

Why Women Don't Win Literary Awards: The Saltire Society Literary Awards and Implicit Stereotyping

STEVIE MARSDEN

*CAMEo Research Institute for Cultural and Media Economies, University of Leicester,
Leicester, United Kingdom*

CAMEo, University of Leicester, 7 Salisbury Road, Leicester, LE1 7QR,

stevie.marsden@leicester.ac.uk

Dr Stevie Marsden is a Research Associate at CAMEo Research Institute for Cultural and Media Economies, University of Leicester. She completed her doctoral thesis, *The Saltire Society Literary Awards, 1926-2015: A Cultural History*, in 2016 at the University of Stirling's Centre for International Publishing and Communication. It is the first comprehensive analysis of the Saltire Society Literary Awards, Scotland's oldest series of book awards. Her research interests include book award culture, with a focus on how it intersects with gender, cultural, social and economic value, and the literary economy.

WORD COUNT 7674 (excl. bibliography & footnotes)

WHY WOMEN DON'T WIN LITERARY AWARDS: THE SALTIRE SOCIETY LITERARY AWARDS AND IMPLICIT STEREOTYPING

The purpose of this analysis is to consider the Saltire Society's Book of the Year and First Book of the Year Awards in relation to wider issues pertaining to media representations of Scottish literary and publishing culture. Through a statistical analysis of the Society's Book of the Year and First Book of the Year shortlists and winners between 1988 and 2014, this examination shows the extent to which the Society's Literary Awards reflect, as opposed to subvert, historic and existing gender imbalances in Scottish literary and publishing culture. Indeed, despite critics arguing that there was a change in tide in the late 1980s and early 1990s regarding the balance in gender representation in Scottish literature, this analysis suggests that Scotland's book award culture, and in turn, literary culture more widely, remains dominated by men. However, perceptions of the apparent 'balancing' of the gender disparity in Scottish writing do not align with the statistics discussed here, a fact further evidence by misconceptions held by members of the Society's own Literary Awards judging panels. Accordingly, this article contends that such misconceptions lend credence to the argument that the Society's judges have participated in implicit stereotyping based upon the 'culturally pervasive stereotype' (Banaji et al 1993: 278) that Scottish women writers play a 'minor' role in Scottish literary and publishing culture.

Key words: Scottish, women writers, book awards, Saltire Society, implicit stereotyping

This work was supported by the Arts and Humanities Research Council under Grant AH/J010200/1.

Introduction

Writing for the Book Machine blog in April 2013, Felice Howden argued that '[g]ender has no place in media coverage of [...] book awards by mainstream media' and argued that media coverage which focuses upon the gender imbalance of literary award shortlists and judging panels is 'perennially absurd' (Howden 2013). She continued, suggesting that news reportage of book awards continually relies upon an 'easy (and false) dichotomy' which is drawn from 'long-blurred gender lines' (Howden 2013). Howden's comments were written in response to an article on *The Guardian* newspaper's website which highlighted the fact that the shortlist for the 2013 Arthur C Clarke Award for science fiction was an all-male one, despite the judging panel being 'mostly female' (although, of course, this criticism is problematic as it is based on the assumption that women judges would be more likely to vote for women writers) (Flood 2013). Five months later, in September 2013, Lesley McDowell also wrote about women writers and contemporary book award culture. Writing in *The Herald* newspaper, McDowell focused her attention on what she believed to be a trend of Scottish women writers winning a variety of awards and accolades:

Two weeks ago Kerry Hudson, Aberdeen-born author of *Tony Hogan Bought Me An Ice-cream Float Before He Stole My Ma*, won the Scottish Mortgage and Investment Trust First Book Award. That's not so remarkable in itself until you realise she's the fifth woman to win this prize in the last six years, joining a mix of fiction and non-fiction writers like Sue Peebles, Sarah Gabriel, Andrea McNicoll and Jane McKie. Fellow nominee Jenni Fagan was hailed as one of Granta's Best Young British Writers earlier this year (and earned a selection for Oprah's Book Club and a New York Times review by Michiko Kakutani). Denise Mina topped it off by winning the Theakstons Old Peculiar Crime Novel of the Year Award for the second year in a row. (McDowell 2013)

Considering this run of success for Scottish women writers, McDowell questioned whether this was 'the beginning of a new "matrilineal" heritage, poised to take over fiction, poetry and non-fiction where a 'patrilineal' tradition ha[d] left off?' (McDowell 2013).

What such examples demonstrate is the contemporaneity and controversy of the issue of gender in relation to literary award culture in the UK. While Howden takes a vehement stand against what she views as a ‘non-existent’ distinction ‘between male and female writers’ (Howden 2013), Flood and McDowell use specific examples to draw attention to the evident and ongoing gender imbalances in literary award culture (Flood 2013; McDowell 2013). As the following quantitative and qualitative analysis of the Saltire Society Literary Awards, Scotland’s oldest series of awards for Scottish books, will illustrate, Howden’s arguments that coverage drawing attention to gender imbalance in literature is ‘lazy’ and belongs ‘in the past’ (Howden, 2013) is inherently flawed since, as this paper will demonstrate, seemingly systemic gender biases against women writers still proliferate in literary award culture to this day.

Do Women Writers Win Awards?

For many years gender has remained pertinent to conversations related to literary award culture. The Women’s Prize for Fiction (formerly the Orange Prize for Fiction (1996 – 2012) and Bailey’s Women’s Prize for Fiction (2013 – 2017)), for instance, was launched in 1996 in direct response to an all-male shortlist for the Booker Prize in 1991 and the fact that by 1992 ‘only 10 percent of novelists shortlisted for the Booker Prize had been women’ (Mosse 2013). Founded by the author Kate Mosse and literary agent Jane Gregory, the Bailey’s Prize is awarded annually to ‘any full length novel, written in English by a woman of any nationality’ (“Rules”, *Women’s Prize for Fiction*, 2013). The launch of the Women’s Prize for Fiction, which only accepts submissions from women writers, was marred by criticism that the award was sexist, with the Booker Prize winning author A S Byatt saying that she was ‘against anything which ghettoises women’ (MacDonald 1996: 2). Indeed, controversies surrounding the award continue to resurface over 20 years after it was first conferred. In 2012, Sebastian Shakespeare argued that ‘[w]omen just don’t need the Orange Prize’, and that the award was

‘rightly attacked as patronising and positive discrimination gone wrong’ when it was founded (Shakespeare 2012: 15). More recently, in 2016 Lionel Shriver, the former Orange Prize for Fiction winner (Shriver won the £30,000 award in 2005 for her bestselling novel *We Need To Talk About Kevin* (2003)), suggested that winning the award was ‘not as meaningful’ as winning the Man Booker, since the Women’s Prize for Fiction ‘eliminate[s] half the human race from applying’ (Flood 2016). Some of the prize’s winners have, however, questioned the motives of such negative attitudes to a prize which is given to women writers only. Linda Grant, who won the Orange Prize in 2000 for *When I Lived in Modern Times* (2000)¹ has argued that the reason why the Orange Prize received, and continues to receive, so much criticism, is because of the ‘amount of money involved’ (Kennedy 2000). Grant continued to suggest that ‘[m]en that moan about the fact that they’re not eligible for the prize and complain that it is sexist have no understanding of what sexism means’ (Parker and Grant 2010: 133).

As such criticisms, and defences, of awards for women writers have burgeoned in recent years, so too have statistical analyses which highlight the gender disparity of book awards open to both men and women. In 2015, the author Nicola Griffith published a statistical analysis of the gender balance of the Pulitzer Prize, Man Booker Prize, National Book Award, National Book Critics’ Circle Award, the Hugo Award and the Newbery Medal between 2000 and 2014 (Griffith 2015). Griffith’s study focused upon the gender of authors and protagonists of books which had won the above awards over a fifteen year period. From her study, Griffith came to the conclusion that the majority of books written by women that win major awards are written from the perspective of a male protagonist, going as far to say that ‘the more prestigious the award, the more likely the subject of the narrative will be male’ (Griffith 2015). The results of

¹ It is worth noting that Grant’s Orange Prize win was marred in its own controversy, when allegations of plagiarism were anonymously released to the media in the days following her win. The accusation related to Grant’s winning book reproducing writing by the academic and author A J Sherman and in later paperback editions of the text, Sherman’s influence is acknowledged. (Kennedy, ‘Orange prize winner rejects claims of plagiarism’, 2000).

Griffith's study were startling: of the fifteen books that won the Man Booker Prize for Fiction between 2000 and 2014, only two were written by women and were about women or girls and none of the fifteen Pulitzer Prize winners during this period were books about women/girls *and* written by women. Such results led Griffiths to conclude that: 'The literary establishment doesn't like books about women' (Griffith 2015).

More recently still, studies undertaken by Savannah Lambert at the University of Pennsylvania as part of James F. English's 'Novel of the Year' class found that between 1990 and 2016 men won 63% of the three major book awards – the National Book Award, the Pulitzer Prize and the National Book Critics Circle Award – in the US. Like Griffith's examination of women in award culture, Lambert's study showed that 'not only do women win these awards less frequently, but that books by women and men are less likely to win if they focus on women or girls as the main characters' (Ahlborn, 2018). While Lambert acknowledges that it is difficult to identify 'a single definitive cause of the gender gap we're seeing among award winners', she believes the 'first step is just pointing out what the issues are' (Ahlborn, 2018).

Other UK-based awards tell a similar story. The Saltire Society's Literary Awards (which now include prizes for Fiction, Non-Fiction, Poetry, First Books, Research Books and History Books, and the winner of each category is shortlisted for the Scottish Book of the Year Award) are Scotland's oldest series of awards which reward literature from, and about, Scotland. The Society has been awarding Scottish books (in some way or another and at times sporadically) since the Society's founding in 1936. The earliest awards were referred to as 'commendations' and came with little, or no, monetary reward. However, the Book of the Year Award, which included fiction, poetry and non-fiction books (until these categories were expanded into their own awards in 2015) was formally instituted as an annual award in 1982, and soon followed by the founding of the First Book of the Year Award in 1988. As a precursor

to the deeper examination of gender disparity in Scottish literature through the Saltire Society Literary Awards presented in this article, I borrowed Griffith's method and terms, to complete an assessment of the representation of women writers and protagonists among the winners of the Saltire Society's Book of the Year Award between the same time period used by Griffith (2000-2014)² and this examination yielded similarly disconcerting results.³

Of the fifteen books which won the Book of the Year Award between 2000 and 2014, ten were written by men and focused on 'the perspective of a male protagonist'. Additionally, of the four women writers who won the award during this fifteen year period, only two, Liz Lochhead and Janice Galloway, wrote about women protagonists in *Medea* and *Clara* respectively. The other winning books by women writers, Kate Atkinson's *Case Histories* and A L Kennedy's *Day*, dealt with the male experience.⁴ Such results appear to undermine the optimistic reverie cited at the beginning of this article which suggested Scotland's literary culture may buck trends and follow a more 'matrilinal' lineage (McDowell 2013). However, McDowell also acknowledged the 'long-standing patrilineal nature of the Scottish literary tradition', suggesting that this is a tradition which:

[...] still sees Scottish Literature departments at universities dominated by studies of Fergusson, Burns, Hogg, Scott and Stevenson. It's a tradition that asks: who will be the successor to Alasdair Gray and write the next *Lanark*, the next great bench-mark in Scottish fiction? Who will be the successor to James Kelman and be the next Scot to win the Booker Prize? (McDowell 2013)

² The Saltire Society is a Scottish cultural charity which aims to celebrate the full breadth of Scotland's cultural landscape, holding events and presenting awards for architecture, literature, civil engineering, and arts and crafts in Scotland.

³ Griffith's 'analysed the last 15 years' results for half a dozen book-length fiction awards: Pulitzer Prize, Man Booker Prize, National Book Award, National Book Critics' Circle Award, Hugo Award, and Newbery Medal.' Her method was to 'collate the gender of the writer (I assumed that when reviews talked about an author as "she" or "he" that author identifies as female or male respectively) with that of their protagonist/s (whether in first or third person); sometimes based on my own reading of the book, more often on reviews.' (Griffiths, 'Books about women don't win big awards: some data', 2015).

⁴ It is worth noting that in 2015 Ali Smith won the Society's Fiction Book of the Year Award for *How to Be Both* (2014), a novel which interweaves the stories of the Renaissance painter Francesco del Cossa and a young woman called George. However, Smith lost out on the Scottish Book of the Year Award to the Research Book of the Year winner *The Scottish Town in the Age of Enlightenment 1740-1820* (2014) by Bob Harris and Charles McKean.

For McDowell, the ‘unspoken assumption behind these male-dominated questions is inevitable: it will be a man [...] [t]hat's the way our tradition goes’ (McDowell 2013). When it comes to the representation of women writers in Scottish literature, this appears to be the crux of the matter: Scottish women writers are consistently side-lined in favour of their male counterparts.

As these small, snapshot studies indicate, there is much to be said about the recognition and representation of women writers in literary award culture. A more detailed examination of the Saltire Society Literary Awards’ relationship with both women writers and judges is imperative to acquiring an understanding of how these particular awards function within contemporary Scottish literary and publishing culture and the rest of this article will be dedicated to a comprehensive analysis of the Saltire Society’s Literary Awards in terms of gender balance. The shortlists for the Society’s Book of the Year and First Book of the Year Awards not only offer an insight into the propagation of books written by Scottish women writers since 1982, but are also reflective of the status of women writers within Scottish literary and publishing culture more widely. Although entries made to the Saltire Society’s Book of the Year and First Book of the Year Award only represent a small selection of the literature being produced by Scottish writers since 1982, as it only includes books actually nominated for the Society’s Literary Awards and received and read by the judges, this data is nonetheless useful in contributing to building a picture of the impact and role of Scottish women writers upon the Scottish literary landscape in the late 20th and early 21st century.

