English, and since there is less of a fixed, Norwegian canon of gender theory, which is a good thing, there is also less agreement about terms and concepts relating to the different theories, which can be confusing for both students and general readers. The same terms can be used in different ways by different scholars and express different meanings. By providing short definitions and comments that are agreed upon by representatives of the main Gender Studies environments in Norway, we hoped that we could provide students with an important tool, and also create some "lowest common denominator" definitions that researchers could agree upon across theoretical and methodological differences. In practice, the group spent most of its time on these fine-tuning discussions. A second motivation was to continue the important, historical process of academicization of the relatively recent academic field of gender research. If Gender Studies were still only a supplement to existing disciplines and institutionally embedded within their departments, we could have just about managed with the terms already in existence and defined within the disciplines in which gender scholars are educated and engaged. But the current stage requires that we take account of and make transparent the fact that sometimes terms are used in a slightly different way in Gender Studies.

One example is the term *performativity*. Originating in Theatre Studies, it has become widely used across the Humanities and Social Sciences, not just Gender Studies. It would be inappropriate for a group of gender researchers to create a definition of the term that aspired to define performativity in general. Our solution was to give a definition of *gender performativity*. Related to this, is the background notion of Gender Studies "growing up" and becoming as much a form of established, academic discourse as the various disciplines

that it started out to criticize. With Gender Studies institutions at universities and associations, dedicated book series, journals, with a National Council for Gender Research, etc., this academic field in Norway now bears the hallmarks of an established field—while, of course, continuing to be critical, like all academic fields. So, it is time to take stock of the field's status, its terminology, and where we are at, epistemologically. A project like this can facilitate critical self-reflection and force any conflicting understandings of the historical processes out in the open. There is a great need for critical self-reflection for an almost-discipline that has tended to see itself in eternal opposition to power.

The small edited volume *En introduktion till genusvetenskapliga begrepp* [An introduction to concepts in Gender Studies] (Lundberg & Werner, 2016) was the fifth book in a series produced by the National Secretariat of Gender Research in Sweden and edited by Anna Lundberg and Ann Werner between 2012 and 2016. The first step in defining Gender Studies concepts, their meaning, history, and contexts, and to publish this work in a small volume was taken in 2014 when the questions “What words and concepts do you think are important in Gender Studies today?” and “Who can write about them?” were posed by the editors to representatives of almost all the Gender Studies environments in Swedish universities, many of whom discussed them with their colleagues. In 2015, these questions were also posed widely on the mailing list that is hosted by the Secretariat (*Genuslistan*), of which anyone can be a member, and to representatives of the Secretariat. The aim was to discuss, challenge, explain, and deconstruct the concepts that are central to Gender Studies in Sweden today. Hundreds of words and concepts were received by the editors, who undertook the task of planning how they should be presented and discussed in a small volume, or online.

As editors, we were initially unsure about how to choose among the words and concepts. Realizing that we would not be able to address them all thoroughly, we considered short definitions (one to five sentences) in order to be able to define as many words as possible. Finding this approach insufficient to describe the complexity of some concepts and their context, or genealogies, we instead clustered the words into 12 areas of interest and connected these areas with a number of possible authors (discussed in the introduction to Lundberg & Werner, 2016), aiming to allow them to write short essays about an area of interest, which would include discussions, definitions, and the situated-ness of the concepts and words central to that area. Because we regarded the defining of central concepts for an area of research like Gender Studies as an important activity, potentially biased and dangerous, we wanted to include multiple voices in the process. After a workshop with the (available) authors in November 2015, a thirteenth area of interest was added. Examples of these areas are: “Sex and gender, femininity, and masculinity”, “Family, work, and care”, and “Intersectionality”.

