
ESSAYS

GENDER OF HAIKU POETS PUBLISHED IN JOURNALS: GAME-ON, LADIES?

J. Zimmerman

The topic of gender bias can evoke passionate opinions among haiku poets. Conjectures vary from its being non-existent to its being vast. Vehement beliefs range between the vital necessity and the utter unimportance of assessing whether gender bias exists in haiku journals.

Speculative views are best counterbalanced by facts. Therefore, this article examines the proportion of women among haiku poets published in many journals over several decades. I investigated whether significant differences occurred in the proportion of women published when the editors were female versus when they were male. Next, thanks to data from several journal editors, I compared percentages of women poets published with the corresponding percentages of submissions that came from women. As Charles Trumbull has written, “A proper analysis, especially trying to determine evidence of bias, would require knowledge of how many women submitted how many haiku.”¹ Then I compared the data with percentages of women who subscribed to journals, with women’s percentages in haiku-society anthologies and membership lists, and with their appearance elsewhere.

The work reported here evolved in parallel with two 2019 publications. One was my *Presence* article, “Gender of Poets Winning Haiku and Senryu Contests,” in which I showed that a significant number of women won haiku contests, that a much smaller percentage of women judged contests than won them, and that a higher percentage of women entered than won.² For eight contests, women averaged 47% of the top-three winners (confidence interval 43% to 51%) and 38% of contest judges (confidence interval 32% to 44%).³ Contest organizers of five contests supplied information on the percentage of women in the submitting

poets, which averaged 56%. Curiously, for contests that provided entrant information, 50% of their top-three winners were women, significantly more than 42% for contests declining to provide entrant percentages.

Additionally, Charles Trumbull, in his magisterial and Touchstone-awarded book, *A History of Modern Haiku*, reported data for poets published by every *Modern Haiku* editor.⁴ His percentages of published poets who were women averaged between 33% and 54% for different editors; his corresponding percentages of published haiku authored by women averaged between 34% and 53%.⁵

Believing that current information for a variety of journals is of particular interest to the practicing haiku poet, I collected data for the recent decade (2011–2020) for the eleven journals listed in Table 1.⁶ Two journals (*Frogpond* in the USA and *Blithe Spirit* in the UK) are published by national haiku organizations. One (*Mariposa*) is published by the regional HPNC organization. Two others (*Modern Haiku* in the USA and *Presence* in the UK) are significant journals of record. All the others are very important to the communities they serve. One (*Chrysanthemum*) is international not only in its poets but also in publishing every poem and article in English and in German, as well as in the language of a poem's submission if different. Several journals publish haiku in Japanese. Four (*Chrysanthemum*, *Failed Haiku*, *Prune Juice*, and *The Heron's Nest*) are on-line; the others are distributed on paper and have information on-line. Two (*Failed Haiku* and *Prune Juice*) are journals of senryu; *Bottle Rockets* seems to emphasize senryu, which the other journals neither stress nor exclude.

For my datasets, I counted only poets for whom at least one stand-alone haiku or senryu appeared in an issue. I excluded poems appearing in linked forms or in articles, book reviews, contest results, and so on. That allowed a meaningful comparison of the numbers for the journals with those for contests and anthologies. For all counts and percentages, I excluded a poet from my data if their gender was unknown to me and excluded it from an editor's data if unknown to them.⁷

Table 1 summarizes data for the current decade, 2011-2020. The first column lists the journals, sequenced by the percentage of women among the poets published (second column). Each percentage has one decimal

place. This appearance of precision gives an overly optimistic sense of accuracy: any issue of a journal can alter the journal's average by many tenths of a percent. For each journal, the confidence interval is close to $\pm 2\%$; it tends to be smaller for journals that publish more poets and correspondingly show less statistical variation.⁸ It is noted that some data were unavailable (see footnotes), and that one journal, *Failed Haiku*, did not begin publication until 2016, so its dataset is small.