Women Writers in Scotland

The Saltire Society Literary Awards are intimately associated with discussions regarding Scottish women writers since a number of the key figures in critical academic discourse about gender and Scottish literature are former Saltire Society Literary Award judges (a fact which

emphasises that the Scottish literary community is a relatively small one). While such critical literature does not discuss literary award culture in any detail, these scholarly works, as well as contemporaneous commentary regarding the representation of women writers in Scotland, are invaluable to an analysis of women writers and Scottish literary award culture. The definitions and parameters by which the term ‘Scottish women writers’ is used throughout this analysis, for example, is discussed in much of the literature related to this topic.⁵ As noted by Gifford and McMillan (Gifford and McMillan 1997: xv), and Christianson and Lumsden (Christianson and Lumsden 2000: 2-3), terms such as ‘Scottish’, ‘women’ and ‘writer’ are unstable classifications. The flexibility of such terms is particularly pertinent to book awards, which rely on rules of eligibility as a means of classification for an author’s entitlement for an award. However, since the most important criterion of eligibility for the Society’s Literary Awards is the geographic status or national identity of the author, and all of the books considered in this analysis will adhere to these particular terms, the ‘Scottishness’ of the women writers discussed therein is determined in terms of the Society’s own terms of eligibility.⁶

Before moving on to a detailed statistical analysis of the gender balance of the Saltire Society Book of the Year and First Book of the Year Award shortlists and winners, it is important to establish the wider cultural and historical contexts of the promotion and representation of women in Scottish literature and publishing culture from the 1980s to the 2000s. Historically, Scottish women writers were ignored or overlooked when it came to the narration of Scotland’s literary history. As the editors of one of the first major scholarly texts studying Scottish women writers Douglas Gifford and Dorothy McMillan, suggested that they

⁵ See, for example: D. Gifford and D. McMillan, *History of Scottish Women’s Writing*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1997; A. Christianson and A. Lumsden, *Contemporary Scottish Women Writers*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000; Monica Germana, *Scottish Women’s Gothic and Fantastic Writing: Fiction Since 1978*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2010; and, Glenda Norquay, ed., *The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Women’s Writing*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2012.

⁶ The Saltire Society Literary Award’s invites entries from the publishers of authors of Scottish descent or living in Scotland, or dealing with the work or life of a Scot, a Scottish question, event or situation. Books are accepted in English, Gaelic and Scots, and can be published anywhere in the world.

could 'claim with some confidence that what has in the past been perceived as the "Scottish Tradition in Literature" has been both male generated and male fixated' (Gifford and McMillan 1997: xix). This tendency for Scottish women's writing to be ostracised from literary histories and, ultimately, from the formation of the British literary canon, is, Gifford and McMillan argue, particularly significant since Scottish women writers have not only been viewed as 'unequal to their male Scottish counterparts' but have also been viewed 'as junior literary sisters of English women writers' (Gifford and McMillan 1997: xix). One of the terms Gifford and McMillan use to describe the way in which Scottish women writers have been historically viewed is 'minor'. In other words, Scottish women writers have been continually portrayed as playing lesser roles in the development of Scotland's literary and cultural development.

Such negation of the work of women writers was cause for debate in the 1980s and 1990s. In an article entitled 'Superiorism' published in an issue of the Scottish literary journal *Cencrastus* in early 1984, Carol Anderson and Glenda Norquay argued that 'the cultural life of Scotland [...] has been largely dominated by men' (Anderson and Norquay 1984: 8). Anderson and Norquay also theorised that the 'potential contribution of women to contemporary Scottish culture ha[d] been stunted' by the failure of the Scottish Enlightenment of the 18th century to recognise the historic contribution by women to Scottish culture (Anderson and Norquay 1984: 9). Similarly, writing in a special edition of *Chapman* entitled 'The Women's Forum' ten years later, Joy Hendry noted how a previous edition of the journal, 'Woven by Women', published in 1980, was 'a milestone [...] as the first Scottish publication to focus on women's cultural achievement across the artistic spectrum in Scotland' (Hendry 1993: 3). Hendry continued, arguing that, in the early 1980s writers and commentators 'still had to argue that in almost every field not only *could* women contribute to good work, but they *already had*' (Hendry 1993: 3). Also writing in 'The Women's Forum', the Scottish writer and poet Tessa Ransford suggested that such issues relating to the denigration of women writers

and artists remained pertinent in the early 1990s. In an essay entitled 'The Case of the Intellectual Woman', Ransford argued that 'intellectual women' were a 'phenomenon which our society in Scotland or in the UK generally is not entirely happy with' (Ransford 1993: 148). Ransford continued to suggest that '[t]he intellectual woman is in serious danger of decapitation in our society, now as in the past. Her head is of value only if cut off from her body and her body appreciated only if cut off from her head.' (Ransford 1993: 152).

More recently, a positive approach has been taken when considering the representation and influence of Scottish women writers upon Scottish culture and literature. In *Contemporary Scottish Women Writers*, Alison Lumsden and Aileen Christianson note how the exclusion of Scottish women writers in discussions of Scotland's literary and cultural development in the 1970s and 1980s was followed by an influx of writing from Scottish women in the 1990s. This escalation of writing from Scottish women necessitated that the contribution from Scottish women writers to Scotland's literary landscape be re-examined:

The 1990s have seen the addition of many new Scottish women writing from a more confident assumption that being female and being Scottish are linked and culturally positive. The breadth of the work of contemporary Scottish women writers now ensures the redrawing of the literary map of Scotland, allowing for these writers a natural assumption of place in a culture previously more accessible to male Scottish writers. Women writers have become fully part of 'the bedrock' of this 'small/and multitudinous country'. (Christian and Lumsden 2000: 1)

Such comments suggest that, while Scottish women writers had been absent, or completely ignored, for much of the 1970s and 1980s, the 1990s appeared to bring with it a new age of Scottish literary culture which saw women writers recognized for their contribution to Scotland's literary and publishing industries.

The Saltire Society Literary Awards and Women Writers

A statistical analysis of the gender balance of the Saltire Society Book of the Year and First Book of the Year Award shortlists, winners and judging panels offers one way in which such hypotheses regarding the upsurge of women writers in Scotland in the 1990s can be quantified and also helps to determine the extent to which the Saltire Society and its Literary Awards reflected such prejudices against Scottish women writers. The following quantitative examination contributes to existing scholarship about Scottish women writers, and the representation of women writers in book award culture more generally, by providing data which quantifies perceived trends in contemporary Scottish literature.

The statistics for this analysis are taken from the lists of nominations and shortlists of the Saltire Society's Book of the Year and First Book of the Year Awards since 1982 and 1988 respectively. However, when it comes to comparative analyses of the two awards' representation of women writers, only data from 1988 to 2014 will be used for the Book of the Year Award so as to ensure the comparative analysis with the First Book of the Year Award is balanced. As the longest running and most consistently granted of the Society's Literary Awards, the records for the Book of the Year and First Book of the Year Awards are the most comprehensive and therefore the most fruitful to analyse. In order to make this count as precise as possible, entries solely authored or edited by women have been counted alongside books by multiple authors, which include men and women. If an entry is authored by both men and women, each author receives the same credit (a count of '1'). If a writer has more than one book nominated or shortlisted in any given year, each book has received a count towards the total number of entries (for example, in 1991 two of James Kelman's books were submitted for the Book of the Year Award). The purpose of such methods of calculation is to ensure the most accurate totalling of the number of books by men and women writers nominated or shortlisted for the Society's Book of the Year and First Book of the Year Awards.

Between 1982 and 2014 over 2,026 books were submitted for the Society's Book of the Year and First Book of the Year awards⁷, of this total number of entries, just under a third – 640 entries – are authored, co-authored or edited by women⁸. As Table 3 shows, the number

⁷ Since the Book of the Year and the First Book of the Year awards were adjudicated by the same judging panel, for many years the nominations for each category were not organised separately. Accordingly, the total figure of nominations, 2,026, includes nominations for both the Book of the Year and First Book of the Year. While efforts were made to determine exactly which books adhered to the Society's criteria of eligibility of 'first' books and which did not, it was often difficult to definitively ascertain this because biographical information for some authors is unavailable or conflicting. Therefore, for simplicity, the gender breakdown of the total number of nominations amalgamates the figures for both the Book of the Year and First Book of the Year awards.

⁸ This total does not include submissions for 2000 and 2009 as records for these years are unavailable. The records of the annual submissions for the Society's Book of the Year and First Book of the Year have been collated using a pre-existing database created by the Saltire Society which was supplemented with submissions lists from previous years in the Society's archives.

of entries submitted for the Saltire Society's Book of the Year and First Book of the Year Awards by women writers almost always accounted for around a third of the total number of entries in any given year and, on average, the percentage of entries from women writers per year was 28%. There are, however, a number of years in which the number of entries from women writers constituted a larger number of the total entries: 2006 (43%), 2013 (42%) and 2014 (40%). In 1985 four of the eight entries nominated for the Book of the Year award were by women writers, but this balance of nominations was not reflected in the shortlist: of the six books shortlisted for the 1985 Book of the Year Award only one, Naomi Mitchison's *Among you Taking Notes*, was authored solely by a woman. The other book shortlisted for the award which included the work of a woman writer was *Lean Tales*, a collection of short stories by Agnes Owens, Alasdair Gray and James Kelman.

However, to conduct a more nuanced analysis of the representation of gender in the Saltire Society Book of the Year and First Book of the Year Awards, each award must be considered in turn, beginning with an analysis of the breakdown of shortlists and winners for the Book of the Year award. It remains important, however, to note that while the following analyses only considers data from 1988 onwards, women were shortlisted for the Book of the Year award between 1982 and 1988. Dorothy Dunnett was shortlisted for the inaugural Book of the Year award, receiving a 'commendation' for her novel *King Hereafter* (the Society's commendations came with no monetary reward, but were a formal recognition of a particular book shortlisted in that year). Naomi Mitchison's memoir *Among you Taking Notes* and Jessie Kesson's collection of short stories *Where the Apple Ripens & Other Stories* were shortlisted in 1985 and 1986 respectively. Mitchison's novel *Early in Orcadia* was also shortlisted in 1987, alongside Muriel Sparks' *The Stories of Muriel Spark*, which won the award. Sparks' collection was the first book by a woman to win the Society's Book of the Year Award.

To return to the data considering the Book of the Year award between 1988 and 2014, of the 185 books shortlisted for the award during this time, 59 (32%) of these were by women. Of these 59 shortlisted for the award, only seven women went on to actually win the award (see Table 1). Following Sparks' win in 1987, Liz Lochhead was the next woman to win the award for her play *Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off* in 1989. However, this award was shared with Allan Massie's *A Question of Loyalties*. The next woman to win the award was A. L. Kennedy in 1995 for her second novel *So I am Glad*, but this was also conferred jointly, with Kennedy sharing the award with Neal Ascherson's collection of essays *Black Sea*. As a result, the next woman to be the sole recipient of the Book of the Year Award – nearly fifteen years after Sparks' win in 1987 – was Liz Lochhead for her play *Medea* in 2001. Following Lochhead's win in 2001, the Book of the Year award was conferred to women writers four more times up to 2015. Consequently, even though women writers comprised 32% of all shortlisted entries for the Book of the Year Award between 1988 and 2014, they represented just 12% of Book of the Year Award winners.

Women writers appear to have fared slightly better when it comes to the Saltire Society's First Book of the Year Award. Of the thirty-one winners of the award between 1988 and 2014, twelve (39%) of these were women. Four of these awards were conferred jointly, with Sian Hayton, A. L. Kennedy, Ali Smith, Kate Clanchy, Meghan Delahunt, Maggie Fergusson, Eleanor Thom and Sarah Fraser being the sole recipients of the award (see Table 2). However, despite the fact that women writers have historically been better represented in the First Book of the Year shortlists – accounting for a near equal 48% of the books shortlisted for the award – similarly to the Society's Book of the Year Award, when it comes to the selection of winners, there is a 10% drop in women writers. This diminution in the representation of women writers during the progression from shortlist to winner within the Society's Book of the Year and First Book of the Year Awards indicates that something must

happen in the final stages of the judging process that leads to the regular exclusion of women writers. The final section of this paper offers an examination of these statistics in terms of the Saltire Society's Literary Awards judging panel and implicit stereotyping.

The Saltire Society Literary Awards and Implicit Stereotyping

There are a number of factors that may influence the absence of women writers from the nominations, shortlists and winner's roll calls for the Saltire Society Literary Awards. For instance, the Society's literary award judges can only evaluate books which are eligible for the award and have been nominated by publishers (or, as was often the case, noticed by judges and requested from publishers) in any given year. So if fewer women writers were published in general during this period, the Society's nominations and shortlists would reflect this. Indeed, some of the Society's Literary Award judges have anecdotally suggested that there were fewer women being published, in Scotland at least, in the late 1980s through to the mid-late 1990s. Alison Lumsden, who co-authored *Contemporary Scottish Women Writers* in 2000, was a member of the Society's Literary Awards judging panel between 1998 and 2004 and became the Chair of the Research Book of the Year Award Panel in 2014, speculated that 'it's probably true that there were more books by men than women published' during the six year gap in which no women won the Society's Book of the Year Award between 1989 and 1995 (Lumsden in conversation with author 2014).

Lumsden's hypothesis was echoed by former Saltire Society Literary Award judge (2004-2010) and current Chief Executive of Publishing Scotland, Marion Sinclair. Sinclair, who was Editorial and Marketing Assistant at Polygon between 1988 and 1990, and Editorial Director at Polygon between 1990 and 1997, agreed that there was likely a gender imbalance in Scottish literary and publishing culture during the 1980s, noting that literature in the 1980s

‘would probably have been heavily male dominated’ (Sinclair in conversation with author 2014). Sinclair continued, observing that:

[W]hen I think back to the eighties in terms of the women, in terms of the female writers [...] Agnes Owens was around then, Liz Lochhead, Shena MacKay, but there probably weren't all that many female Scottish novelists in the mid-eighties, between say '82 and '88. I think things probably started getting better in 1988 [...] I'm guessing that towards the late eighties [...] women writers - both in terms of poetry and fiction - began to come up in terms of numbers. (Sinclair 2014)

Such retrospective hypotheses suggesting that there were more men being published in Scotland than women is supported both by the data gathered from the Book of the Year and First Book of the Year award nominations, shortlists and winners discussed above, and, by the critical works cited at the beginning of this analysis. The critical works of Gifford, McMillan, Norquay and Anderson all indicate that women writers were systematically ignored or forgotten, or simply did not exist, within Scotland's literary and publishing histories: a fact borne out by the Saltire Society Literary Awards. Likewise, the contemporaneity of the articles by Anderson and Norquay (1984) and Ransford (1993) indicate that this was an issue recognised by Scottish women writers working in Scotland at the time.