The authors were selected by the editors from suggestions given through the process described above. We, as editors, strove to represent a variety of universities, age groups, and disciplines, but also to approach authors on the basis of their specialist knowledge in the area of interest. Drafts for the chapters were sent to a reference group of potential readers who, together with the editors and the Secretariat, gave feedback to the authors and helped to improve their chapters before publication. The goal was for the chapters to be accessible to the interested public, not just scholars. An introductory chapter discussing the method employed and the difficulties encountered in the project was written by the editors, based on the process and discussion that took place during the workshop of November 2015. At its outset, the Swedish project was open regarding design and format, and the actors

involved had freedom to model it. The group-based work started out in a similar way to the Norwegian project, with representatives from Swedish Gender Studies communities. However, it expanded from there, taking in voices from the broader field of gender studies and gender research and adding suggestions about what concepts to include, and scholars qualified to write about them. The decision regarding format, that is, to work with concepts in short essays rather than defining terms, came gradually and was finally settled during the workshop. The Swedish concepts were described by individual researchers, leaving room for one single, situated voice to interpret a given area, thus expressing particular theoretical preferences. This is interesting in itself, since the whole project found the meaningfulness of plurality to be crucial. One researcher was thus given the task of articulating a collectively formulated project. It is fair to assume that this way of dealing with plurality influenced the outcomes of the project in a range of ways, and that the issue of representativity, power, and knowledge production is at the heart of these processes.

Dialogue as a form of writing

The form of this paper is inspired by academic dialogic writing, drawing on feminist and post-colonial scholar Nira Yuval-Davis (1999). Writing academic texts in dialogue requires a different approach from regular single-author writing, or co-author writing. Amongst other things, it requires interest in self-reflexivity, improvisation, and the willingness to shift direction when the dialogue partner(s) present(s) new motifs and ideas. Yuval-Davis's notion of transversal dialogue springs from peace-activist work and emphasizes that different perspectives may be incompatible, but that, to create a dialogue, participants can still move between reflecting on their own position and familiarizing themselves with the perspectives of others. This means that equality and care through reflexivity and shifting viewpoint are emphasized over consensus by showing interest in the other party's side without necessarily agreeing with each other. It also requires a deep interest in, or even curiosity about, the perspectives and ideas presented by others.

Yuval-Davis (1999, p. 95) maintains that knowledge is encouraged through dialogue between different contextualized perspectives and positions. The attraction of Yuval-Davis's approach, for academic text production and debate, is that it falls back on neither consensus nor antagonism. Writing in dialogic form may also be enjoyable in that it is somewhat unpredictable. Dialogue requires the participants to be able to latch onto one another's contributions and build on them, partly by association but also anchored in previously acquired knowledge and frames of reference (Lundberg & Farahani, 2017). Dialogic article writing can thus be viewed as a practical manifestation of the foundation of all academic work: knowledge production in dialogue with other voices, other expressions, and previous research. The dialogue that took place during the writing of this article is partially visible in the text itself; still, much of the dialogue took place in the commentary field and email discussions during the writing process and is now invisible to the reader.

Methods

Ann & Anna: In our project, we convened a reference group consisting of representatives from Gender Studies environments in Sweden who helped us to list the words, concepts, and authors. Then we invited the public and the Secretariat to do the same. We strove to

find plurality in terms of the geographical, disciplinary, and personal affiliations of authors (such as age/generation, or ethnicity/race). The authors were invited to discuss the planned volume in a workshop in order to enrich the introductory chapter, as well as to learn from each other, and shape the final product, which we were not sure about until the last six months of the process. How did you discuss plurality, and use the idea, while developing your project?

Amund & Jorunn: The Language Council has developed its own introduction to terminology work, *Termlosen: Kort innføring i begrepsanalyse og terminologiarbeid* [The term pilot: A short introduction to concept analysis and conceptual work] (Suonuuti, 2012). *Termlosen* was a very basic, but useful, point of methodological departure: its definition of a definition is that it is (only) one sentence. All further content should be relegated to the comments field, which should not be too expansive either. This strict format made us think very hard about how to be brief and concise. On the other hand, it did not allow us to go into any nuanced detail regarding how the terms have been used differently within different historical periods, theoretical frameworks, or disciplines. Of course, this background played a role when we were designing the project. Thus, we placed strongest emphasis on the central terms and not on in-depth explanations. The small number of terms and the restrictive format of the term bank perhaps also made it more palatable to critics. An interesting challenge to conducting this kind of project in Gender Studies is that most of the terminological methods available have been developed with other fields of knowledge in mind (i.e. natural and technological sciences). This was the first time that the Language Council had funded a terminology project in a field dominated by perspectives from the humanities and social sciences, so we had to constantly adjust and revise the traditional terminological methods to make them applicable to research that consistently emphasizes and values contextualization and historicization.

As to your question, terminology work has to be a collective endeavour, and not an individual one, otherwise the whole point is undermined. We discussed diversity at each step of the process, because we saw it as important for the validity, representativeness, and reliability of the final result. Firstly, the Language Council actively encouraged all four of the largest academic communities for Gender Studies in the country to be represented in the project group. Once the group had found a *modus operandi*, it worked really well. Secondly, the project group included scholars from a range of disciplines across the humanities and social sciences; specialists in analysing words, language, and concepts, and specialists in criticizing and redefining terms in every new confrontation with their empirical materials. Thirdly, while carrying out our work on the terms, we were guided by criteria of historical, disciplinary, and geographical representativeness in our selection of terms to include in the database. Whether or not we succeeded in creating a fully representative term bank is a different question, for others to answer, but at least our intention was to mirror—or represent—the actual theoretical landscape.

Ann & Anna: We discussed communities, disciplines, the social sciences, and humanities in a very similar way. But we also spent a lot of time in the group of authors discussing age and generation, as well as ethnicity/race—a loaded issue in Swedish Gender Studies—and to some extent gender identity/sexuality, striving to represent not only the canon of Swedish gender research, but also the opposition, the challengers, and newcomers to the field. We are not sure whether we succeeded in our efforts. Our perspective on representativeness was grounded in Donna Haraway's (1991) idea that knowledge is always situated. Therefore,

the knowledge and contributions of all the participants in the Swedish project have been regarded by us as multifaceted; participants' knowledge is shaped by disciplinary identities and affiliations, but also more generally by their experiences and identities that were formed in difference.

Amund & Jorunn: Haraway's term *situated knowledge* is included in our term bank. The epistemological insight that it represents implies the need to hear a multiplicity of voices—from both the centre and the margins. Your ambition to include what is new/marginal to the field is important when trying to write a book that can represent Swedish Gender Studies. Similarly, we tried to strengthen a newcomer when we included the gender-neutral pronoun *hen*—which avoids the distinction between *hun* (she) and *han* (he)—in our list. We thought of it as being potentially relevant to research, but our inclusion of *hen* sparked some controversy because it is rarely thought of as a research term. However, some of the most challenging theoretical discussions about representativeness in our project were related to diachronics and the question of whether theories of the past should still be represented by their respective poster terms. These were the most challenging precisely because there was no one from the past in attendance to represent them.

One example is the term *androgyny*, which is frequently employed in second-wave feminism and still features in analyses of non-binary historical understandings of gender. Another example was the inclusion of the term *suffragette*—which is neither a Norwegian term nor one that reflects current realities. It was still included because the main function of our term bank will be pedagogical, and many scholars are writing on the suffragettes at the moment. Students will meet these terms, which reflect past theoretical concepts or past realities, through their learning process; therefore, they should be in the term bank. In general, if we had had more space and if the format had allowed it, we would have liked to display more of the historical development of the meanings and concepts behind each term. The history of concepts is an important research field in its own right, and one could also have written the history of gender research as a conceptual history. Anyway, we hope that we have included sufficient materials for the students to understand that neither terms nor concepts are static: preferred terms change, as does the content of terms. What we provide in the term bank is just a combination of concepts, meanings, and terms at a frozen point in time, i.e. the same as the project period.

Ann & Anna: We may have had a more contemporary focus when we were choosing our areas for the small volume. But within each chapter there are historical contextualizations and older concepts included as context. In the introductory chapter, we underline that meaning-making is always a product of a particular time and place, that the book should be seen as a work in progress, and that, as editors, we welcome further discussions regarding key concepts, meanings, and genealogy. The fact that a concept such as *decolonization* is not discussed in the book, even though Swedish Gender Studies is heavily affected by the so-called intersectional turn, illustrates the way in which our field of knowledge is shifting quite rapidly. Had the book been published in 2018, two years later, *decolonization* would certainly have been included. Instead of trying to find a common denominator, a key endeavour in the Norwegian approach, we wrote in the introduction that readers might find themselves disagreeing with the descriptions of a concept. As you have discussed above, there is rarely consensus amongst scholars regarding concepts or how to use them. Also, since we defined Gender Studies as a transdisciplinary field (Lykke, 2011), we saw it as necessary to allow for the texts to travel quite freely across disciplinary borders when accounting for concepts and

their genealogies. In this way, the method, and even the epistemological outset, differs in a range of ways from the one used in Norway, where you spent time sorting out the origins of each concept, and making sure that the concepts described were relevant to the field of Gender Studies as a whole, describing them in one sentence. During the workshop in Sweden, mentioned above, the group of scholars discussed whether they could account for anything that the whole field and its agents would agree upon. The group agreed that it is very difficult to identify points of consensus in gender research. Thus, we fully appreciate and understand the many hours and hard work behind your endeavour to localize common denominators in the term bank.

Language

Ann & Anna: In your project, you were funded by the Language Council, and in ours we focused on concepts more than terms; also, we were funded by the Secretariat, which holds a government mission to support Swedish gender research. Neither of the Swedish editors is a language scholar. What did the development of the Norwegian academic language bring to the table in your project? How do these projects contribute to a possible building of national identity?

Amund & Jorunn: Amund is trained in the tradition of analytical philosophy, whose central area is the definition of concepts, and Jorunn has university qualifications in linguistics and philology. This may mean that we approach language as a “thing” and a research object in itself. For us, the question is rather: why develop Norwegian and Swedish academic languages in an age of “internationalization”? Due to the current extreme hegemony of English, languages around the world are becoming extinct at record speed.

Internationalization today largely means that researchers are encouraged to communicate in English, which thus becomes the language of colonization, with the aim of engaging in international discussions. It also involves importing “international” (usually Anglophone or even just English translations of) theory that is not necessarily universally applicable. Of course, Norwegian research should be part of international discussions to a much higher degree, and at different levels. Norwegian models and concepts for describing gender as it is lived in Norway should be part of international gender theory (Toril Moi has done much in this regard; see Moi, 1999). The same applies to empirical studies on how Norwegians do gender. The problem is the extent to which gender theories formed on the basis of such things as US empirical studies or Anglophone philosophy (which lacks grammatical gender) are employed as keys to understanding Norwegian materials, not the employment of such theories *per se*.²

If this dilemma is discernible in Norway, the situation is even more acute for Gender Studies communities having to grapple with far greater linguistic differences than between Norwegian and English in their translation and adaptation of hegemonic Anglophone theory into something that can be uttered in their language in a meaningful way. Many will also lack the institutional facilities that Norwegian Gender Studies possess, for carrying out the two-way conceptual and linguistic translation involved (see e.g. Mehrez, 2007, pp. 110–111). Whether the raw materials under analysis are interviews, laws and other legal documents, schoolbooks, poetry, literature, or liturgies, the linguistic nuances are everything. If one has to work via another language and conceptual system in order to analyse and critically assess these materials (and different languages have very different ways of indicating gender),

so many potentially significant nuances may be lost in translation that it could endanger the research quality of the end result. The final consequence of eliminating Norwegian as an academic language could be that everything that is thought or formulated within this particular context will become inaccessible—a situation that students of extinct languages encounter all the time. Even if one managed to formulate the nuances relatively accurately, for instance in English, it still does not mean that the text would be fully comprehensible. Expectations and understandings of gender vary, and what is entirely sensible and meaningful in one setting is completely incomprehensible or meaningless in another.

Hopefully, *Fagtermer i kjønnsforskning* [Academic terms in gender research] contributes to enabling students and scholars from the small Norwegian language community (one-third the size of the Swedish one) to write, teach, and learn about gender in a linguistic format that contains the concepts and models most adequate to grasp and express the facts on Norwegian ground.

We also had the chance to reflect upon this situation in a more challenging way through our close collaboration—or indeed, entangledness—with a third project similar to the two presented here, namely the production of the *Latvian Glossary of Feminist Terms*—in Latvian.³

Ann & Anna: We thought a lot about how we were shaping Gender Studies in Sweden with our efforts. Given that most projects attempting to define a field, or the concepts of a field, have tended to forget someone, or something, we kept wondering what our small book revealed about Swedish Gender Studies, and about us, the editors. Keeping in mind Chimamanda Ngozi Adichie's warning about the dangers of a single story (Adichie, 2009), and being aware of the exclusionary and biased Westernizing effects of, for example, the way in which the wave metaphor is used to frame *the* history of feminism (Caughie, 2010), we took the issues of power, language, geography, and knowledge seriously.

Terms and concepts

Ann & Anna: What terms, words, and concepts were the most self-evident for you to bring into the project? Which ones did you forget about (if you know)?

Amund & Jorunn: We decided at the beginning to divide the term bank into four conceptual areas, which turned out to be a good idea: Feminism, gender and sexuality, *likestilling*, and *mangfold* (diversity). *Likestilling* is a difficult term to translate into English, but we settled upon *gender equality*. The concept of equality has a long, rich history in philosophy, and more recently in social theory, but within the context of Gender Studies it is used in particular ways and reflects the Norwegian term *likestilling*. Incidentally, this term was not initially used in connection with gender, but in the nineteenth century it denoted the relationship between the two forms of the Norwegian language, which are now, as result of the fight for linguistic *likestilling*, both official languages. Initially, we had *gender* and *sexuality* as separate conceptual areas, but found that they could not be separated.

Ann & Anna: This is interesting, since *jämställdhet*, the Swedish equivalent to *likestilling*, was not discussed at length in the Swedish project—neither in the book nor during the workshop. In Sweden, *jämställdhet* is defined as a political rather than an academic or theoretical concept. Another area initially neglected was economics. After the workshop in November 2015, we realized that the area of finance, economy, and money and all the words and concepts within feminist and gender research connected to this area had been omitted

from our project. As editors, we discussed why this might be, and then included it in the publication. But we are not sure why it was neglected initially, by the editors, the reference group, and also in the suggestions gathered from the Secretariat and the national mailing list.

Disciplines

Ann & Anna: How did you approach the question of interdisciplinarity, or transdisciplinarity (Lykke, 2011)? We found it impossible to include all positions in the fields of gender research and feminist research. Likewise, it was hard to make choices about what to include, what to place first, who should write it, and so on.

Amund & Jorunn: Much of the discussion in the project was about analysing which terms came from which disciplines, and which terms are in use in Gender Studies as a whole and not only among, say, gender historians, sociologists, or psychologists (in which case we would not include them) and which terms are in use today (and not just during the infancy of feminism and Gender Studies). It was time-consuming to sift out a small group of terms—from among all those initially catalogued and listed as occurring in published gender research—that fulfilled all the relevant criteria and thus were the terms that defended their place within the term bank. This means that there are hours and hours of work and discussion behind every little sentence.

Power

Ann & Anna: As discussed above, the way we see it, power comes into play in our project on many levels. The definitions of 13 areas of interest, the selection of authors and reference group participants, the idea that concepts and words can be defined, as well as our own role of setting the agenda for the whole project seemed to us like dilemmas of power. How did you discuss power, the symbolic power of naming and agenda-setting, in your project? What disadvantages and risks did you see?

Amund & Jorunn: The dynamics of Norwegian Gender Studies mean that there is less of an agreed canon. All the main Gender Studies environments have their specialities and have to collaborate closely with their local academic contexts. Furthermore, the regrettable lack of targeted Gender Studies funding in Norway means that there is little in the way of a material basis driving the production of a high-grid canon, although there is surely a low-grid one. To open your mouth and speak is to exercise power; or, expressed in “Foucauldian”, power is everywhere (Foucault, 1990). There is no way that one can organize oneself so that power dynamics are entirely eliminated. As long as there is an open, critical discussion, power is in flux, which is why balance is important.

Our meticulous process of collecting terms, then sifting and discussing definitions, meant that by the time the term bank was published, we had already tried to conceive of and deal with every relevant criticism that we could think of—and our series of launches have so far not brought up anything new. It is interesting that some of the most critical remarks have come from the older generation, who had always seen Gender Studies—and themselves—as being in opposition to established academia. Hence, they were hesitant about a move towards definitions, a form and format of academic power that has been used in the past to define feminist criticism as alien to the academic effort. However, if we want Gender Studies to be part of academia, we also have to be able to give a scientifically transparent

account of our basics: terms, concepts, and theories. And, as we pointed out above, definitions cannot be static anyway since language is always in flux. The advantage of the online term bank mode of publication is that we can actually change or add terms after a further process with the Language Council.

Ann & Anna: Yes, it is a great advantage for your project that changes can be made. We discussed an online term bank as well but ended up with a printed publication, one that cannot be changed later. Also, we did not really face any criticism when we published the book. Critical issues were raised when we first started editing the book series, in 2012, by researchers concerned about Gender Studies forming into a traditional discipline, and researchers concerned about the canon formation of this discipline—for example, the whiteness of it. However, it will be interesting to see how the term bank and the conceptual discussions in our edited volume are kept alive. Will other researchers challenge or change them, will new terms be defined, new conceptual discussions be published? In our project, we really wanted it to continue. But so far it has not.

Conclusions

Obviously, the methods employed to set up these two projects share a range of points of departure. At the same time, they are very different from each other. On the one hand, they share the idea that plurality is a given starting point for conceptual work, and that definitions are valid and useful. Many voices contributed to both projects. On the other hand, these voices influenced the work at different stages, and thus also affected the results in different ways. In the Norwegian project, the database format was set from the beginning by the Norwegian Language Council, and a group of researchers selected from the National Council for Gender Research formed a working group to select terms and make decisions about how to define them. In the Swedish project, the group writing the book was formed in several stages, members being suggested by scholars from different universities, by the editors, and by the involved parties from the National Secretariat for Gender Research. The format and shape of the final book was decided along the way. Also, one project's database format is changeable, while the other project's book is printed and will remain the way it is. However, whether the potential for making changes to the term bank will be realized has yet to be seen.

A crucial similarity lies in the fact that the aims of both projects were educational. Their goal was to make Gender Studies accessible to a broader audience, in the Swedish and Norwegian languages. Yet, the choice of format used to communicate knowledge about the field of Gender Studies was very different. In the Norwegian project, the researchers involved worked hard to extract a lowest common denominator as the definition of a term, expressed in one phrase. The Swedish project design worked in the opposite direction, understanding the concepts that were collected as keywords referring to systems of thought that are important to account for. Thus, the project was based upon meaning production as plurality per se, assuming that Gender Studies, as Judith Butler once claimed, is a field of knowledge without proper objects (Butler, 1994). As educational endeavours, these projects are thus very different in design, outset, and outreach, offering the reader a different set of tools for orientation within the field. Whereas the Norwegian method may give the reader a reliable base to work from, the Swedish design, based on the contextualization of key words, concepts, and meanings, may provide the reader with a cluster of thoughts

and connotations to guide—or confuse—them. The future will show how readers situated outside the field of Gender Studies make use of the two different formats.

Notes

1. *Fagtermer i kjønnsforskning* (<http://termwiki.sprakradet.no/wiki/Kategori:Kj%C3%B8nnsforskning>) and *En skriftserie om genusvetenskap* (<https://www.genus.se/vartmaterial/sorterat-pa-typ/en-skriftserie-om-genusvetenskap/>).
2. In this respect, the collaborative effort of the *Dictionary of Untranslatables*, published in French and English, is a model of how to reflect on translatability/untranslatability in a critically academic way (Butler, David-Ménard, & Deutscher, 2014).
3. Jorunn was responsible for one work package under the umbrella project in question, *Gender, Culture, Power: Diversity and Interactions in Latvia and Norway*.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

This work was supported by the Language Council of Norway and the National Secretariat for Gender Research.

Notes on contributors

Ann Werner is an associate professor of Gender Studies, senior lecturer in Media Studies and head of department, Media and Journalism, Linnaeus University, Sweden. Her research pays interest to the relations between gender, media and music including recent publications; *Streaming Music* (2018, Routledge), and book chapters “Titiyo: Race, gender and genre in Swedish popular music” (2017, *Made in Sweden*, Routledge), “Digitally mediated identity in the cases of two Sámi artists” (2017, *The Oxford handbook of popular music in the Nordic countries*, Oxford University Press). With Anna Lundberg, she has published on Gender Studies in Sweden.

Amund Rake Hoffart is a PhD Candidate in Gender Studies at Örebro University. He holds a master’s degree (M Phil) in Philosophy from the University of Oslo and has previously worked as a researcher and teacher at the Centre for Gender Research, University of Oslo. In his thesis work, he explores feminist conceptualizations of intersectionality as well as the translation of intersectional theory to different fields of practice.

Anna Lundberg is an associate professor in Gender Studies, Linköping University, Sweden. Her field of expertise is intersectional and feminist cultural studies, with special reference to drama and theatre. She has published broadly on feminist and intersectional analysis of culture, including texts on theatre for children and youth. Together with Ann Werner, she has also published a variety of texts on Gender Studies’ position in higher education.

Jorunn Økland is a translator and professor of Gender Studies in the Humanities, Centre for Gender Research, University of Oslo and Director, Norwegian Institute at Athens. The author was also former senior lecturer in Biblical Studies and textual theory, University of Sheffield (until 2008). The author’s recent publications include “Odysseer” in *Agora: Journal for metafysisk spekulasjon*; “Translating Gender” in *Humanities and Social Sciences Latvia* (with Ausma Cimdina).

ORCID

Ann Werner  <http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2540-8497>

References

- Adichie, C. N. (2009, October 16). The danger of a single story. *TED-talk*. Retrieved August 10, 2017, from www.ted.com/talks/chimamanda_adichie_the_danger_of_a_single_story/transcript
- Butler, J. (1994). Against proper objects: Introduction. *Differences: A Journal of Feminist Cultural Studies*, 6(2+3), 1–26.
- Butler, J., David-Ménard, M., & Deutscher, P. (2014). Gender. In B. Cassin (Ed.), *Dictionary of untranslatables: A philosophical lexicon* (pp. 375–380). Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Caughie, P. L. (2010). Theorizing the ‘first wave’ globally. *Feminist Review*, 2010(95), 5–9.
- Foucault, M. (1990). *The history of sexuality, vol. 1: An introduction*. New York, NY: Random House.
- Haraway, D. (1991). *Simians, cyborgs and women: The reinvention of nature*. London: Free Association Books.
- Lundberg, A., & Farahani, F. (2017). I dialog. Intersektionella läsningar av hemhörighet, migration och kunskapsproduktion. [In dialogue. Intersectional readings of belonging, migration and knowledge production]. *Tidskrift för genusvetenskap*, 38(3), 77–101.
- Lundberg, A., & Werner, A. (Eds.). (2016). *En introduktion till genusvetenskapliga begrepp* [An introduction to Gender Studies’ concepts]. Göteborg: Nationella Sekretariatet för genusforskning. Retrieved from https://www.genus.se/wp-content/uploads/En_introduktion_till_genusvetenskapliga_begrepp.pdf
- Lykke, N. (2011). This discipline which is not one: Feminist studies as a post-discipline. In R. Buikema, G. Griffin, & N. Lykke (Eds.), *Theories and methodologies in postgraduate feminist research: Researching differently* (pp. 135–149). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Mehrez, S. (2007). Translating Gender. *Journal of Middle East Women’s Studies*, 3(1), 106–127.
- Moi, T. (1999). *What is a woman? And other essays*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Suonuuti, H. (2012). *Termlosen: Kort innføring i begrepsanalyse og begrepsarbeid* [The term pilot: A short introduction to concept analysis and conceptual work]. Oslo: Språkrådet.
- Yuval-Davis, N. (1999). What is “transversal politics”? *Soundings*, 1999(12), 94–98.