Journal (2011-2020)	Percent Women of Published Poets
<i>Mariposa</i>	56.9%
<i>Failed Haiku</i> ⁹	50.7%
<i>The Heron's Nest</i>	46.3%
<i>Acorn</i>	45.6%
<i>Presence</i> ¹⁰	45.3%
<i>Chrysanthemum</i>	44.1%
<i>Frogpond</i>	43.7%
<i>Modern Haiku</i>	43.0%
<i>Blithe Spirit</i> ¹¹	41.4%
<i>Prune Juice</i> ¹²	41.0%
<i>Bottle Rockets</i> ¹³	37.2%

Table 1

These percentages are all substantial. The average (mean) value for the decade shows that 45.0% ($\pm 3.1\%$) of the published poets were women for this set of journals.

For comparison, the following data in Table 2 survey up to fifty years. The journals are sequenced by the average percentage of women poets published (second column) while the third column shows the years covered. For these journals over all years, on average 45.0% ($\pm 3.2\%$) of the published poets were women. The similarity to the one-decade average suggests overall stability in the percentage of women among published poets.

Journal (all years)	Percent Women of Published Poets	Years
<i>Mariposa</i>	56.3%	2002–2020
<i>Failed Haiku</i>	50.7%	2016–2020
<i>The Heron's Nest</i>	47.6%	1999–2020
<i>Modern Haiku</i>	46.4%	1970–2020
<i>Chrysanthemum</i>	46.2%	2007–2020
<i>Presence</i>	45.8%	2008–2020
<i>Frogpond</i>	44.3%	1978–2020 ¹⁴
<i>Blithe Spirit</i>	41.4%	2013–2019
<i>Acorn</i>	40.7%	1998–2020
<i>Prune Juice</i>	38.4%	2009–2019
<i>Bottle Rockets</i>	37.7%	2008–2016, 2020

Table 2

The range between different journals is large and intriguing. For both sets of data, the highest percentage of women belongs to *Mariposa* by a statistically significant amount, two confidence intervals greater than all other journals. *Failed Haiku* has the second highest percentage, identical for both periods, since being first published in 2016. *The Heron's Nest* shows the third highest percentage for both time periods. The lowest percentages are for *Prune Juice* and *Bottle Rockets*, for both the current decade and overall. *Blithe Spirit* has the third lowest percentage for the current decade and fourth lowest overall.¹⁵

The remaining five journals average between 43% and 46% for the current decade, and between 41% and 46% over all years. Little rearrangement of relative positions appears with time, except for *Modern Haiku* and *Acorn*. For the current decade, *Modern Haiku* moves down to the eighth highest percentage (43%) of women compared to being fourth highest (46%) over the larger time period. The change in percentage is significant: its all-year average is outside the confidence interval ($\pm 1\%$) for its one-decade average. Although such a change could arise

statistically, it likely results in large part from the unusually high percentage of women published by founder-editor Kay Titus Mormino.¹⁶ In the first few years, a founder-editor is arguably more likely to receive submissions from their friends and colleagues rather than the whole haiku world. In Mormino's eight years (1970–1977) I found her to average 63%, ranging between 54% and 69% for individual years. Her high values contrast with years as low as 35% under Robert Spiess, 36% under Lee Gurga, 37% under Charles Trumbull, and 40% under Paul Miller. The variety between editors contributes to a large ($\pm 3\%$) confidence interval for *Modern Haiku's* all-year results.

Chrysanthemum does average a slightly higher percentage of women published in the earlier years (fifth highest with 46.2%) compared with the current decade (sixth highest with 44.1%). However, these data have large enough confidence intervals ($\pm 2\%$) that I can attribute the difference to statistical fluctuations as easily as to a possible founder effect. Percentages of women published for earlier years are also slightly higher compared with the current ten years for *The Heron's Nest* and *Frogpond*, but the differences do not alter their third and seventh relative positions.

The other large change with time is for *Acorn*. It is in the ninth position (41%) for the all-year average and moves up to the fourth position (46%) in the current decade. I attribute this difference to a founder effect of *Acorn's* first editor, A.C. Missias; in poets she published during her 1998 to 2007 tenure, on average 34% were women; more information on this is in the next section.