However, while it could be suggested that the gender imbalance of the Society's Book of the Year and First Book of the Year Award nominations merely reflect this general gender imbalance within Scottish literary culture, it does not explain why women writers are less likely to make it through to the final stages of the Society's adjudication process than their male counterparts. If the Society's figures were simply reflecting the presence of women writers in the industry more generally, we would still expect to see a consistent representation of women throughout each stage of the competition at the very least. However, the fact that the representation of women writers drops by 20% from the shortlists to the winners for the Book of the Year Award and by 10% for the First Book of the Year Award suggests there are discrepancies at the final stages of the competition that cannot be explained by chance and lack

of representation in the industry alone. If the probability of women writers winning the awards does not reflect their statistical representation within the data sets, it may be that there are other factors which influence the selection of women writers as winners. For example, if there were more women on the judging panel in the years women writers won the award, one might expect this to influence the selection of women winners. Yet, in the years in which women were recipients of the Book of the Year Award (1987, 1989, 1995, 2001, 2002, 2005, 2007 and 2014) the judging panels were rarely balanced in terms of gender. Between 1987 and 1993, the academic and writer Isobel Murray was the only woman on a panel of up to seven people. Theatre critic Joyce McMillan joined the panel in 1994 and Alison Lumsden joined in 1998. Following the addition of McMillan and Lumsden, there were a number of years (1999, 2000, 2003) during which the gender balance of the panel of six was evenly split. However, in all other years between 1998 and 2005 (when Lumsden left the panel and Marion Sinclair joined), the balance of the panel shifted to four men and three women.

The writer and academic Ian Campbell is the longest standing member of the Saltire Society's Literary Award judging panel and stated that when he became chair of the panel, and had 'some influence' over the selection of the panel's members, he intended for there to be 'an equal representation of genders' (Ian Campbell in discussion with the author 2014). This concept of having a balanced judging panel, Campbell suggested, was 'still quite a new idea' when he became co-chair of the panel with Douglas Gifford in 1995 (Campbell, 2014). When speaking about the gender balance of the judging panel retrospectively, the judges actually recall more balance to the panel than there really was. Ann Matheson, who joined the panel in 2006, believed that the Literary Awards judging panel was balanced and that, as long as she had been a member 'it's always been balanced [...] probably about 50/50' (Ann Matheson in discussion with the author 2014). Matheson continued to say that '[i]n my time there have always been four women' (Matheson 2014). This, however, does not seem to be case.

According to contemporaneous documentation Matheson joined the panel in 2006; joining Joyce McMillan and Marion Sinclair as the only three women on a panel of seven judges and between 2006 and 2013, there were only ever three women on the panel (Claire Squires replaced Sinclair when she stepped down from the panel in 2010). However, in recent correspondence, Matheson reaffirmed that when she joined the panel it consisted of herself, Marion Sinclair, Joyce MacMillan *and* Isobel Murray: ‘I can definitely confirm that Isobel and I were on the panel together. We sat beside one another during panel meetings and she was a very feisty woman.’ (Matheson 2018a) Matheson also remarked that,

When Isobel stepped down, I do recall that there was a lot of discussion about finding another woman panel member but finding panel members of either gender was not very easy in the days when panel members had to read all the books (Matheson 2018b)

This confusion over the make-up of the Society’s Literary Awards judging panel, and the fact that the Society’s own records do not align with the panel members’ memories of events, exemplifies further the Society’s confused and, seemingly incomplete, history with regards to its award panels’ gender parity. Indeed, such uncertainty surrounding the gender balance amongst the panel is also reflected in comments from Lumsden regarding the disproportion of male to female winners of the awards. On hearing about the large gaps between women writers winning the Book of the Year award, Lumsden was surprised but argued that she ‘didn’t perceive any gender bias at all in the [panel]’ (Lumsden 2014). She continued to suggest that ‘obviously the gender balance was good [...] but you never got a sense that gender was really an issue at all in the discussions’ (Lumsden 2014). While Lumsden maintained that, from her perspective, there was no ‘positive’ bias towards women writers and that ‘there was never a sense of “well we better give it to a woman”’, she also suggested that the attitudes of the women who were members of the panel would have prevented any negative bias *against* women writers, indicating that she, Murray and McMillan would ‘almost [be] watching out for female writers’ (Lumsden 2014). Such discrepancies between the statistical imbalance of women and

men writers and judges, as well as the inconsistencies between individual memories and historical detail suggest that there is a complex and entrenched level of gender bias at work within the Saltire Society's Literary Awards that, while inadvertent, no less affects the outcome of the awards themselves.

It is with this in mind that I propose that the gender bias against Scottish women writers within the Society's Literary Awards is evidence of *implicit stereotyping* (Banaji and Greenwald 1995). This approach⁹ contends that 'incidental exposure to stereotypical knowledge unconsciously, yet selectively, influences judgment' and that 'stereotypes and attitudes can operate unconsciously' (Banaji et al 1993: 272). Banaji et al go on to argue that '[c]ulturally pervasive stereotypes about social groups, whether consciously accepted or rejected by the individual, may produce stereotyped judgments, even by members of the stereotyped group (Banaji et al 1993: 278). Within the context of the Saltire Society Literary Awards, the 'culturally pervasive stereotype' is the historic notion that women writers are absent from Scottish literary culture because they are not as talented or accomplished as their male counterparts.

Such implicit stereotyping is further exemplified by the way in which the Society and the Literary Award judges administrate and discuss the awards. As women writers are more likely to be shortlisted for, and win, the First Book of the Year Award, it could be argued that this has made the award more accessible for women writers. However, the First Book of the Year Award has repeatedly been presented and viewed as a 'minor' award by the Society and Literary Award judges, both in terms of economic and cultural value. For the first two years of its existence, the prize fund for the First Book of the Year was £1,000, £500 less than for the

⁹ Banaji, Hardin and Rothman, as well as Banaji and Greenwald, have come to conclusions regarding implicit stereotyping following experiments assessing the 'involvement of memory and other cognitive processes in stereotyping' with regards to gendered judgments of fame. Their work, which indicates that both men and women have a propensity to associate fame and prestige with men rather than women, is a good basis from which to assess how implicit bias may affect the Saltire Society Literary Award judges' judgment of men and women writers. (Banaji and Greenwald, 'Implicit Stereotyping and Prejudice', p.63)

Book of the Year Award. In 1990 the prize funds for both awards were raised: the Book of the Year was increased to £5,000 and the First Book of the Year was increased to £1,500. Between 1990 and 2014 the First Book of the Year Award prize fund remained £3,500 less than the Book of the Year and this only changed with the introduction of a new prize fund system in 2014 which saw all Saltire Society Literary Award category winners receive £2,000. Therefore, winners of the First Book of the Year award between 1990 and 2014 received 70% less than Book of the Year award winners and since women writers are statistically more likely to win the First Book of the Year Award, this economic imbalance mirrors the society-wide inequities between the income of men and women.¹⁰

Moreover, on numerous occasions, internal reports and minutes from judging panel meetings have referred to the Book of the Year award as the ‘main’ award. Minutes from a meeting of the Literary Award judging panel held on Wednesday 25th September 1996 referred to the entry lists for the Book of the Year and First Book of the Year awards as the ‘main list’ and ‘First Book list’ respectively (NLS Acc 13517/31). This happened again in 2002, 2006 and 2008 (NLS Acc 13517/31). Such semantic differentiation between the awards also occurred in correspondence between the Society’s Administrator, Kathleen Munro, and representatives from sponsors. In a letter to an employee of *The Scotsman* newspaper, who sponsored the Book of the Year award between 1988 and 2000, Munro stated that ‘*The Scotsman* has supported the main Award since 1988’ (NLS Acc 12393/84). The use of such terminology can be interpreted in a number of ways. With regards to the private meeting minutes that are only circulated among the Society’s Council and Literary Award judges, referring to the Book of the Year as the ‘main prize’ may well have been an innocuous means of easily and quickly distinguishing between the awards. Similarly, given the First Book of

¹⁰ According to a report published by the Chartered Management Institute (CMI) and employment law advisor XpertHR, women earn up to 35% less than men in similar occupations, a figure that emulates the economic difference between the Society’s Book of the Year and First Book of the Year Awards. (Goodley, ‘Gender Pay Gap: Female Bosses Earn 35% Less Than Male Colleagues’).

the Year Award's status as an award for first books, its so-called 'minor' status may also relate to the early career status of the author. A number of authors, such as A. L. Kennedy, Ali Smith and Michel Faber who have won the First Book of the Year Award (in 1991, 1995 and 1999 respectively) have gone on to win the Society's Book of the Year Award (in 2007, 2014 and 2015 respectively). Such patterns contribute to the construction of the narrative that the First Book of the Year Award is a 'minor' award received early in an author's career before they win the 'major' Book of the Year Award once they are recognised as an established author. However, the fact that such vocabulary was also used in correspondence with sponsors of the awards, suggests that this terminology may have been used as a means of reinforcing the import and prestige of the Book of the Year award over and above that of the First Book of the Year award. In both instances there is a sense that the value and prestige of the Book of the Year is more important than that of the First Book of the Year.

While such semantic occurrences are likely unintentional developments that are only used, from the perspective of the Society's administrators and judges, to easily differentiate between the awards in private correspondence, by referring to the Book of the Year award as the 'main' award, the Literary Award judging panel and representatives of the Society have inadvertently placed the First Book of the Year award in the position of being the antonymous 'minor' Award. Consequently, since this is the award that women writers are more likely to be shortlisted for and win, there is a sense that the Society's Literary Awards are maintaining the traditional characterisation, or stereotype, of Scottish women writers as 'minor' contributors to Scottish literary culture, as highlighted by Gifford and McMillan (Gifford and McMillan 1997: xix). Such reiteration of the 'minor' status of Scottish women writers is demonstrative of what Banaji et al refer to as the 'cumulative effects of individual stereotyped judgments' (Banaji et al 1993: 279). Once adopted from external influences (i.e. Scottish literary culture and society more widely), such 'stereotyped judgments' are unknowingly

perpetuated among the Society's Literary Award judges. Writing about the formation of implicit and explicit attitudes within groups, and how these relate to individual responses or interpretations of attitudes and stereotypes, A. R. McConnell et al explain that 'group knowledge may impact implicit attitude formation even when perceivers devote considerable cognitive resources to understanding social targets' (McConnell et al 2008: 793). In other words, even if individual panel members (or 'perceivers') express opinions which acknowledge the lack of recognition of Scottish women's writing (i.e. show 'understanding [to] social targets'), as Lumsden did when reflecting upon her experience as a judge, the individual implicit opinions of a panel member will likely be influenced by the groups' more universal opinion which, in turn, is influenced by external cultural biases.

This argument goes some way to explaining why certain members of the panel recall a greater gender balance to the awards and the judging panels than there really was. The fact that Lumsden and Matheson remember being part of a panel that was gender balanced is indicative of how their personal attitudes have implicitly influenced their interpretation of historic events. As Ziva Kundra suggests: 'we may have inaccurate memories of our own past behavior and attitudes [...] we may be mistaken about the prevalence of various attitudes and behaviors among our peers' (Kundra 1999: 5). Since Lumsden and Matheson regard themselves as being sympathetic to the issue of gender balance, they have not only assumed that their principles were reflected in the selection of award winners during their time as judges, but also incorrectly recall the general attitude of the panel as being entirely impartial to gender. (This notion, however, is based on the apparent complete omission of discussions of gender by the Society's Literary Award judges, as opposed to explicit prejudice against women writers being expressed during panel meetings.) Nevertheless, the statistical analyses of the gender imbalance of the shortlists and winners of the Book of the Year and First Book of the Year awards included herewith denote that this cannot be the case. The Society's gender imbalance

appears to be both reflective and symptomatic of wider issues within Scotland's literary and cultural history. A statement which is further substantiated by the fact that the gender imbalance evident in the Society's Book of the Year and First Book of the Year Award shortlists is narrowing as society seemingly becomes more conscious of gender disparity more generally. Comparing the five years at the start of each decade (1990 – 1994, 2000 – 2004 and 2010 – 2014), for example, shows that the inequality between the number of men to women authors being shortlisted for the Book of the Year and First Book of the Year Awards has reduced. In terms of the First Book of the Year Award, the change has been dramatic, with women writers accounting for 32% of the total number of shortlistees between 1990 and 1994, with this rising to 57% (2000 – 2004) and 67% (2010 – 2014). The change to the Book of the Year shortlists has, however, been incremental, with just under a quarter (24%) of shortlisted books between 1990 and 1994 coming from women writers. This rose to 34% between 2000 and 2004, but only to 36% between 2010 and 2014, indicating that the Society's gender inequities, particularly in relation to the Book of the Year Award, are not levelling as quickly as might be expected.

Conclusion

The purpose of this analysis was to consider the Saltire Society's Book of the Year and First Book of the Year awards in relation to wider issues pertaining to gender representation in Scottish literary and publishing culture. What this examination has shown is the extent to which the Society's Literary Awards reflect, as opposed to subvert, historic and existing gender imbalances in Scottish literary and publishing culture. There has been a historic failure to recognise women writers in Scotland which is reflected in the Society's Book of the Year and First Book of the Year shortlists and winners roll calls. Despite the fact that critics argued that there was a change in tide in the late 1980s and early 1990s regarding the gender balance in

Scottish literature more broadly, this analysis suggests that Scotland's literary culture, and in turn, book award culture, was dominated by men. The fact that *perceptions* of the gender imbalance in Scottish writing do not align with the statistics discussed here parallels the misconceptions held by members of the Society's Literary Awards judging panels. This lends credence to the argument that the Society's judges have participated in implicit stereotyping based upon the 'culturally pervasive stereotype' (Banaji et al 1993: 279) that Scottish women writers play a 'minor' role in Scottish literary and publishing culture, hence the propensity for women writers to be more likely to win the oft-called 'minor' First Book of the Year Award rather than the Book of the Year Award.

This analysis reveals that the perception of the Saltire Society's unbiased observance of the work of Scottish women writers is inaccurate: Scottish women writers were statistically less likely than their male counterparts to be shortlisted for, or go on to win, the Society's Book of the Year or First Book of the Year Awards. This paper considers this outcome to be an example of implicit stereotype bias which reflects the historical (non-)representation of Scottish women writers in literature more widely. Reading these results alongside critical discussions of the position of women writers within Scotland demonstrates how the Saltire Society's bias mirrored the systemic gender imbalances within Scottish literary culture more generally. Further analysis of the representation of women writers in Scotland's publishing history is undoubtedly needed to advance this area of critical inquiry: however, this analysis of how the Saltire Society's Literary Awards engage with gender issues has started the process of identifying misconceptions that surround gender in relation to Scottish literary award and Scottish literary and publishing culture more widely.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank the AHRC for funding this research and the Saltire Society for granting me access to their archives.

Works Cited

- Ahlborn, Susan (2018), 'The Award Gender Gap,' *Omnia*, 25 January, at <https://omnia.sas.upenn.edu/story/award-gender-gap> (accessed 16 April 2018).
- Anderson, Carol and Norquay, Glenda (1984), 'Superiorism', *Cencrastaus*, 15, pp. 8-10.
- Banaji, Mahzarin R., Hardin, C., & Rothman, A. J. (1993). 'Implicit stereotyping in person judgment.', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65:2, 272.
- Banaji, Mahzarin R. and Greenwald, Anthony G. (1994) 'Implicit Stereotyping and Prejudice', in M. P. Zanna and J. M. Olson (eds.), *The Psychology of Prejudice: The Ontario Symposium*, London: Lawrence Erlbaum, pp. 55-76.
- Banaji, Mahzarin R. and Greenwald, Anthony G. (1995), 'Implicit Gender Stereotyping in Judgments of Fame', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68:2, pp. 181-198.
- Christianson A. and Lumsden D., (2000), *Contemporary Scottish Women Writers*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Howden, Felice (2013), 'Gender has no Place in Media Coverage of Book Awards', *BookMachine Blog*, 8 April, at <http://bookmachine.org/2013/04/08/gender-has-no-place-in-media-coverage-of-book-awards/> (accessed 10 September 2014).
- Flood, Alison (2013), 'Arthur C Clarke award announces all-male shortlist', *Guardian*, 4 April, at <http://www.theguardian.com/books/2013/apr/04/arthur-c-clarke-award-shortlist-all-male> (accessed 10 September 2014).
- Flood, Alison (2016), 'Lionel Shriver rubbishes plans for dedicated Year of Publishing Women', *Guardian*, 10 March, at <http://www.theguardian.com/books/2016/mar/10/lionel-shriver-rubbishes-year-of-publishing-women-kamila-shamsie> (accessed 06 April 2016).
- Germana, Monica (2010), *Scottish Women's Gothic and Fantastic Writing: Fiction Since 1978*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Gifford, D. and McMillan, D. (1997), *History of Scottish Women's Writing*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. Kennedy, Maev (2000), 'Orange prize winner rejects claims of plagiarism', *Guardian*, 8 June, at <https://www.theguardian.com/uk/2000/jun/08/books.booksnews1> (accessed 27 May 2015).

- Goodley, Simon. (2014), 'Gender Pay Gap: Female Bosses Earn 35% Less Than Male Colleagues', *Guardian*, 19 August, at <http://www.theguardian.com/business/2014/aug/19/gender-pay-gap-women-bosses-earn-35-percent-less-than-men> (accessed 10 April 2015).
- Griffith, Nicola (2015), 'Books about women don't win big awards: some data', *Nicola Griffith Blog*, 26 May, at <http://nicolagriffith.com/2015/05/26/books-about-women-tend-not-to-win-awards/> (accessed 27 May 2015).
- Hendry, Joy (1993), 'Editorial', *Chapman*, 74-75, p. 3.
- Kundra, Ziva (1999), *Social Cognition: Making Sense of People*, London: MIT Press.
- Letter from Kathleen Munro, Saltire Society Administrator to Keith Bales Business Development Director, *The Scotsman*, 28 April 1997, Acc. 12393, File No. 84, Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland (NLS).
- MacDonald, Marianne (1996), 'Sexism storm as women-only book prize launches', *Independent*, 26 January, p. 2.
- Matheson, Ann (2018a), 'Re: Saltire Society Literary Awards Research', 24 April [email to author]
- Matheson, Ann (2018b), 'Re: Saltire Society Literary Awards Research', 20 April [email to author]
- McConnell, A. R., and Rydell, R. J., Strain, L. M., and Mackie, D. M. (2008), 'Forming Implicit and Explicit Attitudes Toward Individuals: Social Group Association Clues', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 94:5, pp. 792-807.
- McDowell, Lesley (2013), 'Women begin to lead way in Scottish Literature', *The Herald*, 21 September, at <http://www.heraldscotland.com/books-poetry/comment-debate/women-begin-to-lead-the-way-in-scottish-literature.22182685> (accessed 10 September 2014).
- Mosse, Kate (2013), 'History', *Women's Prize for Fiction*, 9 March, at <http://www.womensprizeforfiction.co.uk/about/history> (accessed 16 April 2018).
- Norquay, Glenda (ed) (2012), *The Edinburgh Companion to Scottish Women's Writing*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Parker, Emma and Grant, Linda (2010), 'On Fiction, Femininity, and Fashion: an Interview with Linda Grant', *Feminist Review*, 96, pp. 127-134.
- Ransford, Tessa (1993), 'The Case of the Intellectual Woman', *Chapman*, 74-75, 148.
- 'Rules' (2013), *Bailey's Women's Prize for Fiction*, 8 March, at <http://www.womensprizeforfiction.co.uk/about/rules> (accessed 16 April 2018).
- Saltire Society Literary Awards Panel Meeting Minutes, 25 September 1996, Acc. 13517, File No. 31, Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland (NLS).
- Saltire Society Literary Awards Panel Meeting Minutes, 30 October 2002, Acc. 13517, File No. 31, Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland (NLS).
- Saltire Society Literary Awards Panel Meeting Minutes, 13 November 2002, Acc. 13517, File No. 31, Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland (NLS).
- Saltire Society Literary Awards Panel Meeting Minutes, 1 November 2006, Acc. 13517, File No. 31, Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland (NLS).
- Saltire Society Literary Awards Panel Meeting Minutes, 15 November 2006, Acc. 13517, File No. 31, Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland (NLS).

Saltire Society Literary Awards Panel Meeting Minutes, 17 September 2008, Acc. 13517, File No. 31, Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland (NLS).

Saltire Society Literary Awards Panel Meeting Minutes, 4 November 2008, Acc. 13517, File No. 31, Edinburgh, National Library of Scotland (NLS).

Shakespeare, Sebastian (2012), 'Women just don't need the Orange Prize', *London Evening Standard*, 25 May, p. 15.

Unpublished interviews

Alison Lumsden in discussion with the author, April 2014.

Marion Sinclair in discussion with the author, March 2014.

Ian Campbell in discussion with the author, April 2014.

Ann Matheson in discussion with the author, March 2014.

Table 1: Gender of Winners of the Saltire Society Book of the Year Award 1988-2014

