

BACHELOR WERKSTUK ENGELSE TAAL EN CULTUUR

AND THE AWARD FOR 'NOVEL OF THE YEAR' GOES TO...

GENDER BIAS IN LITERARY PRIZES

BY MIRTE CUNNEN

FIRST ASSESSOR: PROF DR O. DEKKERS
SECOND ASSESSOR: DR C.J.J. LOUTTIT

Radboud Universiteit



Abstract

This thesis will discuss gender bias in the field of English literary awards, focusing in particular on the Man Booker Prize, the Pulitzer Prize for Fiction and the National Book Awards between 2000 and 2018. The research question that this thesis will answer is “To what extent do literary prizes portray a gender bias that favours male authors over female authors?” It will be argued that masculinity is preferred over femininity in the working environment and that this is attributed to masculinised characteristics. The same gendered concept can be applied to the artistic field, as the archetype artist is regarded as male due to the ideology of the artist, the structure of social perceptions of the artist, and the structure of the artists career. The masculinisation of the archetype artist causes a gender bias within the literary field, thereby denying female artists the same chance at accumulating symbolic capital. Bourdieu argues that symbolic capital is necessary for acquiring economic capital, which in the context of literary prizes consists of improved book sales and award money when winning a literary award. The results of the study indicate although literary prizes appear to have become more female-friendly, in reality they are less female friendly than at the start of the measuring period in 2000. This is due to a higher number of shortlisted female authors that was not reflected in the numbers of female winners. Therefore, a gender bias appears to be present in the awarding literary prizes, yet not in the nominating of candidates.

Keywords: gender bias, literary awards, Man Booker Prize, Pulitzer Prize, National Book Awards, masculinisation, archetype artist, symbolic capital, economic capital, Bourdieu

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	4
CHAPTER 1: GENDER BIAS IN ORGANISATIONS, ARTISTIC ENVIRONMENT, AND LITERARY PRIZES	8
1.1 MALE ARCHETYPE IN WORKING ENVIRONMENT	8
1.2 THE MALE ARCHETYPE OF AN ARTIST	9
1.3 MILLER’S SOCIAL PERCEPTION AND BOURDIEU’S SYMBOLIC CAPITAL	12
1.4 CONCLUSION	16
CHAPTER 2: THE LITERARY PRIZES, THEIR SYMBOLIC CAPITAL AND METHODOLOGY	18
2.1 THE MAN BOOKER PRIZE	18
2.2 THE PULITZER PRIZE	21
2.3 THE NATIONAL BOOK AWARD	24
2.4 SELECTION CRITERIA FOR PRIZES.....	26
2.5 METHOD	27
CHAPTER 3: RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	29
3.1 RESULTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL PRIZES	29
3.2 RESULTS OF THE LITERARY PRIZES COMBINED.....	34
CONCLUSION	38
BIBLIOGRAPHY	43
APPENDIX I	48

Introduction

This thesis will examine if male authors are favoured over female authors in the English literary prize culture and will regard whether gender bias exists in this aspect of the literary field and if this leads to gender inequality. Within practice, several indications exist that this gender bias is felt to be present, as different measures are taken to counter possible gender bias. For example, the establishment of the Women's Prize for Fiction in 1996. This is an "annual prize for the best full-length novel written in English by a woman of any nationality published in the UK in the past year" and it was founded in reaction to the all-male Booker Prize shortlist of 1991.¹ By taking the male aspect out of the equation and only accepting female authors, the prize solves the issue of a possible gender bias. Another indication of the possible presence of gender bias in the literary prize culture is the establishment of the Prix Feminina, a prestigious French literary award, in which not the contestants but the judges are all female. This prize contest was founded in response to literary prize the Prix Goncourt, which has an all-male jury. An indication that appointment of an all-female jury was effective in countering possible gender bias is apparent through the fact that the Prix Feminina has a more gender balanced distribution of winners.² The creation of these supposedly counter-prizes raises the question if gender bias is present within the literary prize culture.

Previous research regarding gender equality within the artistic world has found evidence of structural gender bias towards female artists, implying that the artist-archetype is male.³ The reason that the archetype artist is regarded as male is due to ideology of the artist, the structure of an artist's career and the structure of the social perception of an artist. Other research conducted by Ekelund and Börjesson on gender bias, highlights the importance of gender in

¹ Britta Zangen, "Women as Readers, Writers, and Judges The Controversy about the Orange Prize for Fiction." *Women's Studies* 23, no. 3 (2003): 281-282.

² Diana Holmes, "Literary Prizes, Women, and the Middlebrow." *Contemporary French Civilization* 41, no. 3-4 (2016): 441.

³ Diana L. Miller, "Gender and the Artist Archetype: Understanding Gender Inequality in Artistic Careers." *Sociology Compass* 10, no. 2 (2016): 119.

relation to an artist's literary career. They found that there is a discrepancy between the career length of a female author and that of a male author.⁴ Most research that has been done on gender inequality in the literary field, however, has taken place outside of the academic sector and has mainly developed itself in newspaper articles. The Guardian, for example, published an article specifically claiming that there is a "gender bias within the literary industry."⁵ And this is not the only non-academic source that claims an unequal position for women in this field. The United States based company VIDA: Women in Literary Arts is a "feminist literary organisation"⁶ that carries out annual counts highlighting gender imbalances. Moreover, they publish interviews, book reviews and essays and organise events to raise awareness to gender inequality. One of the few academic researches carried out on this topic is that of Harvey and Lamond of the Australian National University. Using a comparative quantitative survey, they researched the "gender disparity in Australian book reviewing that has been identified by the Stella Count over the past four years."⁷ They argued that "the pie charts produced by feminist literary organisations Stella and VIDA [...] underestimate the implications of the gender bias they identify."⁸ Although their research does not limit itself to the literary prize culture, it is an adequate example of gender bias being present as a result of the symbolic masculinisation of aesthetic evaluation. Another research conducted by Tuchman and Fortin found empirical evidence of a pay gap between men and women and found that recognition based on gender was present within the literary field.⁹ This strongly implies the presence of a gender bias towards female authors.

⁴ Bo G. Ekelund and Mikael Börjesson, "The Shape of the Literary Career: An Analysis of Publishing Trajectories." *Poetics* 30 (2002): 362.

⁵ Lisa Dempster, "If You Doubted There Was Gender Bias in Literature, This Study Proves You Wrong." *The Guardian*, June 10, 2016.

⁶ Melinda Harvey and Julieanne Lamond, "Taking the Measure of Gender Disparity in Australian Book Reviewing as a Field." *Australian Humanities Review* 60 (2016): 89.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 84.

⁸ *Ibid.*, 85.

⁹ Gaye Tuchman and Nina E. Fortin, "Fame and Misfortune: Edging Women Out of the Great Literary Tradition." *American Journal of Sociology* 90, no. 1 (1984): 86.

Even though gender bias within the artistic world has been a much-researched topic within the journalistic world, and despite the multiple newspaper reports of gender bias being present within the literary prize culture, little to no academic research has been carried out regarding the specific topic of gender bias in the field of literary prizes. This thesis, therefore, will focus on gender bias within the English literary prize culture to see if such bias exists. It will do so by researching the question “*To what extent do literary prizes portray a gender bias that favours male authors over female authors?*”. It is hypothesized that the gendered structure of the social perception of the artist, more specifically the symbolic masculinisation of the aesthetic evaluation, implies a gender bias that favours male authors over female authors. Three prestigious English literary prize contests will be analysed over a period of 19 years to establish if gender bias is indeed present within the English literary prize culture.

Knowledge in regard to whether English literary prizes tend to be more or less female friendly can create awareness of implicit gender bias within the literary industry. Its importance is highlighted when taken into account that gender bias present in literary prizes can, in turn, create gender inequality within the literary field. Literary prizes bestow prestige and recognition, also known as Bourdieu’s symbolic capital, on authors which can help further develop their careers.¹⁰ This symbolic capital can then be exchanged for economic capital by way of book sales and award money. If gender bias presents itself within the English literary prize culture, it signals that female authors have a disadvantage in accumulating the necessary symbolic capital to be successful as an author and this bias can thus potentially create gender inequality within the literary field. Moreover, knowledge about possible gender bias within the English literary prize culture not only creates awareness but it also provides a basis for discussion and debate on how to circumvent such practices and subsequently forms the foundation for a more gender balanced literary prize culture.

¹⁰ Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993): 75.

To achieve this research's purpose, the method is set up as follows. This thesis will look at the shortlists from the period 2000-2018 of the Man Booker Prize, the Pulitzer Prize and the National Book Awards. From these shortlists, information will be gathered on the number of female nominees, winners and judges of these prizes. This data will be converted into percentages and distributed over the 19 years. To give a more coherent account of the percentages, the period will be divided into 3 periods of 5 years and 1 period of 4 years, i.e. 2000-2004, 2005-2009, 2010-2014 and 2015-2018. The overall results will be displayed in three tables which will be added to the chapter.

The thesis is divided into three main chapters. Chapter 1 will elaborate on the literature regarding gender bias in organisations and the male archetype of the artist. Furthermore, the link between the male archetype, and more specifically the structure of the social perception of the artist, and literary prizes will be made clear in this chapter. In addition, the chapter will adopt a Bourdieusian perspective on the importance of literary prizes in forming a basis for accumulating symbolic capital and how gender bias constitutes a form of symbolic violence. Chapter 2 will discuss the literary prizes that will be examined, namely the Man Booker Prize, the Pulitzer Prize and the National Book Awards and will also discuss the methods applied to examine if gender bias is present in the nomination and awarding of these literary prizes. Chapter 3 will discuss the results of the application of these methods. The last chapter will consist of a conclusion based on the above and will answer the research question if there is a gender bias in the English literary prize culture and if they tend to favour male authors over female authors.

Chapter 1: Gender Bias in Organisations, Artistic Environment, and Literary Prizes

Since the beginning of time men have been associated with the proverbial ‘bringing home the bacon’, while women have been associated with taking care of the domestic sphere. Translated into modern-day equivalents, this would mean that men earn the money and women take care of the household. This phenomenon is still rooted in our society today and presents itself in the patriarchal working environment, including the artistic one. Consequently, it influences the social perception of women thereby denying them the same social capital as their male counterparts. This chapter will look at the male archetype in the working environment, the male archetype of the artist, social perception and Bourdieu’s symbolic capital. A preliminary conclusion will conclude this chapter.

1.1 Male Archetype in Working Environment

Looking at a typical working environment seems to suggest that masculinity is preferred over femininity. An esteemed employee would generally be described as hardworking, dedicated, confident and not afraid to take risks. All of these characteristics are commonly denoted to men rather than to women.¹¹ As a result, men are generally regarded as more efficient employees because they have to take less time off. Acker argues that the preference of masculinity over femininity in the business environment stems from the ideology that a job already implicates a gendered concept and that hierarchies in organisations are divided into ranks of commitment.¹²

A woman who has to take care of a family is automatically regarded as less committed to her

¹¹ Rosabeth Moss Kanter, “Women and the Structure of Organizations: Explorations and Theory and Behavior,” in *Another Voice: Feminist Perspectives on Social Life and Social Science*, eds. Marcia Millman and Rosabeth Moss Kanter (New York: Anchor Press, 1975): 15.

¹² Joan Acker, “Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations.” *Gender and Society* 4, no. 2 (1990): 149.

work and therefore constrained to a lower hierarchical function within an organisation. The same social expectations are not held for men because the archetype for an efficient employee is masculinised and men are therefore automatically modelled to fit this standard.