The lowest percentages are for the senryu journal *Prune Juice* (41% for the current decade and 38% over its life) and for *Bottle Rockets* (37% for the current decade and 38% over the years I had issues for). While the latter is open to submissions of haiku as well as senryu, its material appears to me to have the human-affairs emphasis of senryu. For two senryu contests through the start of 2020, women won only 39% of the top three places, whereas 50% of the top-three winners in six non-senryu contests were women.¹⁷ Have women been less inclined than men to write and publish senryu? To investigate further, I added the senryu journal *Failed Haiku*, a recent (begun 2016) online journal. *Failed Haiku*, however, gave the second-highest journal percentage, with 51% of its published

poets being women. This appears to deny my hypothesis. I contacted the founder-editor, Mike Rehling, who told me that he is especially conscious of representing women strongly:¹⁸

I don't track anything like that [gender statistics of submitting poets], but my quick view of it is that FH is a lot more than 51% female. It is a personal prejudice of mine that shows up in every issue. I look for the best poems and women have a way of accomplishing that measure more often than men. All my teachers were and are women.

Because women can find a particularly supportive editor-in-chief at *Failed Haiku*, Rehling's slant could make that journal an outlier, compared with the lower percentages for the senryu contests and for *Prune Juice* and *Bottle Rockets*. So, I still have the notion that, as with senryu contests, women tend to be somewhat less represented than men in senryu-favoring journals.

Strikingly, in a later section, I show recent data that acceptances for women are occurring at a considerably higher percentage than historically for *Bottle Rockets* in its forthcoming issue 43, and also that this corresponds to a high percentage of women's submissions. The lower historical percentages may simply be due to fewer submissions by women.

GENDER OF PUBLISHED POETS COMPARED WITH GENDER OF EDITORS

A few editors and poets have asked me whether I have evidence of male editors being disposed to favor male poets more than female, or of female editors being disposed to favor female poets more than male. Privately, more than one poet, miffed by an editor's rejection, has asserted a bias.

In their earliest years *Modern Haiku*, *Chrysanthemum*, *Frogpond*, and *The Heron's Nest* appear to have published higher percentages of women under each founding editor than subsequently. However, I have no access to personal letters or other sources that might prove or contradict whether gender bias was active. If there was gender weighting of founder-editors' choices (as opposed to statistical fluctuations in the data), I imagine it arose largely from their pre-existing friendships and acquaintanceships with poets.

One journal, *Acorn*, published a higher percentage of men under its founding editor. For 1998 to 2007, founding editor A.C. Missias averaged 34% ($\pm 4\%$ confidence interval) women in the published poets. In contrast, *Acorn* editors after Missias averaged 46% ($\pm 1.5\%$) women: the 2008–2011 editor Carolyn Hall averaged 47% and the 2012–present editor Susan Antolin averaged 45%. I queried Missias, who replied:¹⁹

I don't think I ever gave consideration to gender when evaluating poems, except possibly in some edge cases when it might affect how the literal content of a poem was interpreted (like whether the pronoun 'she' might indicate a romantic interest, maybe)... I do imagine that the first issue or two was influenced by who already knew me—people from the Shiki Internet Haiku Salon, for example—but after that the word seemed to spread on its own in the usual ways. It's possible, however, that the *submitters* gave thought to editorial gender. Because I've always gone by A.C. Missias, they might have assumed that I was male.

For *Modern Haiku*, founder-editor Kay Titus Mormino averaged 63% ($\pm 4\%$ confidence interval) of the published poets being women during her eight-year tenure (1970–1977). Subsequent editors of *Modern Haiku* averaged 42% ($\pm 2\%$) women. The difference is clear. Trumbull documented circumstantial and plausible evidence for Mormino's founder effect being “a projection of those who had submitted to Mormino's earlier publications.”^{20 21}

Accepting the existence of this founder effect, I omitted *Modern Haiku*'s founder in calculating whether its percentages of women published seemed to correlate with the gender of its editors. Because subsequent editors were all men, that left me without comparative data there.

Frogpond did yield comparisons. Six of its fourteen primary editors have been women; on average 43% ($\pm 3\%$) of the poets they published were women. Eight of its editors have been men; on average 45% ($\pm 3\%$) of their published poets were women. