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Research Question

How do the measurable properties of diversity (i.e. variety, balance, and disparity) manifest in trade publishing in Oregon?

Introduction

In this paper I will explore the ongoing conversation about the state of diversity in the publishing industry, the identity of the Pacific Northwest as a bastion of diversity relative to New York City, and whether and how the economic concept of cultural diversity can be useful to publishers committed to increasing diversity in their lists or amongst their staff. Generally speaking, the term “diversity” refers to the social choice to be inclusive of everyone regardless of race, sex, class or economic status, etc. In this paper, I will also refer to the economic concept of cultural diversity. In publishing, this concept, developed from principles of biodiversity in healthy ecosystems and defined for the book industry by Françoise Benhamou and Stéphanie Peltier, is measured by analyzing the three properties of diversity—variety, balance, and disparity—“according to the three forms of categorization of the population of individual books...: the title, the genre and the original language.”

This applied definition was developed when economists attempted to bring a more rigorous definition to the fairly nebulous concept of cultural diversity in response to a 2003 UNESCO (United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, the intellectual arm of the United Nations) mandate for a draft of a legally enforceable international convention on increasing and protecting diversity

---

2 Benhamou and Peltier, “How should cultural diversity be measured?” 89.
in cultural industries. The resulting research generally agrees that the mandate was ill advised and that creating a legally enforceable set of rules designed to increase cultural diversity was not possible, especially without a definite measure for optimum diversity in a market. From their attempts to test their hypotheses on the unfeasibility of a New International Instrument on Cultural Diversity (NICD), however, we are left with key conceptual definitions and a framework in which to measure diversity in a cultural industry.³ Briefly, what researchers (including Benhamou and Peltier) found was that measured rates of diversity differed depending on which of the three properties was being analyzed. When variety (“the number of categories into which a quantity can be partitioned,” and the most commonly analyzed condition) was the focus, rates of diversity were much higher. When balance (“the pattern in the distribution of that quantity across the relevant categories”) or disparity (“accounting for the nature of the categorization scheme and adjusting for the degree to which the categories are different from each other”) were taken into consideration, the rates dropped significantly. Though the American publishing industry has no governing body mandating calls for increased diversity, researchers concerned with the NICD applied the principle to case studies of cultural industries such as the film industries in the European Union, United States, France, Hungary, Mexico, and South Korea (Moreau and Peltier, 2004) and the French publishing industry (Benhamou and Peltier, 2007), creating the foundational basis for this paper.

³ Acheson and Maule, “Convention on Cultural Diversity.”
The issue of social diversity in the American publishing industry has been much discussed and widely agreed-upon—without much forward progress to speak of in the last decade. All too often, the industry is content to equate discussing the issue with creating and taking the action steps to address the problems caused by a lack of diversity on every level. The high cost of living in New York City—reasonably considered the central hub of the publishing industry—is often cited (along with low starting salaries) as a key factor in retaining low rates of diversity. In response, the Pacific Northwest has become idealized as the first answer to the diversity problem. Relatively low cost of living and a laid-back reputation foster a significantly large number of small and medium-sized press endeavors, creating such variety that diversity is implicitly and explicitly inferred. Additionally, though demographic surveys of the industry indicate that there has been little change in publishing staff, the prevailing understanding is that the push for increased diversity in recent years has contributed to ‘diversity’ being understood as a benefit rather than a barrier, and thus to an increase in diverse books being published. It is this phenomenon that I am choosing to focus on in this paper; if we accept the premise that we are making small but forward strides on the issue of diversity, one would expect to see this reflected in titles being produced by the west coast publishing scene as the hospitable environment. I propose adapting the framework

---

6 Jason Low, “Where is the Diversity in Publishing?”
for measuring cultural diversity developed by those concerned with UNESCO’s mandate for an international agreement on cultural diversity to assess these gains.

While the social and economic principles of diversity are, and should be, considered distinct from one another, I have chosen to apply one to the other to attempt to begin to reframe how we understand ‘diversity’ as a concept in publishing. By applying a quantifiable economic lens to a historically nebulous and poorly defined social choice, I hope to foreground (and, to an extent, justify) the action steps available to us as publishers if we choose to conceive of diversity as a variable we can and should measure, foster, and protect.

**Goals and Limitations**

The primary aim of this paper is to explore how we can define the categories involved in measuring the three properties of diversity in relation to publishing in the Pacific Northwest. Because the economic principle of cultural diversity is highly conceptual, and dependent on correct application of complex statistical proofs, it is entirely beyond the scope of this paper to accurately measure cultural diversity in Oregon trade publishing. The furthest I attempt to take this reframing is to explore how the measurable properties of cultural diversity (variety, balance, and disparity) manifest in the adapted categories in this limited case study, and create a preliminary understanding of how and why this principle could be useful to the American trade publishing industry. Additionally, it is beyond the scope of this paper to provide more than a cursory overview of the 2003 UNESCO mandate and

---

the resulting convention on protecting cultural diversity. I am solely concerned with economists’ methodological response to the question of how to measure cultural diversity in an industry.

When we talk about (the social choice of) diversity in publishing, what we’re talking about is diversity of many identities (race, gender, sexuality, ability, etc.), but in American trade publishing (as in so many conversations about ‘diversity’ in America), we are also specifically talking about minority racial representation, specifically representation of black authors and characters, and subjects that concern the black community. It is worth noting that this paper will also be necessarily limited by its focus on Oregon, and within that, trade publishing, broadly defined as books published for a general audience. Based on my preliminary data, it is reasonable to hypothesize that the rates of diversity amongst published authors would be higher if more of the Pacific Northwest—the Bay Area, for example—were included. Furthermore, because the push for diversity in publishing has been arguably more successful in Young Adult and children’s publishing, the observed trends would likely indicate increased rates. The reframing I’m proposing, however, could be adapted to analyze any aspect of the American trade publishing industry.

I would also like to make it clear that I am white, and nothing I put forth in this paper in terms of noting the importance of diversity to the publishing industry and the simplest solutions to the problem (hiring more diverse staff) are new ideas. People of color working in the industry have already said everything that could be said on this front loudly and clearly, and my intent is not to speak for or over these existing conversations. Rather, it is my hope that this proposed framework could be
expanded into a metric for success that will inevitably be asked for as a justification for implementing at the small and mid-size press level the policies that have been successful for large, well-funded companies and organizations.

**A Brief Review of the Literature**

**Social Choice**

While it has long been well known (if not well documented) that the publishing industry is dominated by white women (where it’s not dominated by white men), the last decade and the corresponding rise of social media have brought much-needed visibility to the issue. In addition to providing a significant platform for people of color working in publishing to speak about their experiences, the ubiquity of social networking has made the reality of the industry more public. Annual studies such as the *Publishers Weekly* Publishing Industry Salary Survey, Jason Low’s 2015 Diversity Baseline Survey, and the VIDA Count make known the demographics that account for who’s in the room and how much they get paid. In recent years, these studies have also begun to probe at why these demographics are stagnating. *PW* in particular cites low starting salaries relative to a high cost of living and old-guard racism perpetuated in hiring practices.\(^8\) Though campaigns like #WeNeedDiverseBooks have had a negligible effect on the publishing workforce, this increased visibility awareness has “made diversity an asset for books rather

than a detriment.”9 Attempting to make this claim purely by analyzing finished products is disingenuous, however. Throughout the industry, editors, authors, and publishers of color are entreating the existing system to change its ways. Diverse books aren’t simply sprung fully-formed from a white editor’s slush pile, and as a disproportionately small slice of the industry fights for change, an imperative to learn how to assess and evaluate manuscripts outside your own lived experience has become the rallying cry in the interim. Ken Chen, director of the Asian American Writers’ Workshop, addresses the difficulties authors of color face trying to get their work past white gatekeepers.10 In response to the misconception that a book-buying market is as homogenous as the industry, Chen calls out the difference between petitioning for greater diversity to stay on-trend and actually being involved with communities of color. “Your ability to imagine that there is a market for [a book or author] has to do with your ability to imagine that those people exist,” Chen says of successfully pushing diverse books through production, “and if you can’t imagine that people of color actually exist and buy books, then you can’t imagine selling books to them.”11

PEN America Content Director Antonio Aiello’s discussion with editors from the Asian American Writer’s Workshop, Gove Atlantic, Little A, and Picador, and Managing Editor Nicole Chung’s interview with literary agent Linda Z. for The Toast are just two excellent examples in a sea of work that picks up the thought where Chen leaves off—hiring diverse staff is the number one priority if these authors and

9 Ibid.
10 Neary, “To Achieve Diversity in Publishing.”
11 Ibid.
their titles are ever going to get a truly fair shake. Having the experience and the ability to evaluate diverse books is critical, and too often white editors and publishers don’t. This leads to what Chung describes as “literary tokenism,” in which publishers are concerned with diversity for the sake of diversity, but disparage the same books as lacking broad appeal. Books are segregated by their author’s identities, with white authors functioning as the default (“There’s no “Lads Who Write About Gentrified Brooklyn” shelf,” Linda Z. notes). Z. echoes Chen’s comments about the need to be critically engaged with what’s actually going on in communities of color. Specifically, she reinforces the need for publishers to commit to “reaching audiences beyond the core group of rich white women and Republicans we think of as “book buyers,”” for editors to commit to reading widely and beyond their lived experiences, and for sales reps to avoid limiting their understanding of a book to [identity], to avoid having them segregated by bookstores.

Efforts to recruit and retain diverse staff create results—but what support is there for these? The Mellon University Press Diversity Fellowship program (a collaborative effort between the University of Washington Press, the MIT Press, the Duke University Press, the University of Georgia Press, and the Association of American University Presses funded by the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation) and the Association of American Publishers’ partnership with the United Negro College Fund (a summer internship program with industry leaders, including Cengage Learning, Elsevier, Hachette Book Group, HarperCollins Publishers, MacMillan,

13 Ibid.
14 Ibid.
McGraw-Hill Education, Penguin Random House, Perseus Books Group, Scholastic, and W.W. Norton) are two examples of programs creating paid opportunities for students from diverse backgrounds to work with publishing industry giants.\textsuperscript{15} Almost exactly a year ago, the Children’s Book Council and the grassroots nonprofit We Need Diverse Books™ announced their partnership for a summer internship program to provide similar opportunities.\textsuperscript{16} Literary Arts, a local cultural organization dedicated to supporting Oregon writers, established the Writers of Color Fellowship, which is “intended to fund writers of color to initiate, develop, or complete a literary project in poetry, fiction, literary nonfiction, drama, or young readers literature.”\textsuperscript{17} These are just a few examples of programs and opportunities being developed across the country as an attempt to move the issue of diversity in publishing out of stagnation.

\textbf{Economic principle}

In 2003, the 32\textsuperscript{nd} UNESCO General Conference issued a mandate that the Director General draft “a convention on protecting the diversity of cultural contents and artistic expressions” for presentation in 2005.\textsuperscript{18} This document was meant to function for standard-setting, as a “legally enforceable set of rules” for protecting diversity in cultural industries. The implication, and in the case of the French book publishing industry the explicit statement, is that what member states are protecting this diversity \textit{from} is being overwhelmed by American mass culture, a

\textsuperscript{16} CBC, “Publishing Internship Program.”
\textsuperscript{17} Literary Arts, “Applying for an Oregon Literary Fellowship.”
\textsuperscript{18} Acheson and Maule, “Convention on Cultural Diversity,” 243.
concept I will utilize in my reframing. At the 33rd UNESCO General Conference in 2005, the Director General did adopt the Convention on the Protection and Promotion of the Diversity of Cultural Expression, but for the purposes of this paper I am solely concerned with economists’ response to the 2003 mandate.

In their 2004 article, “Convention on Cultural Diversity,” economics professors Keith Acheson and Christopher Maule provide an overview of their concerns about the mandate, and whether the existing draft wording meets the conditions necessary for a rules-based international agreement. The central concern of their paper notes that there are plenty of justifications for wanting to protect cultural diversity (such as linguistic survival within minority communities) but questions whether supporters of this convention have “defined enforceable obligations on national cultural policy that generate sufficient gains from membership to support a [dispute settling mechanism] capable of enforcing compliance.” The shortened version of the conclusions the two authors demonstrate is that the existing draft language allows for a self-definition of cultural diversity by member states, and fails to meet the necessary conditions for a legally enforceable international agreement. This lack of clarity about the definition of ‘cultural diversity’ is a central theme in the rest of the reviewed literature.