1.2 The Male Archetype of an Artist

Even though artists do not work in the same bureaucratic organisations mentioned by Acker, the same concept can be applied to the artistic environment because, in the literary and cultural field, the generally theorised ideal-typical artist is also modelled after a masculine archetype. Miller theorises that this masculinised archetype has arisen out of a threefold of ways, namely the ideology of the artist, the structure of an artist's career and the social perception of the artist.¹³ Miller further argues that the ideology of the artist is gendered because of the "collective understandings of creative genius centre a masculine subject."¹⁴ What she means by this is that the ideology surrounding the concept of an artist is gendered due to certain symbolic traits being ascribed to the artist as a creative genius. For example, when thinking of famous, historic geniuses more often than not a man comes to mind, i.e. Einstein, Da Vinci, Newton, etc. A quick internet search for 'greatest geniuses' primarily yields male names, confirming Miller's statement. More specifically, the social behaviours that are associated with a genius are total commitment, reclusion, eccentricity and as a result anti-social behaviour. These traits are in itself gendered as they are more easily accepted when exhibited by a male rather than by a female.¹⁵ The creative potential that transcends the mundane is also more likely to be attributed

¹³ Diana L. Miller, "Gender and the Artist Archetype: Understanding Gender Inequality in Artistic Careers." *Sociology Compass* 10, no. 2 (2016): 120.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁵ Cecilia L. Ridgeway, *Framed by Gender: How Gender Inequality Persists in the Modern World*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011): 61.

to male artists rather than female artists.¹⁶ Hence, the concept of a ‘genius’ already entails a male rather than a female connotation.

A second observation that Miller makes is that the structure of an artist’s career is gendered because the “need for artists to do entrepreneurial labor privileges practices that are more socially acceptable in men than women, such as self-promotion and risk-taking.”¹⁷ An artist's recognition and success often depend on these entrepreneurial activities of self-promotion and risk-taking, thus denying female artists equal opportunities.¹⁸ Moreover, when promoting their work, artists are expected to be passionate about it and to prioritise their art above anything else. There is no room for anything but the product that they have created, implying that a family is an inconvenience. As a result, the structure of an artist’s career conflicts with the structure of a domestic life wherein children and domestic responsibilities are prioritised.¹⁹ Furthermore, artistic careers consist of irregular schedules and working long and at unreliable hours.²⁰ Writing a book or creating a painting is often subject to bursts of inspiration and requires the artist to be able to work at times when inspiration hits. Making a movie and filming on location can mean being away from home for months. In addition to this, promoting the final product often includes travelling around the world to appear at premiers of films or openings of art galleries. If the product is successful, an additional round of collecting awards can be added to this timeframe. All things considered, the life of an artist could be regarded as time-consuming and not compatible with domestic life. Spending this much time away from home is more acceptable for a man than a woman, thus creating a gender bias in the

¹⁶ Rozsika Parker and Griselda Pollock, *Old Mistresses: Woman, Art and Ideology*. (Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981): 6.

¹⁷ Diana L. Miller, “Gender and the Artist Archetype: Understanding Gender Inequality in Artistic Careers.” *Sociology Compass* 10, no. 2 (2016): 120.

¹⁸ Allyson Stokes, Tina Fetner, Melanie Heath, and Neil McLaughlin. *Fashioning Gender: A Case Study of the Fashion Industry*. (McMaster University, 2013): 88.

¹⁹ Diana L. Miller, “Gender and the Artist Archetype: Understanding Gender Inequality in Artistic Careers.” *Sociology Compass* 10, no. 2 (2016): 122.

²⁰ Allyson Stokes, Tina Fetner, Melanie Heath and Neil McLaughlin. *Fashioning Gender: A Case Study of the Fashion Industry*. (McMaster University, 2013): 91.

artistic field and favouring masculinity over femininity. Furthermore, this gender bias leads to different experiences for female artists than male artists when interacting with individuals such as editors and publishers, because female artists feel taken less seriously.²¹ As a result, female artists often lack the self-confidence in their abilities which is key for their ability to perform entrepreneurial labour.

The third argument put forth by Miller is that the social structure of the perception of an artist is gendered because “collective evaluations of aesthetic quality systematically favor men over women.”²² An evaluative bias exists towards female artists as they are generally viewed as less competent than men and as such do not receive the same recognition as their male counterparts.²³ This is in part because aesthetic evaluation is inherently subjective in nature and thus contains some ambiguity. In these instances of ambiguity, individuals tend to fall back on automatic, cognitive processes that are rapid and intuitive but also engender stereotyping, among which gender can play a role in the evaluation.²⁴ Moreover, this gender bias leans towards more favourable evaluations of the work done by male artists compared to that of female artists. This gender bias has been recognised and female authors have tried to circumvent it by using a male or gender-neutral name.²⁵ An example of such an artist is J.K. Rowling, who was told by her publisher not to use her full name but rather her initials to increase book sales. Furthermore, the evaluation of female artists’ work will often include the evaluation of the physical appearance and sexuality of those women. In addition to having to be a good artist in the first place, female artists’ appearances are taken into considerations as they will be perceived “through the lens of sexuality” and opinions about them will be filtered “through the

²¹ Diana L. Miller, “Gender and the Artist Archetype: Understanding Gender Inequality in Artistic Careers.” *Sociology Compass* 10, no. 2 (2016): 119.

²² *Ibid.*, 122.

²³ Cecilia L. Ridgeway, *Framed by Gender: How Gender Inequality Persists in the Modern World*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011): 78.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 63.

²⁵ Diana L. Miller, “Gender and the Artist Archetype: Understanding Gender Inequality in Artistic Careers.” *Sociology Compass* 10, no. 2 (2016) 124.

general social expectations that women should always be physically attractive and sexually available.”²⁶ Unlike women, men do not face the same kind of social perception when their work is evaluated. For male artists, it is socially acceptable to display anti-social behaviour, such as moodiness or rudeness and to still be positively perceived by the public. A male artist's sexuality is considered irrelevant regarding his art. Miller, therefore, concludes that the "social structuring of perception and evaluation disadvantages women."²⁷ The result of being disadvantaged has a large impact as it means receiving less prestige and recognition, which is necessary to succeed in an artistic career.

1.3 Miller's Social Perception and Bourdieu's Symbolic Capital

Recognition and prestige in the artistic field are of great importance for an artist's career. The recognition of the artist's work and the awarded prestige will determine whether or not the artist can make a living and if he/she can continue working in this field. Social perception, however, is structured by gender, as argued by Miller, and women are taken less seriously than men in the artistic field and therefore have to work harder for equal recognition.²⁸ She states that women are consistently regarded as less competent than their male colleagues and that their success is attributed to “their physical attractiveness rather than their talent.”²⁹ Within the literary field one would expect this symbolic masculinisation to be less apparent as literature has been associated with femininity. More women than men read, and there are many canonical female authors. Yet, the disparity in recognition and pay between female and male authors is still found, implying that the male archetype of an artist significantly impacts how female artists

²⁶ Ibid., 122.

²⁷ Ibid., 125.

²⁸ Ibid.

²⁹ Ibid.

are perceived.³⁰ One manifestation in which this might be visible is that of the literary prize culture.

A prominent figure in the debate on cultural and social theory is left-oriented French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu. His work has been translated into many different languages and he is considered one of the greatest sociologists of the 20th century. Bourdieu viewed the social world as a space that is separated into multiple varieties (fields) of practice that each contain their ideas, rules, and standards. Examples of such fields are art, religion, politics, education, etc. According to Bourdieu, these “social fields are places where people struggle for position.”³¹ What he means by this is that people within these social ‘arenas’ use their social capital to gain a better hierarchical position and thus gain more power. In the art world, this can be seen in the fierce competition between artists and the desire to always be better and more original than the other artists. A result of this competition is the rise of artistic prize contests, such as the Man Booker Prize, the Pulitzer Prize, the National Book Award and many other literary prize contests.

These competitions also lead to an increase in corporate sponsorship, as many awards are funded by big companies. The Man Booker Prize, for example, is funded by the Man Group and the Costa Book Awards are funded by Costa Coffee, a company that also sells coffee. Bourdieu critiques corporate sponsorship and argues that it compromises artistic and intellectual autonomy.³² In *The Rules of Art*, he states that “the literary field is structured round two opposing poles, one geared to the market, the other “restricted” pole, primarily to “artistic concerns.”³³ There is significant tension between these poles and Bourdieu argues that this

³⁰ Gaye Tuchman and Nina E. Fortin, “Fame and Misfortune: Edging Women Out of the Great Literary Tradition.” *American Journal of Sociology* 90, no. 1 (1984): 86.

³¹ Pierre Bourdieu. *Social Theory Rewired*. Routledge Publishers. N.d. Accessed 8 August, 2019.

³² Bourdieu, P., and H. Haacke. *Free Exchange*. (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995): 20.

³³ Sharon Norris, “The Booker Prize: A Bourdieusian Perspective.” *Journal for Cultural Research* 10.2 (2006): 140.

tension is what enables us to separate literature from non-literature.³⁴ This distinction is fading, however, because art is “severely threatened by the increasingly greater interpretation between the world of art and the world of money.”³⁵ The autonomy of literary prizes is threatened by corporate sponsorship, as many forms of sponsorship have become part of the prizes itself.

Bourdieu studied philosophy in Paris and was taught by Louis Althusser, who was influenced by Karl Marx’s ideas and transferred many of these ideas to Bourdieu.³⁶ Two key concepts of Bourdieu’s sociologist theory where Marxist influences can be detected are cultural and social capital. Bourdieu’s cultural capital “refers to the collection of symbolic elements such as skills, tastes, posture, clothing, mannerism, material belongings, credentials, etc.”³⁷ Certain aspects of this kind of capital can be applied to literary prizes. For instance, selecting the nominees and winner is a matter of taste, as the judges of these awards will pick novels that are to their liking. The winning novel will also affect the taste of many of its readers by appearing high on many best-sellers’ lists, as people will more likely buy a book with good reviews. Bourdieu argues that cultural capital can be divided into three different forms: embodied, objectified and institutionalised.³⁸ Literary awards can be classified under the last category, institutionalised, as this form “refers to credentials and qualifications such as degrees or titles that symbolize cultural competence and authority.”³⁹ Winning a prestigious literary award grants the winner a title that increases his/her cultural authority.

The second capital of Bourdieu’s theories is symbolic capital, that according to him is to be understood as “economic or political capital that is disavowed misrecognised and thereby, hence legitimate, a ‘credit’ which, under certain conditions, and always in the long run,

³⁴ Pierre Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art: The Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996): 340.

³⁵ Ibid., 344.

³⁶ Elliot B. Weininger, “Pierre Bourdieu on Social Class and Symbolic Violence.” *Alternative Foundations of Class Analysis* (2002): 120.

³⁷ Pierre Bourdieu. *Social Theory Rewired*. Routledge Publishers. N.d. Accessed 8 August, 2019.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid.

guarantees ‘economic’ profits.”⁴⁰ Although Bourdieu does not specifically write about literary prizes, he has claimed that his theories on cultural theory could be applied to other disciplines concerning the debate on culture. One of these disciplines is the literary prize culture, as literary prizes are a form of social perception in the way that they review artists’ work based on “an individual’s reputation, honor or prestige within a social space.”⁴¹ Within the literary prize culture, Bourdieu’s ‘economic profits’ consist of improved book sales when winning an award and the prize money. Goff states that winners of prestigious literary awards such as the Man Booker Prize can expect an increase in sales of hard copies as well as paperbacks, resulting in a boost in income.⁴² One of the aspects of symbolic capital that Bourdieu mentions is the “capital of consecration” which consists of the recognition of the artist’s work and name.⁴³ When winning a major literary prize like the Man Booker Prize or Pulitzer Prize, an author is guaranteed economic profit, name recognition, and prestige. Literary prizes, however, involve aesthetic evaluations. Since the structure of social perception of the artist adheres to the ideal-typical archetype of the masculinized artist, aesthetic evaluations and the resulting symbolic capital will favour male authors over female artists. Miller argues that “if this currency is more readily available to men than women, then artistic careers are systematically structured by gender, and the ideal-typical artist who regularly and accumulates and uses this currency is symbolically masculinized.”⁴⁴ Consequently, literary prizes and the symbolic capital that can be accrued by winning them are most likely withheld from female artists that lack the same opportunities as male artists. Therefore, gender inequality might be created within the literary prize culture. This gender inequality as viewed from the perspective of the seminal work of

⁴⁰ Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993): 75.

⁴¹ Diana L. Miller, “Symbolic Capital and Gender: Evidence from Two Cultural Fields.” *Cultural Sociology* 8, no. 4 (2014): 462.