Year of Award	Author and Book Awarded	Gender
1988	Ascherson, Neil, <i>Games with Shadows</i> (London: Radius, 1988) Nairn, Tom, <i>The Enchanted Glass</i> (London: Radius, 1988)	Male Male
1989	Lochhead, Liz, <i>Mary Queen of Scots Got Her Head Chopped Off</i> (London: Penguin, 1989) Massie, Allan, <i>A Question of Loyalties</i> (London: Hutchinson, 1989)	Female Male
1990	MacLean, Sorley, <i>From Wood to Ridge/O choille gu bearradh</i> (Manchester: Carcanet Press, 1989)	Male
1991	McMillan, Duncan, <i>Scottish Art</i> (Edinburgh: Mainstream, 1990)	Male
1992	Smith, Ian Crichton, <i>Collected Poems</i> (Manchester: Carcanet Press, 1992)	Male
1993	Mackay, James, <i>A Biography of Robert Burns</i> (Edinburgh: Mainstream, 1992)	Male
1994	Brown, George Mackay, <i>Beside the Ocean of Time</i> (London: John Murray, 1994)	Male
1995	Kennedy, A. L., <i>So I am Glad</i> (London: Jonathan Cape, 1995) Ascherson, Neal, <i>Black Sea</i> (London: Cape, 1995)	Female Male
1996	McIlvanney, William, <i>The Kiln</i> (London: Sceptre, 1996)	Male
1997	MacLaverty, Bernard, <i>Grace Notes</i> (London: Jonathan Cape, 1997)	Male
1998	Warner, Alan, <i>The Sopranos</i> (London: Jonathan Cape, 1998)	Male
1999	Bruce, George, <i>Pursuits: Poems 1986-1998</i> (Dalkeith: Scottish Cultural Press, 1999)	Male
2000	Frame, Ronald, <i>The Lantern Bearers</i> (London: Duckbacks, 1999)	Male
2001	Lochhead, Liz, <i>Medea</i> (London: Nick Hern Publishing, 2000)	Female
2002	Galloway, Janice, <i>Clara</i> (London: Jonathan Cape, 2002)	Female
2003	Robertson, James, <i>Joseph Knight</i> (London: Fourth Estate, 2003)	Male
2004	Greig, Andrew, <i>In Another Light</i> (London: Weidenfield & Nicolson, 2004)	Male
2005	Atkinson, Kate, <i>Case Histories</i> (London: Doubleday, 2004)	Female
2006	John Burnside, <i>A Lie About My Father</i> (London: Jonathan Cape, 2006)	Male
2007	Kennedy, A. L., <i>Day</i> (London: Jonathan Cape, 2007)	Female
2008	Kelman, James, <i>Kieron Smith Boy</i> (London: Hamish Hamilton, 2008)	Male
2009	Crawford, Robert, <i>The Bard: Robert Burns, A Biography</i> (London: Jonathan Cape, 2009)	Male
2010	Robertson, James, <i>And The Land Lay Still</i> (London: Hamish Hamilton, 2010)	Male
2011	Gray, Alasdair, <i>A Life in Pictures</i> (Edinburgh: Canongate, 2010)	Male
2012	Kelman, James, <i>Mo Said She was Quirky</i> (London: Hamish Hamilton, 2012)	Male
2013	Burnside, John, <i>Something Like Happy</i> (London: Jonathan Cape, 2013)	Male
2014	Smith, Ali, <i>How To Be Both</i> (London: Hamish Hamilton, 2014)	Female

Table 2: Gender of Winners of the Saltire Society First Book of the Year Award 1988-2014

Year of Award	Author and Book Awarded	Gender
1988	Vettese, Raymond, <i>The Richt Noise and ither Poems</i> (Edinburgh: Macdonald, 1988)	Male
1989	Hayton, Sian, <i>Cells of Knowledge</i> (Edinburgh: Polygon, 1989)	Female
1990	Tait, Harry, <i>The Ballad of Sawney Bain</i> (Edinburgh: Polygon, 1989)	Male
1991	Kennedy, A. L., <i>Night Geometry and the Garscadden Trains</i> (Edinburgh: Polygon, 1990)	Female
1992	Kay, Jackie, <i>Adoption Papers</i> (Newcastle: Bloodaxe Books, 1991)	Female
1993	Bell, Ian, <i>Dreams of Exile: Robert Louis Stevenson, A Biography</i> (Edinburgh: Mainstream, 1992)	Male
1994	Crumey, Andrew, <i>Music in a Foreign Language</i> (Cambridgeshire: Dedalus, 1994)	Male
1995	Smith, Ali, <i>Free Love</i> (Lodnon: Virago, 1995)	Female
1996	Clanchy, Kate, <i>Slattern</i> (London: Chatto & Windus, 1995)	Female
1997	Robertson, Robin, <i>A Painted Field</i> (London: Picador, 1997)	Male
1998	O'Donnell, Dennis, <i>Two Clocks Ticking</i> (Edinburgh: Curly Snake, 1997)	Male
	Wallace, Christopher, <i>The Pied Piper's Poison</i> (London: Flamingo, 1998)	Male
1999	Faber, Michel, <i>Some Rain Must Fall</i> (Edinburgh: Canongate, 1998)	Male
2000	Galbraith, Douglas, <i>The Rising Sun</i> (London: Picador, 2000)	Male
2001	Delahunt, Meaghan, <i>In the Blue House</i> , (London: Bloomsbury, 2001)	Female
2002	McIlvanney, Liam, <i>Burns the Radical</i> (East Linton: Tuckwell Press, 2002)	Male
	Welsh, Louise, <i>The Cutting Room</i> (Edinburgh: Canongate, 2002)	Female
2003	Mac an t-Saoir, Mártainn, <i>Ath-Aithne</i> (Inverness: Clár, 2003)	Male
2004	Hill, Peter, <i>Stargazing</i> (Edinburgh: Canongate, 2003)	Male
2005	Aberdein, John, <i>Amande's Bed</i> (Edinburgh: Thirsty Books, 2005)	Male
2006	Fergusson, Maggie, <i>George MacKay Brown: The Life</i> (London: John Murray, 2006)	Female
2007	McNay, Mark, <i>Fresh: A Novel</i> (Edinburgh: Canongate, 2007)	Male
2008	Nicholl, Andy, <i>The Good Mayor</i> (Edinburgh: Black & White, 2008)	Male
2009	Thom, Eleanor, <i>The Tin Kin</i> (London: Duckworth, 2009)	Female
2010	Hall, Simon, <i>The History of Orkney Literature</i> (Edinburgh: John Donald, 2010)	Male
	Peebles, Sue, <i>The Death of Lomond Friel</i> (London: Chatto & Windus, 2010)	Female
2011	Williams, Luke, <i>The Echo Chamber</i> (London: Hamish Hamilton, 2011)	Male
2012	Fraser, Sarah, <i>The Last Highlander: Scotland's Most Notorious Clan-Chief, Rebel and Double Agent</i> (London: Harper Press, 2012)	Female
2013	Armstrong, Tim, <i>Air Cuan Dubh Drilseach</i> (Inverness: Clár, 2013)	Male
	Buchanan, Eunice, <i>As Far As I Can See</i> (Newtyle: Kettillonia, 2012)	Female

2014

Campbell, Niall, *Moontide* (Newcastle: Bloodaxe Books, 2014)

Male

DRAFT

Table 3: Breakdown of Total Number of Books Submitted for the Saltire Society Book of the Year and First Book of the Year Awards 1982 - 2014 by Gender

Year	Total Number of Submissions	Submissions authored, co-authored or edited by women	Percentage of submissions by authored, co-authored or edited by women
1982	3	1	33%
1983	3	0	0%
1984	4	0	0%
1985	8	4	50%
1986	22	4	18%
1987	24	6	25%
1988	21	3	14%
1989	28	8	29%
1990	39	10	26%
1991	44	9	20%
1992	46	7	15%
1993	36	9	25%
1994	40	10	25%
1995	47	10	21%
1996	74	20	27%
1997	63	13	21%
1998	82	31	38%
1999	88	28	32%
2000	No data available		
2001	98	32	33%
2002	59	19	32%
2003	84	28	33%
2004	104	30	29%
2005	111	31	28%
2006	108	46	43%
2007	160	52	33%
2008	146	47	32%
2009	No data available		
2010	116	41	35%
2011	95	32	34%
2012	68	25	37%
2013	90	38	42%
2014	115	46	40%