The most pertinent of the texts I reviewed (Françoise Benhamou and Stéphanie Peltier, “How should cultural diversity be measured? An application using the French publishing industry,” 2007) addresses the lack of a metric for diversity by attempting to create a working definition of ‘cultural diversity’ and the

---

19 Benhamou and Peltier, “How should cultural diversity be measured?,” 86.
methodology to analyze it, which is applied specifically to the publishing industry. The authors review existent literature, noting as Acheson and Maule did that though the concept of cultural diversity is central to cultural policy debates, the definition remains “fuzzy.” In their overview of the history of measuring cultural diversity in cultural economics, Benhamou and Peltier stress a lack of a unified definition, as well as the weakness of the existing definitions that rely on a single dimension. They choose instead to adopt a multi-dimensional approach, drawing on research on diversity in bioculture and technological change to develop their definition, and noting how the costs and benefits in this analogous definition pertain to the UNESCO debates:

As in the field of culture, the main topic is the choice between the costs and benefits of the preservation of greater diversity and a situation in which there would be reduced variety and greater standardisation. In bioculture, for example, the choice between concentrating on few varieties with high returns and maintaining enough diversity to prevent the risk of generalized infection (Weitzman 2000) presents a difficult dilemma. By analogy, for the book industry, there is a choice between producing few books of the same type to realise economies of scale and publishing a wide variety of books of different types to guarantee the pluralism of creation. To take the analogy further, the standardisation of products could be seen as a symptom of “generalised infection.”

From the associated fields, Benhamou and Peltier identify the three key properties of diversity that I’ve already touched on briefly. These three properties—variety, balance, and disparity—are all “necessary but individually insufficient

---

21 Benhamou and Peltier, “How should cultural diversity be measured?” 86.
22 Ibid., 88.
conditions for the existence of diversity.” Once again, variety is the number of categories a quantity is broken into (in publishing, the number of unique titles); balance is how the quantity is distributed amongst categories, and disparity is the measurement of categorization and the degree to which the categories differ. They measure variety in the publishing industry by analyzing three categories: title, genre, and original language. When analyzing the title, diversity increases in direct proportion to the number (variety) of titles published, balance is achieved when all titles have similar market shares, and disparity is reflected in how different the contents of each title are from one another. According to categorization by genre, diversity increases in direct proportion to the number of genres available, balance is reflected in the extent to which the genres are represented among published books, and disparity is the extent to which the genres are clearly differentiated from one another. Where Benhamou and Peltier are concerned with diversity according to original language, they hypothesize that the market for translated books in (French) publishing represents the degree of openness to other cultures, and thus diversity increases in direct proportion to the number of different original languages available, and the extent to which they’re represented and distinguishable from each other.

Beyond the usefulness of this research to my attempts to provide variable definitions and preliminary analysis of the Oregon trade publishing industry, Benhamou and Peltier’s research generates an important understanding of the practical reality of measuring cultural diversity in a homogenous, standardized way.

23 Ibid., 88
24 Ibid., 89.
When variety (the most commonly analyzed property) is the only dimension taken into consideration when measuring cultural diversity, the rates are read much higher than when balance or disparity are taken into consideration.\textsuperscript{25} Though the accurate application of these properties as a way to measure diversity in a cultural industry involves the correct application of complex proofs, the fundamental principle behind the development of these properties appears in much of the further literature on measuring cultural diversity (Flôres 2006, Ranaivoson 2007, and Moreau and Peltier 2009). These authors’ methodological contributions would be invaluable, should a researcher with the requisite economics and statistics background choose to apply them.

Finally, in “The Diversity of Diversity: further methodological considerations on the use of the concept in cultural economics,” Renato G. Flôres Jr. (2006) provides important justifications and further considerations for the aim of this paper. Flôres questions the usefulness of ‘cultural diversity’ beyond a descriptive tool, and points to a lack of understanding about ‘optimal’ levels of diversity (as opposed to ‘reasonable’ levels).\textsuperscript{26} He notes the inherent difficulties of associating the social or ethical choice for diversity with the economic dimension, when concerns about positive feelings associated with reasonable diversity butt up against utilitarian decision (or policy) making processes. Diversity as a social choice, Flôres maintains, “should be clearly distinguished from its potential economic value.”\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{25} Ibid., 104.
\textsuperscript{26} Flôres, “The Diversity of Diversity,” 9.
\textsuperscript{27} Ibid., 12.
Adapting the Framework

It is precisely this potential economic value, coupled with the burgeoning view of the social choice for diversity as a boon, rather than a detriment, to books published for a general audience that interests me. In the face of a stalling conversation about the merits of the social choice of cultural (in the case of American trade publishing, deviating from “mainstream,” white culture) diversity in publishing, we can choose instead to reframe the issue to reflect pursuing a more optimum cultural diversity in a market. While the prevailing attitude of economists is that using measurements of cultural diversity to support drafting a legally enforceable set of rules about increasing that diversity is tricky, and likely a waste of resources, the more focused definitions and metrics for assessing diversity in a cultural industry that were produced in the debates surrounding the 2003 UNESCO mandate provide the structure for this reframing.28

The multidimensional definition of cultural diversity and the categories for analyzing the concept in publishing developed by Benhamou and Peltier provide the basis for adapting the metric to apply to cultural diversity within one American (mass) culture. The properties of diversity remain the same, but the categories over which they are measured will need to be adapted to reflect the issues specific to American trade publishing—in this case, minority racial representation among published authors, and representation of black authors in particular. In adapting Benhamou and Peltier’s categories to begin to assess diversity in Oregon trade publishing, we must make slight alterations to where we measure the three

properties of diversity. All three categories developed (title, genre, and original language) have use in measuring diversity in these specific areas, and hypothesizing about what kind of diversity we should see is relatively straightforward, depending on what publishing house or market we choose to analyze. For example, within a house that publishes primarily literary fiction in English, there is unlikely to be great diversity in any of those categories. If, however, we choose instead to analyze diversity in these categories across all of one of the Big Five’s literary fiction imprints, the rates will increase.29

Following the framework for the development of one of these categories, racial diversity among published authors increases in direct proportion to the number of racial identities represented (variety), the extent to which each identity is represented (balance), and the extent to which each identity is distinguishable from the others (disparity).30 This could be further elaborated to investigate other author identities—gender, sexuality, class, ethnicity, nationality, etc.—or applied to book content to investigate representation within published titles. Because, unlike the economists involved in the development of the UNESCO convention, we (as publishers committed to fostering diversity in American trade publishing) are interested in tracking rates of diversity over time rather than justifying a legally enforceable standard of diversity, the lack of definition of ‘optimal’ diversity or

29 The degree to which these rates increase is an answer found in the hard numbers that it is beyond the scope of this paper for me to provide; it is reasonably and demonstrably true that increasing the sample size will necessarily increase diversity in these categories to some measurable degree.
30 ‘Disparity’ as a measurement of diversity of representation is more applicable to ethnic identities or nationalities, in which authors may share a racial identity but be more or less distinguishable from each other depending on that ethnicity or nationality (i.e. a group of three white authors—a Canadian, a French author, and an American—share a racial identity, but their nationalities are clearly distinguishable from one another). However, a group with a 10:1 ratio of any racial identities will have high disparity, despite having low overall diversity.
potential disputes over differing categories is not a concern. Theoretically, a publishing house looking to increase the racial diversity of its published authors could utilize this framework to measure the success of the action steps they pursue (i.e. hiring more diverse staff, developing an internship program, etc.).

**A Case Study**

To demonstrate briefly how we might assess diversity in this category in Oregon trade publishing, I will look at how variety, balance, and disparity in racial representation of authors manifested in the last decade of nominations for the Literary Arts Oregon Book Award Ken Kesey Award for the Novel and the Pacific Northwest Booksellers Association Pacific Northwest Book Awards. The Oregon Book Awards “honor the state’s finest accomplishments by Oregon writers,” and the Pacific Northwest Book Awards “recognize excellence in writing in the Pacific Northwest.”

They therefore provide a reasonable, if not entirely representative, sample of what’s being produced by the Oregon trade publishing industry. I chose to investigate the last ten years of nominees rather than the entire history of the award to provide a chronological parallel with the shifts in conversation about the state of diversity in the industry over the last decade.

Of fifty authors with strong ties to Oregon nominated for the Ken Kesey Award for the Novel from 2005 to 2015, only two belong to communities that are racialized in America; no black authors were represented in that ten-year period. Of

---

sixty-seven authors from the Pacific Northwest (the PNBA includes Washington, Oregon, Alaska, Montana, Idaho, and British Columbia), there are sixty white nominees and seven nominees with identities that are racialized in America. Again, no black authors are represented in this ten-year period. There is a vast multitude of reasons a person might identify with a minority, mixed, ambiguous, or otherwise complicated racial identity, and I have not tried to define these authors’ lives for them. Rather, I provide a breakdown of OBA nominees’ ethnicities, as identified by their bios or publicity material, as well as a more generalized overview of the identities of the PNBA nominees.\textsuperscript{32}

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{pie_chart.png}
\caption{OBA Ken Kesey Award for the Novel 2005-2015 Nominees}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{32} It is possible that I have mistakenly identified someone as white who does not identify that way. However, if authors did not state an alternate identity and were white-passing, I coded them as white for this paper.
Because the sample I’ve provided is so small, these numbers are not as shocking as they may initially seem, but they do indicate a distinct lack of racial diversity in Oregon (and Pacific Northwest) trade publishing that requires further investigation. Applying the adapted framework for assessing cultural diversity in the category of racial representation among authors, we can see that every property analyzed demonstrates an incredibly low rate of diversity. Even variety, the
property commonly used to overestimate rate of diversity, is lacking. If publishers whose authors are eligible for this award chose to adopt a commitment to increasing diversity, ideally we would see an increase in diversity reflected in all three properties: greater variety of racial identities, greater balance among how often these identities are represented, and better information available about how these identities are clearly distinguishable from one another.\footnote{Analyzing this disparity would require researchers to conduct more in-depth interviews with authors or deeper investigations into their backgrounds to provide a greater understanding of how they identify.}

**Concluding Remarks and Further Questions**

This paper represents a broad overview of a complex concept that will ultimately require further dedicated research if it is to be put into practice. The first step would be more data collection completed with greater resources and over a longer period of time. This could provide a better understanding of authors’ racial identities, though it is unlikely that the numbers I’ve represented here would change significantly. Ultimately, it would be beneficial to the development of further categories for measuring cultural diversity to research whose stories are being published (what characters, subjects, or issues are represented) in Oregon trade publishing; comparing diversity among subjects with that of authors would provide a more accurate assessment.

It is important to remember that this is only a proposed metric for success—the action steps that will increase diversity in publishing still need to be pursued to see a significant change over time. From the preliminary data, we can see that
although there is notable disparity, the lack of variety and balance among authors published in (and near) mainstream Oregon publishing correlates with a low rate of diversity. There is, however, a booming alternative press scene in Oregon (particularly in Portland), and it would behoove researchers interested in mainstream publishing to investigate how the rates of diversity between the two arenas differ.

Further questions raised by applying this proposed metric to Oregon trade publishing include similar debates as those had by economists in the mid-2000s after the UNESCO mandate: how do we define racial identities of authors? Characters? In this case, a system of self-identification has more merit than in those debates surrounding drafting the convention, but at the very least developing a standardized wording to describe what aspects of an identity is of interest will be key. Any successful increase in cultural diversity in Oregon trade publishing over any amount of time will require increased representation of black authors, even in what are at the moment considered overwhelmingly ‘white’ markets and genres. Ultimately, though more and more in-depth research will be required to develop this adapted framework and put it into practice, the American publishing industry as a whole can benefit from the groundwork laid by the mid-2000s UNESCO debates.
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