⁴² Martyn Goff, “Literary Prizes: Big Money and Glamour for Some.” *Logos* 2, no. 3 (1991): 152.

⁴³ Pierre Bourdieu, *The Field of Cultural Production* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993): 75.

⁴⁴ Diana L. Miller, “Gender and the Artist Archetype: Understanding Gender Inequality in Artistic Careers.” *Sociology Compass* 10, no. 2 (2016): 126.

Bourdieu can be characterised as symbolic violence, i.e. the unconscious imposition of certain norms over other norms by the dominant social group.⁴⁵ In the specific case of the literary field, the male archetype of the artist is the norm that is imposed on female authors. Within the literary prize culture, its effect results in an unbalanced representation of gender in the list of nominees and consequently winners. Three prestigious English literary prizes will be examined over a period of 19 years to further examine whether this is the case.

1.4 Conclusion

Generally, men have been perceived as more favourably compared to women in the working environment. This is largely due to the domestic responsibilities associated with women and the social acceptance of total commitment when exhibited by men compared to non-acceptance when exhibited by women. Within the artistic field, the same gender bias exists as the archetype of an artist is predominantly viewed as male. The three elements that lead to this masculinisation of the artist are the gendered ideology of the artist, the social perception of the artist, and the structure of the artist's career. These aspects involve certain behaviour and associations that are more easily accepted and attributed to male artists than female artists. The structure of the social perception of the artist favours men and manifests in the gender bias present within the aesthetic evaluation of the work of an artist. This gender bias, therefore, has implications for the nomination and awarding of literary prizes as they too require aesthetic evaluation; "what appears to be audience preference or innocuous differences in taste can be the subtle, systematic favoring of men artists and creative workers".⁴⁶ Therefore, there appears to be an imbalance in the literary prize culture, which can be characterised as symbolic violence towards female authors. This can create gender inequality in the literary field as some benefits tend to be

⁴⁵ Pierre Bourdieu, and Richard Nice. *Masculine Domination*. (Cambridge: Polity, 2001.): 1-2.

⁴⁶ Diana L. Miller, "Gender and the Artist Archetype: Understanding Gender Inequality in Artistic Careers." *Sociology Compass* 10, no. 2 (2016): 120.

attributed to being awarded and even nominated for a literary prize as this can lead to critical acclaim, both for other works of the author or the work in question. This critical acclaim is of great importance for authors as it enables them to accumulate symbolic capital that can be capitalised to gain economic capital and further develop their careers. By misrepresenting women in the literary prize culture, gender bias is created that becomes part of the cultural capital and, eventually, part of the cultural identity of literary prizes.

Chapter 2: The Literary Prizes, their Symbolic Capital and Methodology

Literary awards play a significant role in the careers of English novelists. Winning one of these awards creates opportunities to expand authors' symbolic capital and so advance their careers. The Man Booker Prize, the Pulitzer Prize and the National Book Awards are examples of such literary awards that will significantly improve authors' careers. These awards, however, appear to be gender biased. This chapter will discuss the origins and history of the three literary prizes and how winning them contributes to authors' symbolic capital. Additionally, the judges of each prize will be discussed, as well as the selection procedures of the longlists and shortlists. Furthermore, an explanation will be provided for the choice of literary awards. The chapter will conclude with a description of the method used for researching possible gender bias.

2.1 The Man Booker Prize

During the 1960s, the awareness of book prizes in Britain had declined significantly because of the two world wars and the British population was unconcerned with the existence of literary awards. Maschler was unsatisfied with this and "set out to correct it."⁴⁷ He began searching for sponsors to fund a literary award and found them in the Booker Brothers. With their help, he founded what was later to become one of the most prestigious literary awards in the world; the Man Booker Prize for Fiction. The sponsors alone, however, did not solve the problem of the (un)awareness of literary prizes and the award he tried to establish "achieved such sparse notice and had such little effect on sales that some publishers became reluctant to pay the small fee required to nominate a book."⁴⁸ The Booker Prize had to change its course of action and adopt a different measure to try and turn things around. It did so by employing the help of journalism

⁴⁷ James F. English, "The Literary Prize Phenomenon in Context." In *A Companion to the British and Irish Novel 1945-2000*, 166.

⁴⁸ Ibid.

and by using scandal to their advantage to generate publicity. At one point, the Booker even appointed John Berger, who publicly opposed the prize, as a judge and his acceptance speech of 1972 “reaped an enormous amount of publicity”⁴⁹ that significantly increased interest in the Booker. Even though awareness of the prize had increased, its reputation had decreased to the point that “the only form of success available to a British book prize was *success de scandal*.”⁵⁰

The scandal of the old days notwithstanding, people today are more than happy to enter the contest because winning the Man Booker Prize is accompanied by a large sum of money, fifty thousand pounds (£50,000), plus an additional two thousand five hundred (£2,500) for each of the authors on the shortlist.⁵¹ Moreover, it means immediate name recognition and increased book sales. Many prize winners “saw hardcover sales rise immediately through the roof in the days and weeks after the award ceremony.”⁵² This pattern first established itself from the early 1980s onwards, and is still seen today.⁵³ An example of this is the 2018’s Booker Prize winner Anne Burns, who with her novel *Milkman* saw sales grow by “more than 1,000%” and saw the novel selling out in bookstores and rising to the top of the charts.⁵⁴ This success, however, is not limited to the winners alone. Shortlisted authors of the Booker Prize can also count on a considerable increase in their book sales. In 1990, two of the shortlisted authors “did better than any shortlisted title.”⁵⁵ Having your name appear on the shortlist creates name recognition that in turn leads to better profits. In addition to this, winning the prize also creates “opportunities for the literary capital of a prize to produce profits on other, adjacent fields.”⁵⁶ A good example

⁴⁹ Ibid., 169.

⁵⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹ The Man Booker Prize, www.thebookerprizes.com

⁵² James F. English, “The Literary Prize Phenomenon in Context.” In *A Companion to the British and Irish Novel 1945-2000*, 173.

⁵³ Richard Todd, *Consuming Fictions: The Booker Prize and Fiction in Britain Today*. (London: Bloomsbury, 1996): 103.

⁵⁴ Jake Williamson, “Milkman Sales Soar After Man Booker Prize Win.” *BBC News on the Web*, June 15, 2019.

⁵⁵ Richard Todd, *Consuming Fictions: The Booker Prize and Fiction in Britain Today*. (London: Bloomsbury, 1996): 108.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

of this are the language rights and TV or film rights for adaptations of the novel, that increase the winner's income even further.⁵⁷ Hence, the winner of the Man Booker Prize gains significant symbolic capital.

The Man Booker Prize has a jury who decides what ends up on the longlist, shortlist and who eventually chooses the winner. The judges are chosen from authors, literary critics, academics and other significant public figures, such as politicians or actors, and are appointed by the Booker Prize Foundation Advisory Committee.⁵⁸ Membership of the jury only lasts one year, and members are rarely chosen a second time. The jury has the difficult task of selecting novels for the longlist. This list is comprised of usually 12/13 contenders and is published in July. Publishing houses submit novels for the jury to choose from, meaning that the jury has no real influence on what appears on the longlist. From this longlist, 6 novels will be chosen for the shortlist, that is announced in September. The winner of the Man Booker Prize is awarded the prize during a grand ceremony in London in early October.

The funding for the Man Booker Prize had changed over time but has always been a corporate sponsorship. It was originally funded by the company Booker, McConnell Ltd in 1969, traces of this sponsor can still be found in the name of the award. After this, Man Group, a billion-dollar hedge fund company that recently ended its 18-year sponsorship of the literary award took over as sponsor of the award.⁵⁹ This company left its traces too, as part of the name is still found in the award itself. As of June 2019, "Silicon Valley billionaire, philanthropist and author Michael Moritz" will be the new sponsor of the Man Booker Prize.⁶⁰ Unlike the previous sponsors, he will not give his name to the reward, but rather change it back to the Booker,

⁵⁷ Martyn Goff, "Literary Prizes: Big Money and Glamour for Some." *Logos* 2, no. 3 (1991): 152.

⁵⁸ The Man Booker Prize, www.thebookerprizes.com

⁵⁹ Alison Flood, "Booker Prize: Silicon Valley Billionaire Takes Over as New Sponsor." *The Guardian on the Web*, August 9, 2019.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

thereby reversing the Man Group's stamp on the prize and ending the corporate sponsorship of the award.

2.2 The Pulitzer Prize

Joseph Pulitzer was a Hungarian born journalist who had come to America to make his fortune. He began his career as a reporter for the German daily *Westliche Post* in St. Louis in 1868.⁶¹ Proving himself an astute businessman, Pulitzer soon took over the newspaper as publisher and turned the, by then rebranded *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, into a profitable organisation. Not satisfied with only running a paper, he also became a lawyer and was elected to the Missouri legislature.⁶² It did not take Pulitzer long, however, to seek a new challenge. In 1883, he moved to New York and purchased the *New York World*. He turned this newspaper into a success too and his new-gained popularity as successful businessman got him elected to Congress in 1885.⁶³ Pulitzer continued to buy more newspapers and developed the idea of "large-scale advertising" that he sold to other newspapers in the city.⁶⁴ His fanatic approach to selling more newspapers and his casual attitude towards serious journalism at that time earned him the epithet "sensationalist-journalist."⁶⁵ When Pulitzer had to withdraw from public function due to suffering an eye-disease, he started thinking of ways how he could improve education. It was by way of a chance meeting that he came into contact with the president of Columbia University and got to start his work on education.⁶⁶ For Columbia University, Pulitzer came up with the idea of a school for journalism where students would be awarded "annual prizes in journalism,

⁶¹ Paul A. Firestone, *The Pulitzer Prize Plays: The First Fifty Years, 1917-1967: A Dramatic Reflection of American Life*. (New York: Limelight Editions, 2008): xi.

⁶² Erika J. Fischer and Heinz-D Fischer. *The Pulitzer Prize Archive; Documentation: Part F; Volume 17: Complete Historical Handbook of the Pulitzer Prize System 1917-2000: Decision-Making Processes in All Award Categories Based on Unpublished Sources*. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003): 3.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Paul A. Firestone, *The Pulitzer Prize Plays: The First Fifty Years, 1917-1967: A Dramatic Reflection of American Life*. (New York: Limelight Editions, 2008): xii.

⁶⁵ Ibid.

⁶⁶ Erika J. Fischer and Heinz-D Fischer. *The Pulitzer Prize Archive; Documentation: Part F; Volume 17: Complete Historical Handbook of the Pulitzer Prize System 1917-2000: Decision-Making Processes in All Award Categories Based on Unpublished Sources*. (Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003): 4.

based upon comprehensive and accurate reporting.”⁶⁷ This could be considered the early beginnings of the Pulitzer Prize. The real establishment of the prize would happen in 1904 when Joseph Pulitzer was writing his will, wherein he specified what prizes should be awarded and in what category. Initially, the prizes consisted of four categories, each with its own awards. There were four awards in journalism, four in letters and drama, one for education and five for travelling scholarships.⁶⁸ Today, this number has expanded to 14 categories.⁶⁹ The Pulitzer Prize relevant to this thesis is the Pulitzer Prize for Fiction in the category ‘Letters, Drama and Music’.

Winning the Pulitzer Prize for Fiction is accompanied by winning fifteen thousand dollars (\$15,000) and widespread name recognition.⁷⁰ An example of this is illustrated in the 2010 Pulitzer winner Paul Harding. Before winning the Pulitzer Prize for Fiction back in 2010, Harding had trouble finding a publisher who would publish his novel *Tinkers*. After several rejections, his book was eventually published and ended up winning the Pulitzer Prize. Shortly after winning the award, major publishing houses and foundations claimed to have been interested in Harding all along. Winning the Pulitzer gained Harding instant name recognition and landed him on “several year-end bestlists.”⁷¹ A similar story to that of Harding, is the one from 2009 winner Elizabeth Strout. Strout also had trouble getting her stories published but since winning the Pulitzer Prize with her work *Olive Kitteridge*, her career has skyrocketed. Her new novel *Lucy Barton* immediately rose to the top of the New York Times bestseller list and *Olive Kitteridge* has been made into an HBO adaptation that has won an Emmy Award.⁷² Another example of the symbolic capital attributed to winning the Pulitzer Prize is the story of

⁶⁷ Paul A. Firestone, *The Pulitzer Prize Plays: The First Fifty Years, 1917-1967: A Dramatic Reflection of American Life*. (New York: Limelight Editions, 2008): xi.

⁶⁸ The Pulitzer Prize, www.pulitzer.org

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ Ibid.

⁷¹ Motoko Rich, “Mr. Cinderella: From Rejection Notes to the Pulitzer.” *The New York Times on the Web*, June 15, 2019.

⁷² Hermione Hoby, “Elizabeth Strout Interview: From Years of Rejection to the Pulitzer Prize and Bestseller List. *The Guardian on the Web*, June 15, 2019.

2017 winner Colson Whitehead, whose novel *The Underground Railroad* “would come to be published in 40 languages, win a Pulitzer Prize and a National Book Award and be anointed by Oprah.”⁷³ In addition to this, the TV rights for his novel were bought by Barry Jenkins, who won an Oscar for his film *Moonlight*. What these examples illustrate is that winning the Pulitzer Prize is accompanied with a considerable increase in profits and reputation and therefore fit into Bourdieu’s concept of social and symbolic capital.

The Pulitzer Prize for Fiction has a panel of judges who decide which written work is admitted to the competitions and who choose the winners. The jury is appointed by the Pulitzer Prize Board early on in the year, after which they start the process of selecting works for the different categories. The Board also decides which categories are added or removed. Written work is submitted through the Pulitzer website for the different categories. Out of all these works, the juries “are asked to make three nominations in each of the 21 categories.”⁷⁴ For the category Fiction, this number has consistently varied over the years, ranging from three nominations to sometimes four. The jury of the Pulitzer Prize for Fiction is comprised of three members, three less than the jurors for the Man Booker Prize. The awards are chosen by majority vote by the jury, but the Board has the right to vote against their decision, or to vote for an entry that “has not been nominated or to switch nominations among the categories.”⁷⁵

The Pulitzer Prize was initially funded by money from the original endowment made Joseph Pulitzer. This did not last, however, and by the 1970s the prize was suffering a loss each year. The Board came up with the solution to create a supplementary endowment and turned to fund raising on its behalf.⁷⁶ It is in this aspect that the Pulitzer Prize substantially differs from the Man Booker Prize, as the latter is funded by corporate sponsorship and the former by

⁷³ Emma Brocks, “Colson Whitehead: ‘To Deal with this Subject with the Gravity It Deserved Was Scary’.” *The Guardian on the Web*, June 15, 2019.

⁷⁴ The Pulitzer Prize, www.pulitzer.org

⁷⁵ *Ibid*,

⁷⁶ *Ibid*.

endowments and fundraising. If Bourdieu's theory on corporate sponsorship is correct, and it is true that it compromises artistic and intellectual autonomy, the Pulitzer Prize should relatively be uncompromised by "the world of money."⁷⁷ The difference in corporate sponsorship between the two awards is also evident in name of their websites, as the Man Booker Prize is registered as .com, while the Pulitzer Prize's website is .org. Furthermore, the prize money that is awarded to the winners of both prizes differs considerably, with that of the Man Booker Prize no less than 35,000 more than that of the Pulitzer.

2.3 The National Book Award

The National Book Awards are American literary awards that are annually awarded to "celebrate the best writing in America."⁷⁸ The prize contest was first established in 1936 by the American Booksellers Association but abandoned during the difficult times of World War II. The prize was re-established in 1950 and before long, the prize gained recognition and expanded, "adding new award categories for Science, Philosophy & Religion, History & Biography, Arts & Letters, Translation, Contemporary Thought, Autobiography, First Novel, Original Paperback, and Children's Books."⁷⁹ This resulted that by 1980, the prize had a total of 28 prizes, divided over 16 categories and the prize was rebranded to American Book Awards. The expansion was so vast, however, that the impact of the awards decreased, and the Board decided to reinstate the name National Book Awards and reduce the categories to Fiction and Nonfiction, later adding the category Poetry in 1991.⁸⁰ In 1996 and 2018 the last two categories, Young People's Literature and Translated Literature, were added, completing the final categories of the prize.

⁷⁷ Pierre Bourdieu, *The Rules of Art: The Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996): 344.

⁷⁸ The National Book Awards, www.nationalbook.org

⁷⁹ Ibid.

⁸⁰ Ibid.

The winner of the National Book Award receives prize money of ten thousand dollars (\$10,000) and a bronze sculpture. Each finalist is awarded a thousand dollars (\$1,000), a medal and a Judge's citation.⁸¹ According to the website, winning the National Book Award means that you have written a piece of "literary excellence" that has "helped shape the foundation of American literature."⁸² Both the money and the credentials that are accompanied by winning the award attribute to the winner's social and cultural capital. Similar to the winning authors of the previous awards, Jesmyn Ward too struggled with rejection throughout her career but found a platform after winning her first National Book Award in 2011.⁸³ She is also the first woman to win two National Book Awards for Fiction, after winning the award a second time in 2017.⁸⁴

Similar to the previous two awards, the National Book Award has a board, the Foundation, who "assembles twenty-five distinguished writers, translators, critics, librarians, and booksellers to judge the National Book Awards."⁸⁵ The prize differs from the Man Booker Prize and the Pulitzer Prize because "the judges are nominated by past National Book Award Winners, Finalists, and Judges, and then selected and recruited by the Foundation's Executive Director" and the panels create their own criteria for judging the awards and discuss these "independent from the Foundation."⁸⁶ Submissions for the National Book Awards are due in May and out of these submissions, a longlist of ten titles is compiled. Then, a shortlist of five titles is created, out of which the winner is chosen at the award ceremony in November.

The National Book Awards are funded by a foundation, similar to the Pulitzer Prize, although big companies like Google and Facebook appear on their website's support page.⁸⁷

⁸¹ The National Book Awards, www.nationalbook.org

⁸² Ibid.

⁸³ Lanre Bakare and Steph Harmon, "National Book Awards: Jesmyn Ward Wins Major Prize for Sing, Unburied, Sing." *The Guardian on the Web*, Accessed August 6, 2019.

⁸⁴ Constance Grady, "Jesmyn Ward Just Became the First Woman to Win 2 National Book Awards for Fiction." *Vox on the Web*, Accessed August 6, 2019.

⁸⁵ The National Book Awards, www.nationalbook.org

⁸⁶ Ibid.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

The awards are primarily sponsored by donations and therefore can be considered an organisation rather than a profitable company like the Man Booker Prize.

2.4 Selection Criteria for Prizes

The decision to select the Man Booker Prize, the Pulitzer Prize and the National Book Award is based on a number of factors. The first factor is the genre that these literary prizes have in common. All of the prizes have an award for the category ‘novel’. The Man Booker Prize is solely comprised of novels, whereas the Pulitzer Prize and the National Book Award have an array of different prizes, one of them for the category novel. The second criteria used for deciding on these specific prizes, is the considerable prestige these prizes have in common. English argues that prestige is produced by “our individual and collective investment in art.”⁸⁸ If this is true, it could be argued that the Man Booker Prize is considerably prestigious because of all the investment in the form of media attention that it has received over the years. The Man Booker Prize has often been described as “the most significant annual international award in English letters”, followed closely by the Nobel Prize for Literature and the Pulitzer Prize.⁸⁹ The National Book Award, although possibly less known than the other two, prides itself among “the world’s most prestigious literary prizes.”⁹⁰ Another factor that played a part in landing on these three awards are the prerequisites for entering the chosen prizes. The prerequisite for entering the Man Booker Prize is that the novels have to be written or translated into English and published in the United Kingdom or Ireland.⁹¹ This was not always the prerequisite, however, as American authors were not allowed to participate before 2014.⁹² Back then, only

⁸⁸ James F. English. *The Economy of Prestige: Prizes, Awards, and the Circulation of Cultural Value*. (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press): 3.

⁸⁹ Luke Strongman, *The Booker Prize and the Legacy of Empire*. (Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002): vii.

⁹⁰ The National Book Awards, www.nationalbook.org

⁹¹ The Man Booker Prize, “Fiction at its Finest.”

<https://thebookerprizes.com/sites/manbosamjo/files/180912%20Man%20Booker%202018%20Booklet.pdf>

⁹² Liz Bury, “Man Booker Prize Will Open to US Authors in 2014, Report Says.” *The Guardian on the Web*, June 15, 2019.

authors from the United Kingdom, Ireland and the Commonwealth were allowed to enter the contest. The prerequisites for the Pulitzer Prize are that the novel “should be written by an American author, preferably dealing with American life.”⁹³ Apart from that, entry is open to all authors. The National Book Award’s entry requirements are that the books are entered by a publisher and that they have been published in the United Kingdom or Ireland.⁹⁴ The availability of information on the judges also played a significant role, as not all literary prizes provide this information on their website or elsewhere. By choosing these three awards, this study hopes to provide general insights into the literary prize culture. The choice to look at the years 2000 to 2018 was made because this would be a long enough period to establish a pattern.

2.5 Method

For the research in this thesis, data was collected from a variety of sources. The shortlists for the Man Booker Prize were collected from their website. On this webpage, an overview can be found of past winners, nominees and judges.⁹⁵ The shortlists for the Pulitzer Prize were gathered from their webpage as well. Similar to the Man Booker website, past winners, nominees and judges could be found on there.⁹⁶ The data for the National Book Award had to be collected from several sources, because the website did not provide information on all judges but only from 2007 onwards. Consequently, the data for this award has been gathered from their website⁹⁷, as well as from a blog about the National Book Awards.⁹⁸ As stated before, this thesis will focus on prizes awarded between 2000 and 2018, hence only the winners, nominees and judges pertaining to this period have been collected.

⁹³ The Pulitzer Prize, <https://www.pulitzer.org/prize-winners-by-category/219>

⁹⁴ The National Book Awards, www.nationalbook.org

⁹⁵ The Man Booker Prize, www.thebookerprizes.com

⁹⁶ The Pulitzer Prize, www.pulitzer.org

⁹⁷ The National Book Awards, www.nationalbook.org

⁹⁸ National Book Awards, www.nbfictionblog.org

To be able to establish if there is a gender bias in these literary prizes, the sex of all winners, nominees and judges was retrieved and registered. In order to ensure the sex of the authors and judges, every name was subjected to an internet search for name and image before being added to the list. This research focuses on both winners, nominees and judges to establish gender bias, hence the presence of the nominees and judges in the list. No missing data was encountered, with exception for the 2012 Pulitzer Prize, when no award was given because none of the nominees had achieved the majority of the votes.⁹⁹ The nominees and judges for this year, however, have still been incorporated in the research. The appendix contains a list with all the winners, nominees and judges of the three awards from the years 2000 to 2018.

⁹⁹ Alison Flood, "Pulitzers 2012: Prize for Fiction Withheld for First Time in 35 Years. *The Guardian on the Web*, June 14, 2019.

Chapter 3: Results and Discussion

3.1 Results of the Individual Prizes

Table 1 firstly presents the percentage of female nominees, winners and judges in the Man Booker Prize from 2000-2018. The results in the table show that in the overall period, 43% of all the shortlisted nominees were female. The table also shows a clear upward trend with more female authors being represented on the shortlist from 2000 to 2018. When looking at the winners, the overall period in table 1 and 2 indicates that the seven female winners constitute 36,8 % of all winners, indicating a low representation of female authors. The percentages in table 1 and 2 also imply that 2000-2004 was the least female-friendly period, with only 20% of the winners being female. However, a large spike in this percentage is visible in the subsequent period of 2005-2009, when three out of the 5 winners were female, i.e. 60%. Over the period of 2010-2014 and 2015-2018, a downward trend can be observed with the percentage dropping from 40% to 25% and thereby almost getting back to the distribution of 25% in the first period. The overall results show that when looking at the different periods, the Man Booker Prize has become female-neutral over time in regard to its nominees. Regarding the distribution of its winners, however, most periods of the Man Booker Prize were female-unfriendly, especially when taken into account the upward trend of increased percentage of shortlisted female authors. In regard to the proportion of female judges, the Man Booker Prize is fairly consistent with a range from 44,0% to 50%, i.e. between 10-12 female judges. Similarly, to the upward trend of proportion of female nominees from the period 2005-2018 the percentage of female judges shows a continuous increase. This seems to indicate that an increase in number of female judges results in a more equal distribution of female nominees. Still, the second highest representation of women in the jury panel is the period of 2000-2004, which is not reflected in the proportion of female nominees with the lowest percentage of 36,7%. In conclusion, the Man Booker Prize can be considered as a female neutral prize in regard to its nominees and representation of

women in the jury panel, yet female-unfriendly in regard to the percentage of its winners. This indicates the presence of a possible gender bias in this specific literary award in regard to the awarding of the prize, especially when taking into consideration that the representation of female authors and judges was improved over time.

Table 1. Proportion of female nominees, winners and judges per prize 2000-2018.

	Man Booker Prize			Pulitzer prize			National Book Awards		
	%N ^a	%W ^b	%J ^c	%N ^a	%W ^b	%J ^c	%N ^a	%W ^b	%J ^c
2000-2004	36,7	20,0	48,0	46,7	40,0	40,0	60,0	80,0	56,0
2005-2009	40,0	60,0	44,0	46,7	60,0	66,7	36,0	0,0	50,0
2010-2014	46,7	40,0	46,2	33,3	50,0	53,3	48,0	60,0	50,0
2015-2018	50,0	25,0	50,0	46,2	0,0	58,3	65,0	50,0	60,0
Total	43,0	36,8	46,9	43,1	38,9	54,4	51,6	47,4	53,8

^aPercentage of female nominees ^bPercentage of female winners

^cPercentage of female judges

Table 2. Absolute number of female and male nominees and winners per prize 2000-2018.

	Man Booker Prize				Pulitzer prize				National Book Awards			
	M	F	T	W ^a	M	F	T	W ^a	M	F	T	W ^a
2000-2004	19	11	30	1	8	7	15	2	10	15	25	4
2005-2009	18	12	30	3	8	7	15	3	16	9	25	0
2010-2014	16	14	30	2	10	5	15	2	13	12	25	3
2015-2018	12	12	24	1	7	6	13	0	7	13	20	2
Total	65	49	114	7	33	25	58	7	46	49	95	9

^a Absolute number of female winners

Table 3. Absolute number of female and male judges per prize 2000-2018.

	Man Booker Prize			Pulitzer prize			National Book Awards		
	M	F	T	M	F	T	M	F	T
2000-2004	13	12	25	9	6	15	11	14	25
2005-2009	14	11	25	5	10	15	12	12	24
2010-2014	14	12	26	70	8	15	12	12	24
2015-2018	10	10	20	5	7	12	8	12	20
Total	51	45	96	26	31	57	43	50	93

Table 1 secondly presents the percentages of female nominees and winners that were shortlisted for the Pulitzer Prize and the proportion of female judges. The results for the overall period slightly favour male authors over female authors, as 43,1% of the shortlisted authors were female. Looking at the periods, the numbers show that the Pulitzer Prize is consistent in its percentage of shortlisted female authors, with 2000-2004 and 2005-2009 showing 46,7% and 2015-2018 indicating 46,2%. The only exception is the period 2010-2014, when only 33,3% of the shortlisted authors were female. The percentage of female winners for the overall period of the Pulitzer Prize is fairly low with 38,9%. The periods in table 1 indicate that, when looking at the percentage of female winners, there is a small range between the periods just as with the distribution of nominees. Period 2015-2018 is the exception as none of the winners were female, which can also be seen in Table 2. In regard to proportion of female judges the Pulitzer prize is most female-friendly in the period 2005-2009, and least female friendly in the period 2000-2004. Even though, the largest proportion of female judges in the period 2005-2009 seems to be reflected in the highest percentage of female winners and nominees, this does not hold true for the subsequent period from 2010-2018 as the period 2010-2014 shows the lowest percentage of female nominees and the period 2015-2018 indicate no female winners. Taking these numbers into consideration, the conclusion is that the Pulitzer Prize has been moderately consistent with shortlisted female nominees and winners in the first fifteen years of the 2000s. Even though the prize appears to be female-neutral in that period, a gender bias seems to have surfaced in the last four years, as the rather equally distributed shortlists did not result in any female winners. In contrast, the proportion of female judges in the jury panel indicates a fairly equally distribution slightly favouring female judges over male judges. Therefore, the Pulitzer Prize can be considered a female-neutral prize in regard to its nomination of female authors and appointment of female jury members yet has become female-unfriendly

in awarding the prize. This indicates that there is a possible gender bias has emerged in this award.

The last award in Table 1 and 2 is the National Book Awards. The results for this award show that for the overall period 49 out of 95 shortlisted authors were female, in other words 51,6%. This indicates that the distribution of male nominees versus female nominees is fairly equal for this award. The periods in the tables show that after a significant drop to only 36% of the shortlisted being female authors in 2005-2009, an increase to 65,0% is visible in the period 2010-2018, which coincides with the largest representation of women in the jury panel, i.e. 60%. The numbers indicate an upward trend of the representation of female authors on the shortlist. The percentage of winners of the overall period is almost equally distributed, the 47,4% indicating only a slight favouring of male authors. The results for the overall period show a large range from 0-80% of the winners being female. The period 2005-2009 is the least female-friendly, with none of the winners being female and the lowest representation of female authors on the shortlist. The equal distribution of female and male judges of 50% was therefore not reflected in the percentage of nominees and winners. The period 2000-2004 is the most female-friendly with a percentage of 80, especially when taken into account that 15, respectively 60%, of the shortlisted authors were female. Taken these results into consideration, it could be argued that the prize is female-neutral in regard to shortlisting female authors, with the exception of the period 2005-2009. In regard to awarding the prize to female authors, the National Book Award has seen a severe drop in proportion of female winners yet can be deemed female-neutral as the overall downward trend did not go lower than 50%, with the exception of the period 2005-2009. Therefore, the National Book Award is become female-friendly in regard to its percentage of female nominees and female judges, while it has become female-neutral in rewarding the prize to female authors. Overall, the prize can be considered female-neutral verging on female-friendly, indicating that no gender bias appears to be present.

When comparing the prizes to each other based on the results indicated in Table 1, it can be argued that the prizes overall are female-neutral in regard to shortlisting female authors, with 43% for the Man Booker Prize and Pulitzer prize, and 51,6% for the National Book Awards. In regard to the percentage of female winners, The National Book Awards is female-neutral with 47,4%, and the Pulitzer Prize and the Man Booker Prize are both female-unfriendly with 38,8% and 36,8% respectively. The proportion of female judges in the jury panel indicates that all the prizes are female-neutral with a range of 46,9% to 53,8%. Hence, women are adequately represented in the jury panels. The period with the largest differences between the prizes in regard to the percentage of shortlisted female authors and proportion of female winners is 2000-2009. The period with the least differences between prizes in regard to shortlisted female authors is 2005-2009 with range from 36,0-46,7%, whereas it also shows the same large difference in range of female winners as the period 2000-2004 does, namely a gap of 60%. All prizes are most consistent and female-friendly in regard to proportion of female judges.

On the basis of all the results, it can be concluded that the National Book Awards is the most female-friendly when compared to the Man Booker Prize and the Pulitzer Prize because the National Book Awards has a higher overall percentage of female winners and nominees, and only a slightly lower percentage of female judges compared to the Pulitzer prize. Moreover, the National Book Awards made progress in ensuring a more gender equally distributed shortlist and jury panel as more female authors were shortlisted, and female judges were appointed in the last 4 years compared to the first period measured. The Man Booker Prize is the least female-friendly when compared to the other two prizes. It has the lowest overall percentage of female winners and nominees. Still, progress was made upon closer examination of the percentage of female authors on the shortlist, those that were awarded a prize, and the number of female judges in the period 2015-2018 compared to the period 2000-2004. The fact remains that female authors are underrepresented in the awarding of the Man Booker Prize, and

further progress can be made since this underrepresentation implies the presence of gender bias. The Pulitzer prize has regressed rather than progressed with less female authors nominated for the shortlist and no female authors among the winners in the period of 2015-2018, even though the composition of the jury panel showed a higher percentage of female judges, pointing towards the possibility of gender bias affecting the process of awarding. A correlation between proportion of female jurors and nomination and awarding of female authors appears to be present when looking at the overall percentages of the literary prize contests. The Man Booker Prize being the least female-friendly while also having the lowest percentage of female judges and the Pulitzer prize and National Book Awards showing higher percentage of female nominees, winners and judges. Still, the higher percentage of female judges in the jury panel of the Pulitzer prize does not result in a higher percentage of female nominees and winners when compared to the National Book Awards. Moreover, the individual prizes do not provide conclusive evidence that a higher representation of women in the jury will result in a more female authors being nominated or awarded the prize in question when examining the different periods. Hence, jury composition does not seem to affect gender bias.

3.2 Results of the Literary Prizes Combined

Table 4 presents the percentage and number of female and male nominees and winners of all three prizes combined over the period 2000-2018. Looking at the overall period of 19 years, it can be argued that a moderately equal distribution in number of female and male nominees has taken place, with 46,1% only slightly favouring male authors over female authors. Considering the number of female winners in the overall period the results indicate a more or less same distribution of female and male authors as the shortlists, since of the total of 56 winners of all three prizes, 23 of them were female authors. This results in 41,1% of all winners being female. Apparent from Table 5 is that women were best represented in the jury panel of the literary

prize contests as 51,2%, i.e. 126 of the 246 judges, were female. It also the most consistent when compared to the percentages of female nominees and winners, with a range from 49,2%-55,8%. Progress has been made as the period 2015-2018 showed the highest proportion of women in the jury panel with an increase of 6,6% compared to the period 2000-2004.

Table 4. Percentage and number of female and male nominees and winners 2000-2018.

	M	F	T	W ^a	% ^b	%W ^c
2000-2004	37	33	70	7	47,1	46,7
2005-2009	42	28	70	6	40,0	40,0
2010-2014	39	31	70	7	44,3	50,0
2015-2018	26	31	57	3	54,4	25,0
Total	144	123	267	23	46,1	41,1

^a Absolute number of female winners

^b Percentage of female nominees ^c Percentage of female winners

Table 5. Percentage and number of female and male judges 2000-2018.

	M	F	T	% ^a
2000-2004	33	32	66	49,2
2005-2009	31	33	64	51,6
2010-2014	33	32	65	49,2
2015-2018	23	29	52	55,8
Total	120	126	246	51,2

^a Percentage of female judges

When considering the number of female nominees per period, the percentages range between 40,0 and 54,4%. The period 2015-2018 saw the most equal distribution of female and male nominees, even slightly favouring female authors. The period 2005-2009 was the least female-friendly period in regard to the nominees. An upward trend in this period is visible as the percentage of female nominees continuously increase up till 2018.

The number of female winners is fairly consistent with the exception of the period 2015-2018. In the period 2000-2004 46,7% of all the winners were female and the subsequent period from 2005-2014 exhibits a similar balanced distribution of winners ending in a completely

equal distribution of 50%. After that period a significant drop is visible. This decrease results in the lowest proportion of women winning one of the literary prize contests, i.e. 25%. Apart from a slight decrease in the period 2005-2009, the percentage of female nominees gradually increases up to 54,4%. The proportion of female judges also indicate a small decrease in the period 2010-2014, and subsequent increase to 55,8%. This is remarkable, because it would be expected that when the number of female authors on the shortlists and female judges in the jury panel continues to rise, this would also be visible in the number of female winners. Even though the period 2015-2018 exhibits a balanced distribution of female nominees and judges, this is not reflected in the number of female winners of the same years. It would be anticipated that the balanced representation would be directly reflected in an equally balanced distribution of female winners. This is not the case, however, since only 25% of the winners in that period were female while 54,4% of the shortlisted authors and 55,8% of the judges were women. This indicates that 2015-2018 has been the least female-friendly period in regard to winners, yet paradoxically the most female-friendly period in regard to nominees and composition of the jury panels.

What can be concluded from this data is that in the overall period of 2000-2018 the literary prizes are generally female neutral in regard to nomination and rewarding of the awards and in appointment of jury members, indicating that there is no gender bias present. When considering the literary prizes and number of female winners per period, it can be concluded that an upward trend was visible in the number of female nominees and jury members, indicating a continuously balanced distribution, even slightly in favour of female authors. The distribution of female winners, however, was not congruent with that of the nominees and judges as, after a moderate increase in female winners' percentage, a significant drop was visible.

In conclusion, literary prizes have over time become more female-neutral, verging on female-friendly, in nominating female authors for their shortlists and appointing female jury members. The same trend and increase in female-friendliness appeared to be developing in regard to awarding the prizes. The ceasing and even significantly dropping of female percentages of winners, however, indicates that literary prizes have turned considerably less female-friendly than at the beginning of the measured period since a higher number of shortlisted female authors and appointed female jurors was not reflected in the numbers of female winners. Therefore, a gender bias appears to be present in the awarding literary prizes, yet not in the nominating of candidates and appointing of jury members. This could be attributed to the gendered structure of the social perception of the artist. In contrast, the equal distribution regarding the judges, however, is promising because it indicates no social group, e.g. man or woman, is dominant. Both groups occupy an authorised position in determining what constitutes literature, i.e. cultural capital.

Conclusion

Previous research on gender equality in the working environment has shown that male employees are generally favoured over female employees. The preference of masculinity over femininity has been attributed to the fact that the associated characteristics that make a good employee are gendered. These characteristics include hard-working, dedicated, confident and not afraid to take risks. Male employees are also favoured over female employees because the notion still exists that they are not expected to prioritise a domestic life over a career and subsequently are considered more committed to their job. Consequently, gender inequality is part of the working environment.

The same gendered concept of the working environment appears to apply to the artistic field. Masculinisation of the concept of the artist is the result of the ideology of the artist, the structure of social perceptions of the artist, and the structure of the artists career being gendered. The underlying mechanisms of these elements specific to the artist involve certain attitudes and behaviour that favour male individuals rather than female individuals. Hence, the archetype of the artist is considered male. Moreover, transformative creative potential is more often attributed to male than female artists. The structure of the artists career also tends to favour the male artist as it manifests in total commitment and entrepreneurial labour which requires attention seeking and risk taking. These behaviours are, again, less accepted when performed by women. Furthermore, female artists tend to struggle with their sense of responsibility in regard to the domestic sphere thus hindering them in exhibiting total commitment. An artistic career is subjected to long and irregular hours and much time spend away from home. The assumption is made that a female artist would struggle with this due to her responsibilities at home.

The gendered structure of social perceptions of the artist manifest itself in the aesthetic evaluation of an artist's work. The artistic work of male artists tends to be evaluated more

favourably than that of their female counterparts. This is in part due to the fact that aesthetic evaluation is inherently subjective, thus implying uncertainty. As a result of that uncertainty individuals frequently fall back on automatic cognitive processes. These processes also imply the use of implicit gender stereotypes. Furthermore, female artists are often also evaluated on sexuality and physical appearance, while this is irrelevant when a male artist's work is being evaluated. The masculinisation of the structure of social perception of the artist poses a significant problem for female artists as positive aesthetic evaluations are essential for the accumulation of symbolic capital, i.e. recognition and prestige that can be exchanged for economic capital. If a gender bias is present that favours male artists over female artists, the former can more easily accumulate the necessary symbolic capital to further his career while the latter is denied the same opportunity. As a result gender inequality might emerge within the artistic field.

Bourdieu views this as symbolic violence as the norm formulated by the socially strong is imposed on the socially weak. One manner in which symbolic capital can be accrued is by being placed on the shortlist of a literary prize contest or even more so by winning a literary prize contest. Both being nominated for and winning of a literary prize results in increased recognition and prestige that can be exchanged for economic capital. For example, the increased recognition often leads to a short-term increase in book sales. In addition to this, the winning novel is often translated into other languages or adapted into a series or film. Imposition of the male archetype of the artist, however, and more specifically a gender bias in aesthetic evaluation can create gender inequality within the literary prize culture.

This thesis has examined to what extent literary prizes such as the Man Booker Prize, The Pulitzer Prize and the National Book Awards tend to favour male authors over female authors, which might signify the presence of gender bias. Central to answering this question was the percentage of male versus female winners and nominees in the shortlists and female

judges in the jury panel of these three awards. The choice for these three specific prizes stems from the genre, prestige and entry requirements that these prizes have in common. All the prizes have a genre 'novel' and are regarded as considerably prestigious. Moreover, their entry requirements are similar to each other. The three literary prizes were closely examined over the period 2000-2018 and data was gathered of this period in order to form calculate percentages. The data consisted of the percentage of female nominees, winners and judges that and has been presented over three tables. The assumption is that an unequal distribution of female and male authors on the nominees indicates whether a literary prize is female friendly or not. Moreover, the percentage of female nominees should be reflected in the number of female winners. Lastly, the assumption is made that an equal representation of women in the jury panel will also result in a similar proportion of female author being nominated for the shortlist of the literary prizes. Any structural underrepresentation of women in either the shortlist or jury might indicate a gender bias that favours men.

The overall results indicate that the literary prizes in this study have become more female-neutral, even verging to female-friendly, in regard to the nomination of female authors over the course of 19 years. A similar movement has been monitored in regard to awarding the prize to female authors. Overall representation of female authors, however, has significantly ceased and even stopped. This indicates that even though literary prizes appear to have become more female-friendly, in reality they are less female friendly than at the start of the measuring period in 2000. This is due to a higher number of shortlisted female authors and female judges that was not reflected in the numbers of female winners. These results appear to indicate that a gender bias might be present in the awarding of the prizes yet not in nominating for them or appointment of positions in the jury panel. Furthermore, the fact that all the literary prizes presented fairly equal proportions of female judges to male judges indicates a promising trend in the literary prize culture as it implies an equal distribution of cultural and social power to

both women and men. Nevertheless, two remarks have to be made in regard to the method used in this research. Firstly, if the percentage of female nominees is not represented in a similar proportion of female winners it does not prove with certainty that a gender bias exists. It is quite possible that the novels of the male authors were more deserving of the literary prize. This remains a difficult issue as these aesthetic evaluations are inherently subjective. Secondly, the long list has not been taken into account. It is quite possible that few submissions came from female authors in a specific time period and that this explains a less equally balanced distribution of female and male nominees. Moreover, this also holds true the other way around: a more or less equal distribution of female or male nominees was present in a specific time period even though the number of submissions for the long list from female authors were not substantial. The same does not apply to the composition of the jury panel, as their appointment does not revolve around aesthetic evaluations.

Future research might include the longlists to ensure a more thorough image of the periods presented in this thesis. As such, it will provide stronger evidence whether gender bias might be present in the literary prize culture. Furthermore, a larger timeframe would offer a richer set of data to see whether female authors are structurally underrepresented in the literary prize culture. Combined with statistical testing, such as the Chi-square test, the data could provide more definitive evidence whether the differences in representation by women and men conveys a significant difference.

Gender bias is deeply rooted in Western society and also still presents itself in the literary prize culture. Fortunately, steps have been taken to oppose this and gender inequality is no longer widely accepted. This does not mean, however, that the change should stop here because there is still a lot that can be improved. In the literary prize field, for instance, a suggestion would be to come up with objective criteria, that are agreed on by the judges before the competition, by which the novels are judged. Aesthetic evaluations are inherently connected

to prize contests, as they are a matter of taste, thereby always carrying a certain amount of subjectivity. It is therefore important to create objectivity to partly overcome the subjective nature of contests by formulating criteria beforehand. Another recommendation that could prevent possible gender bias, would be to submit all novel anonymously. By doing so, gender is completely taken out of the equation and works are solely judged on their quality. Revealing the winner at the end ceremony still gives the author the symbolic capital that comes with winning the award and removes any doubt that he/she has won the award by something other than their abilities. Creating more all-female prizes, such as the Women's Prize for Fiction, would also be a possibility to further close the gap between male and female authors. However, this does not solve the problem for prizes where both genders can participate. Certainly, none of these options are completely attainable but they might be an incentive to increase further measurements and to think about the issue more carefully.

Bibliography

- Acker, Joan. "Hierarchies, Jobs, Bodies: A Theory of Gendered Organizations." *Gender and Society* 4, no. 2 (1990): 139-158.
- Bakare, Lanre, and Steph Harmon, "National Book Awards: Jesmyn Ward Wins Major Prize for Sing, Unburied, Sing." *The Guardian on the Web*, Accessed August 6, 2019.
<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2017/nov/16/national-book-awards-jesmyn-ward-wins-major-prize-for-sing-unburied-sing>
- Bourdieu, P. *The Field of Cultural Production*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1993.
- Bourdieu, P., and H. Haacke. *Free Exchange*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1995.
- Bourdieu, Pierre, and Richard Nice. *Masculine Domination*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2001.
- "Bourdieu, Pierre." *Social Theory Rewired*. Routledge Publishers. N.d. Accessed August 8, 2019.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Rules of Art: The Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996.
- Brocks, Emma. "Colson Whitehead: 'To Deal with this Subject with the Gravity It Deserved Was Scary'." *The Guardian on the Web*, June 15, 2019.
<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2017/jul/07/colson-whitehead-underground-railroad>
- Bury, Liz. "Man Booker Prize Will Open to US Authors in 2014, Report Says." *The Guardian on the Web*, June 15, 2019.
<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2013/sep/16/man-booker-prize-us-authors-2014>
- Demoor, Marysa., Frieda Saeys and Sigfried Lievens. "'And the Winner Is?'" Researching the Relationship Between Gender and Literary Awards in Flanders, 1981-2000." *Journal of Gender Studies* 17, vol. 1 (2008): 27-39. doi.10.1080/09589230701838370
- Dempster, Lisa. "If You Doubted There Was Gender Bias in Literature, This Study Proves

- You Wrong." *The Guardian*, June 10, 2016. Accessed April 4, 2019.
- Ekelund, Bo G., and Mikael Börjesson, "The Shape of the Literary Career: An Analysis of Publishing Trajectories." *Poetics* 30 (2002): 341-364.
- English, James F. *The Economy of Prestige: Prizes Awards, and the Circulation of Cultural Value*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2005.
- English, James F. "The Literary Prize Phenomenon in Context." In *A Companion to the British and Irish Novel 1925-2000*, 160-176. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2005.
- European Parliament, *Gender Equality in the Media Sector*. Brussels: European Government Printing Office, 2018.
- Firestone, Paul A. *The Pulitzer Prize Plays: The First Fifty Years, 1917-1967: A Dramatic Reflection of American Life*. New York: Limelight Editions, 2008.
- Fischer, Erika J., and Heinz-D Fischer. *The Pulitzer Prize Archive; Documentation: Part F; Volume 17: Complete Historical Handbook of the Pulitzer Prize System 1917-2000: Decision-Making Processes in All Award Categories Based on Unpublished Sources*. Berlin: De Gruyter, 2003. doi:10.1515/9783110939125.
- Flood, Alison. "Booker Prize: Silicon Valley Billionaire Takes Over as New Sponsor." *The Guardian on the Web*, August 9, 2019.
<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2019/feb/28/booker-prize-silicon-valley-billionaire-takes-over-as-new-sponsor>
- Flood, Alison. "Pulitzers 2012: Prize for Fiction Withheld for First Time in 35 Years." *The Guardian on the Web*, June 14, 2019.
<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2012/apr/17/pulitzer-prize-fiction-2012-withheld>
- Goff, Martyn. "Literary Prizes: Big Money and Glamour for Some." *Logos* 2, no. 3 (1991): 150-53. doi:10.2959/logo.1991.2.3.150.

Grady, Constance. "Jesmyn Ward Just Became the First Woman to Win 2 National Book Awards for Fiction." *Vox on the Web*, Accessed August 6, 2019.

<https://www.vox.com/culture/2017/11/16/16665396/2017-national-book-awards-jesmyn-ward-sing-unburied-sing-annie-proulx>

Harvey, Melinda, and Julieanne Lamond. "Taking the Measure of Gender Disparity in Australian Book Reviewing as a Field." *Australian Humanities Review* 60 (2016): 84-107.

Hoby, Hermione. "Elizabeth Strout Interview: From Years of Rejection to the Pulitzer Prize and Bestseller List." *The Guardian on the Web*, June 15, 2019.

<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2016/feb/19/elizabeth-strout-i-dont-want-to-write-melodrama-interview>

Holmes, Diana. "Literary Prizes, Women, and the Middlebrow." *Contemporary French Civilization* 41, no. 3-4 (2016): 437-48. doi:10.3828/cfc.2016.29.

Lea, Richard. "Andrea Levy, Chronicler of the Windrush Generation, Dies at 62." *The Guardian on the Web*, June 15, 2019.

<https://www.theguardian.com/books/2019/feb/15/andrea-levy-chronicler-of-the-windrush-generation-dies-aged-62>

Miller, Diana L. "Gender and the Artist Archetype: Understanding Gender Inequality in Artistic Careers." *Sociology Compass* 10, no. 2 (2016): 119-131.

Miller, Diana L. "Symbolic Capital and Gender: Evidence from Two Cultural Fields." *Cultural Sociology* 8, no. 4 (2014): 462-482.

Norris, Sharon. "The Booker Prize: A Bourdieusian Perspective." *Journal for Cultural Research* 10.2 (2006): 139-158.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. "Women and the Structure of Organizations: Explorations and Theory and Behavior," in *Another Voice: Feminist Perspectives on Social Life and*

Social Science, eds. Marcia Millman and Rosabeth Moss Kanter. New York: Anchor Press, 1975.

Parker, Rozsika, and Griselda Pollock. *Old Mistresses: Woman, Art and Ideology*. Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1981. Accessed June 13, 2019.

Pugh, Griffith T. "National Book Awards, 1964." *The English Journal* 53, no. 5. (1964): 398-399.

Rich, Motoko. "Mr. Cinderella: From Rejection Notes to the Pulitzer." *The New York Times on the Web*, June 15, 2019.

<https://archive.nytimes.com/www.nytimes.com/2010/04/19/books/19harding.html>

Ridgeway, Cecilia L. *Framed by Gender: How Gender Inequality Persists in the Modern World*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Stokes, Allyson, Tina Fetner, Melanie Heath and Neil McLaughlin. *Fashioning Gender: A Case Study of the Fashion Industry*. McMaster University, 2013. Accessed June 13, 2019. <http://hdl.handle.net/ru.idm.oclc.org/11375/13406>.

Strongman, Luke. *The Booker Prize and the Legacy of Empire*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2002.

The Man Booker Prize, "Fiction at its Finest." *Booklet*

<https://thebookerprizes.com/sites/manbosamjo/files/180912%20Man%20Booker%20018%20Booklet.pdf>

Todd, Richard. *Consuming Fictions: The Booker Prize and Fiction in Britain Today*. London: Bloomsbury, 1996.

Tuchman, Gaye, and Nina E. Fortin. "Fame and Misfortune: Edging Women Out of the Great Literary Tradition." *American Journal of Sociology* 90, no. 1 (1984): 72-96.

Weininger, Elliot B. "Pierre Bourdieu on Social Class and Symbolic Violence." *Alternative Foundations of Class Analysis* (2002): 119-171.

Williamson, Jake. "Milkman Sales Soar After Man Booker Prize Win." *BBC News on the*

Web, June 15, 2019. <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-northern-ireland-45914521>

Zangen, Britta. "Women as Readers, Writers, and Judges The Controversy about the Orange

Prize for Fiction. *Women's Studies* 23, no. 3 (2003): 281-299.

doi:10.1080/00497870310066

Appendix I

Table A1. Winners and nominees of the Man Booker Prize 2000-2018.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Winner</i>	<i>Novel</i>	<i>Nominees</i>	<i>Jury</i>
2000	Margaret Atwood (f)	<i>The Blind Assassin</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Trezza Azzopardi (f) ▪ Michael Collins (m) ▪ Kazuo Ishiguro (m) ▪ Matthew Kneale (m) ▪ Brian O'Doherty (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Simon Jenkins (chair) (m) ▪ Roy Forster (m) ▪ Mariella Frostrup (f) ▪ Caroline Gasciogne (f) ▪ Rose Tremain (f)
2001	Peter Carey (m)	<i>True History of the Kelly Gang</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ian McEwan (m) ▪ Andrew Miller (m) ▪ David Mitchell (m) ▪ Rachel Seiffert (f) ▪ Ali Smith (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kenneth Baker (chair) (m) ▪ Philip Hensher (m) ▪ Michele Roberts (f) ▪ Kate Summerscale (f) ▪ Rory Watson (m)
2002	Yann Martel (m)	<i>The Life of Pi</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rohinton Mistry (m) ▪ Carol Shields (f) ▪ Willim Trevor (m) ▪ Sarah Waters (f) ▪ Tim Winton (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lisa Jardine (chair) (f) ▪ David Baddiel (m) ▪ Russell Celyn Jones (m) ▪ Salley Vickers (f) ▪ Erica Wagner (f)
2003	DBC Pierre (m)	<i>Vernon God Little</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Monica Ali (f) ▪ Margaret Atwood (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ John Carey (chair) (m) ▪ A.C. Grayling (m)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Damon Galgut (m) ▪ Zoë Heller (f) ▪ Clare Morrall (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Francine Stock (f) ▪ Rebecca Stephens (f) ▪ D.J. Taylor (m)
2004	Alan Hollinghurst (m)	<i>The Line of Beauty</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Achmat Dangor (m) ▪ Sarah Hall (f) ▪ David Mitchell (m) ▪ Colm Tóibín (m) ▪ Gerard Woodward (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Chris Smith (chair) (m) ▪ Tibor Fischer (m) ▪ Robert Macfarlane (m) ▪ Rowan Pelling (f) ▪ Fiammetta Rocco (f)
2005	John Banville (m)	<i>The Sea</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Julian Barnes (m) ▪ Sebastian Barry (m) ▪ Kazuo Ishiguro (m) ▪ Ali Smith (f) ▪ Zadie Smith (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ John Sutherland (chair) (m) ▪ Lindsay Duguid (f) ▪ Rick Gekoski (m) ▪ Josephine Hart (f) ▪ David Sexton (m)
2006	Kiran Desai (f)	<i>The Inheritance of Loss</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kate Grenville (f) ▪ M.J. Hyland (f) ▪ Hisham Matar (m) ▪ Edward St Aubyn (m) ▪ Sarah Waters (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hermione Lee (chair) (f) ▪ Simon Armitage (m) ▪ Candia McWilliam (f) ▪ Anthony Quinn (m) ▪ Fiona Shaw (f)
2007	Anne Enright (f)	<i>The Gathering</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nicola Barker (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Howard Davies (chair) (m)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mohsin Barker (m) ▪ Lloyd Jones (m) ▪ Ian McEwan (m) ▪ Indra Sinha (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Wendy Cope (f) ▪ Giles Foden (m) ▪ Ruth Scurr (f) ▪ Imogen Stubbs (f)
2008	Aravind Adiga (m)	<i>The White Tiger</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sebastian Barry (m) ▪ Amativ Gosh (m) ▪ Linda Grant (f) ▪ Philip Hensher (m) ▪ Steve Toltz (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Michael Portillo (chair) (m) ▪ Alex Clark (m) ▪ Louise Doughty (f) ▪ James Heneage (m) ▪ Hardeep Singh Kohli (m)
2009	Hilary Mantel (f)	<i>Wolf Hall</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sebastian Barry (m) ▪ A.S. Byatt (f) ▪ J.M. Coetzee (m) ▪ Adam Foulds (m) ▪ Simon Mawer (m) ▪ Sarah Waters (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ James Naughtie (chair) (m) ▪ Lucasta Miller (f) ▪ John Mullan (m) ▪ Sue Perkins (f) ▪ Michael Prodger (m)
2010	Howard Jacobson (m)	<i>The Finkler Question</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Peter Carey (m) ▪ Emma Donoghue (f) ▪ Damon Galgut (m) ▪ Andrea Levy (f) ▪ Tom McCarthy (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Andrew Motion (chair) (m) ▪ Rosie Blau (f) ▪ Deborah Bull (f) ▪ Tom Sutcliffe (m) ▪ Frances Wilson (f)

2011	Julian Barnes (m)	<i>The Sense of an Ending</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Carol Birch (f) ▪ Patrick deWitt (m) ▪ Esi Edugyan (f) ▪ Stephen Kelman (m) ▪ A.D. Miller (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stella Rimington (chair) (f) ▪ Matthew d'Ancona (m) ▪ Susan Hill (f) ▪ Chris Mullin (m) ▪ Gaby Wood (f)
2012	Hilary Mantel (f)	<i>Bring Up the Bodies</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Deborah Levy (f) ▪ Alison Moore (f) ▪ Will Self (m) ▪ Tan Twan Eng (m) ▪ Jeet Thayil (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Peter Stothard (chair) (m) ▪ Dinah Birch (f) ▪ Amanda Foreman (f) ▪ Dan Stevens (m) ▪ Bharat Tandon (m)
2013	Eleonor Catton (f)	<i>The Luminaries</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NoViolet Bulawayo (f) ▪ Jim Crace (m) ▪ Jhumpa Lahiri (f) ▪ Ruth Ozeki (f) ▪ Colm Tóibín (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Robert Macfarlane (chair) (m) ▪ Robert Douglas-Fairhurt (m) ▪ Natalie Haynes (f) ▪ Martha Kearney (f) ▪ Stuart Kelly (m)
2014	Richard Flanagan (m)	<i>The Narrow Road to the Deep North</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Joshua Ferris (m) ▪ Karen Joy Fowler (f) ▪ Howard Jacobson (m) ▪ Neel Mukherjee (m) ▪ Ali Smith (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A.C. Grayling (chair) (m) ▪ Jonathan Bate (m) ▪ Sarah Churchwell (f) ▪ Daniel Glaser (m) ▪ Alastair Niven (m)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Erica Wagner (f) 	
2015	Marlon James (f)	<i>A Brief History of Sven Killings</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Tom McCarthy (m) ▪ Chigozie Obioma (m) ▪ Sunjeev Sahota (m) ▪ Anne Tyler (f) ▪ Hanya Yanagihara (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Michael Wood (chair) (m) ▪ Ellah Wakatama Allfrey (f) ▪ John Burnside (m) ▪ Sam Leith (m) ▪ Frances Osborne (f)
2016	Paul Beatty (m)	<i>The Sellout</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Deborah Levy (f) ▪ Graeme Macrae Burnet (m) ▪ Ottessa Moshfegh (f) ▪ David Szalay (m) ▪ Madeleine Thien (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Amanda Foreman (chair) (f) ▪ Jon Day (m) ▪ Abdulrazak Gurnah (m) ▪ David Harsent (m) ▪ Olivia Williams (f)
2017	George Saunders (m)	<i>Lincoln in the Bardo</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Paul Auster (m) ▪ Emily Fridlund (f) ▪ Mohsin Hamid (m) ▪ Fiona Mozley (f) ▪ Ali Smith (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lola Young (chair) (f) ▪ Lila Azam Zanganeh (f) ▪ Sarah Hall (f) ▪ Tom Philips (m) ▪ Colin Thubron (m)
2018	Anna Burns (f)	<i>Milkman</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Esi Edugyan (f) ▪ Daisy Johnson (f) ▪ Rachel Kushner (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kwame Anthony Appiah (chair) (m) ▪ Val McDermid (f) ▪ Leo Robson (m)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Richard Powers (m) ▪ Robin Robertson (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jacqueline Rose (f) ▪ Leanne Shapton (f)
--	---	---

Source: www.thebookerprizes.com

Table A2. Winners and nominees of the Pulitzer Prize for Fiction 2000-2018.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Winner</i>	<i>Novel</i>	<i>Nominees</i>	<i>Jury</i>
2000	Jhumpa Lahiri (f)	<i>Interpreter of Maladies</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Annie Proulx (f) ▪ Ha Jin (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rebecca Pepper Sinkler (chair) (f) ▪ Joel Canarroe (m) ▪ Wendy Lesser (f)
2001	Michael Chabon (m)	<i>The Amazing Adventures of Kavalier & Clay</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Joyce Carol Oates (f) ▪ Joy Williams (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Gail Caldwell (chair) (f) ▪ Richard Ford (m) ▪ Alison Lurie (f)
2002	Richard Russo (m)	<i>Empire Falls</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Colson Whitehead (m) ▪ Jonathan Franzen (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nancy Huddleston Packer (chair) (f) ▪ John Leonard (m) ▪ Frederic Tuten (m)
2003	Jeffrey Eugenides (m)	<i>Middlesex</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Andrea Barrett (f) ▪ Adam Haslett (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Gail Caldwell (chair) (f) ▪ Joel Conarroe (m) ▪ David Gates (m)
2004	Edward P. Jones (m)	<i>The Known World</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Susan Choi (f) ▪ Marianne Wiggins (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Richard Eder (chair) (m)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rolando Hinojosa-Smith (m) ▪ Steve Wasserman (m) 	
2005	Marilynne Robinson (f)	<i>Gilead</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ward Just (m) ▪ Ha Jin (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rebecca Pepper Sinkler (chair) (f) ▪ Marie Arana (f) ▪ Alan Lightman (m)
2006	Geraldine Brooks (f)	<i>March</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lee Martin (m) ▪ E.L. Doctorow (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Marie Arana (chair) (f) ▪ Richard Eder (m) ▪ Valerie Smith (f)
2007	Cormac McCarthy (m)	<i>The Road</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alice McDermott (f) ▪ Richard Powers (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Catharine R. Stimpson (chair) (f) ▪ David Ulin (m) ▪ Gail Caldwell (f)
2008	Junot Diaz (m)	<i>The Brief Wondrous Life of Oscar Wao</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Lore Segal (f) ▪ Denis Johnson (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elizabeth Taylor (chair) (f) ▪ Francine Prose (f) ▪ Oscar Villalon (m)
2009	Elizabeth Strout (f)	<i>Olive Kitteridge</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Christine Schutt (f) ▪ Louise Erdrich (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ R.H.W. Dillard (chair) (m) ▪ Susan Larson (f) ▪ Nancy Pearl (f)
2010	Paul Harding (m)	<i>Tinkers</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Daniyal Mueenuddin (m) ▪ Lydia Millet (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rebecca Pepper Sinkler (chair) (f) ▪ Charles Johnson (m) ▪ Laura Miller (f)

2011	Jennifer Egan (f)	<i>A Visit from the Goon Squad</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jonathan Dee (m) ▪ Chang-rae Lee (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elizabeth Taylor (chair) (f) ▪ Alan Cheuse (m) ▪ Nicholas Delbanco (m)
2012	No award given	-	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Karen Russell (f) ▪ David Foster Wallace (m) ▪ Denis Johnson (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Susan Larson (chair) (f) ▪ Maureen Corrigan (f) ▪ Michael Cunningham (m)
2013	Adam Johnson (m)	<i>The Orphan Master's Son</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eowyn Ivey (f) ▪ Nathan Englander (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Marie Arana (chair) (f) ▪ Geraldine Brooks (f) ▪ John Dudley (m)
2014	Donna Tartt (f)	<i>The Goldfinch</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Philipp Meyer (m) ▪ Bob Shacochis (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Art Winslow (chair) (m) ▪ Ron Charles (m) ▪ Sabina Murray (f)
2015	Anthony Doerr (m)	<i>All the Light We Cannot See</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Richard Ford (m) ▪ Joyce Carol Oates (f) ▪ Laila Lalami (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elizabeth Taylor (chair) (f) ▪ Alan Cheuse (m) ▪ David Haynes (m)
2016	Viet Thanh Nguyen (m)	<i>The Sympathizer</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Kelly Link (f) ▪ Margaret Verble (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Art Winslow (chair) (m) ▪ Edward P. Jones (m) ▪ Leah Price (f)
2017	Colson Whitehead (m)	<i>The Underground Railroad</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Adam Haslett (m) ▪ C.E. Morgan (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Eric Banks (chair) (m) ▪ Lan Samantha Chang (f) ▪ Mary Ann Gwinn (f)

2018	Andrew Sean Greer (m)	<i>Less</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Hernan Diaz (m) ▪ Elif Batuman (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Nancy Pearl (chair) (f) ▪ Leah Hager Cohen (f) ▪ Elizabeth McCracken (f)
------	-----------------------	-------------	---	--

Source: www.pulitzer.org

Table A3. Winners and nominees of the National Book Award 2000-2018.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Winner</i>	<i>Novel</i>	<i>Nominees</i>	<i>Jury</i>
2000	Susan Sontag (f)	<i>In America</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Charles Baxter (m) ▪ Alan Lightman (m) ▪ Joyce Carol Oates (f) ▪ Francine Prose (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Ron Hansen (m) ▪ Breena Clarke (f) ▪ Chitra Banerjee Divakaruni (f) ▪ David Guterson (m) ▪ A.M. Homes (f)
2001	Jonathan Franzen (m)	<i>The Corrections</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dan Chaon (m) ▪ Jennifer Egan (f) ▪ Louise Erdrich (f) ▪ Susan Straight (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Colin Harrison (m) ▪ Bill Henderson (m) ▪ Angela Davis-Gardner (f) ▪ Mary Morris (f) ▪ Susan Richards Shreve (f)
2002	Julia Glass (f)	<i>Three Junes</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mark Costello (m) ▪ Adam Haslett (m) ▪ Martha McPhee (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bob Shacochis (m) ▪ Adrienne Brodeur (f) ▪ David Wong Louie (m)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Brad Watson (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jay McInerney (m) ▪ Jacquelyn Mitchard (f)
2003	Shirley Hazzard (f)	<i>The Great Fire</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ T.C. Boyle (m) ▪ Edward P. Jones (m) ▪ Scott Spencer (m) ▪ Marianne Wiggins (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Antonya Nelson (f) ▪ Alice Elliot Dark (f) ▪ Peter Cameron (m) ▪ Jay Parini (f) ▪ Jean Thompson (f)
2004	Lily Tuck (f)	<i>The News from Paraguay</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Sarah Shun-lien Bynum (f) ▪ Christine Schutt (f) ▪ Joan Silber (f) ▪ Kate Walbert (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Linda Hogan (f) ▪ Randall Kenan (m) ▪ Rick Moddy (m) ▪ Stewart O’Nan (m) ▪ Susan Straight (f)
2005	William Vollmann (m)	<i>Europe Central</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ E.L. Doctorow (m) ▪ Mary Gaitskill (f) ▪ Christopher Sorrentino (m) ▪ René Steinke (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Andre Dubus III (m) ▪ Rikki Ducornet (f) ▪ Christina Garcia (f) ▪ Tom LeClair (m) ▪ Anna Quindlen (f)
2006	Richard Powers (m)	<i>The Echo Maker</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mark Z. Danielewski (m) ▪ Ken Kalfus (m) ▪ Dana Spiotta (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bharati Mukherjee (f) ▪ Jonathan Lethem (m) ▪ Craig Nova (m)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jess Walter (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ David Plante (m) ▪ Marianne Wiggins (f)
2007	Dennis Johnson (m)	<i>Tree of Smoke</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Mischa Berlinski (m) ▪ Lydia Davis (f) ▪ Joshua Ferris (m) ▪ Jim Shepard (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Francine Prose (f) ▪ Andrew Sean Greer (m) ▪ Walter Kirn (m) ▪ David Means (m) ▪ Joy Williams (f)
2008	Peter Matthiessen (m)	<i>Shadow Country</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Aleksandar Hemon (m) ▪ Rachel Kushner (f) ▪ Marilynne Robinson (f) ▪ Salvatore Scibona (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Gail Godwin (f) ▪ Rebecca Goldstein (f) ▪ Elinor Lipman (f) ▪ Reginald McKnight (m) ▪ Jess Walter (m)
2009	Colum McCann (m)	<i>Let the Great World Spin</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Bonnie Jo Campbell (f) ▪ Daniyal Mueenuddin (m) ▪ Jayne Anne Phillips (f) ▪ Marcel Theroux (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Alan Cheuse (m) ▪ Junot Díaz (m) ▪ Jennifer Charles Johnson (f) ▪ Lydia Millet (f)
2010	Jaimy Gordon (f)	<i>Lord of Misrule</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Peter Carey (m) ▪ Nicole Krauss (f) ▪ Lionel Schriver (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Andrei Codrescu (m) ▪ Samuel R. Delany (m) ▪ Sabina Murray (f) ▪ Joanna Scott (f)

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Karen Tei Yamashita (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Carolyn See (f)
2011	Jesmyn Ward (f)	<i>Salvage the Bones</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Andrew Krivak (m) ▪ Téa Obreht (f) ▪ Julie Otsuka (f) ▪ Edith Pearlman (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Deirdre McNamer (chair) (f) ▪ Jerome Charyn (m) ▪ John Crowley (m) ▪ Victor LaValle (m) ▪ Yiyun Li (f)
2012	Louise Erdrich (f)	<i>The Round House</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Junot Díaz (m) ▪ Dave Eggers (m) ▪ Ben Fountain (m) ▪ Kevin Powers (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Stacey D'Erasmus (f) ▪ Dinaw Mengestu (m) ▪ Lorrie Moore (f) ▪ Janet Peery (f)
2013	James McBride (m)	<i>The Good Lord Bird</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rachel Kushner (f) ▪ Jhumpa Lahiri (f) ▪ Thomas Pynchon (m) ▪ George Saunders (m) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Charles McGrath (chair) (m) ▪ Charles Baxter (m) ▪ Gish Jen (f) ▪ Rick Simonson (m) ▪ René Steinke (f)
2014	Phil Klay (m)	<i>Redeployment</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Rabih Alameddine (m) ▪ Anthony Doerr (m) ▪ Emily St. John Mandel (f) ▪ Marilynne Robinson (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Geraldine Brooks (chair) (f) ▪ Cheryl Cotleur (f) ▪ Michael Gorra (m) ▪ Adam Johnson (m) ▪ Lily Tuck (f)

2015	Adam Johnson (m)	<i>Fortune Smiles</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Karen E. Bender (f) ▪ Lauren Groff (f) ▪ Angela Flournoy (f) ▪ Hanya Yanagihara (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ David L. Ulin (chair) (m) ▪ Daniel Alarcón (m) ▪ Jeffery Renard Allen (m) ▪ Sarah Bagby (f) ▪ Laura Lippman (f)
2016	Colson Whitehead (m)	<i>The Underground Railroad</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Chris Bachelder (m) ▪ Paulette Jiles (f) ▪ Karan Mahajan (m) ▪ Jacqueline Woodson (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ James English (chair) (m) ▪ Karen Joy Fowler (f) ▪ T. Geronimo Johnson (m) ▪ Julie Otsuka (f) ▪ Jesmyn Ward (f)
2017	Jesmyn Ward (f)	<i>Sing, Unburied, Sing</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Elliot Ackerman (m) ▪ Lisa Ko (f) ▪ Min Jin Lee (f) ▪ Carmen Maria Machado (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jacqueline Woodson (chair) (f) ▪ Alexander Chee (m) ▪ Dave Eggers (m) ▪ Annie Philbrick (f) ▪ Karolina Waclawiak (f)
2018	Sigrid Nunez (f)	<i>The Friend</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Jamel Brinkley (m) ▪ Lauren Groff (f) ▪ Brandon Hobson (m) ▪ Rebecca Makkai (f) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Laila Lalami (chair) (f) ▪ Chris Bachelder (m) ▪ Min Jin Lee (f) ▪ Laurie Muchnick (f)

- Chinelo
Okparanta
(f)

Source: www.nationalbook.org, www.nbafictionblog.org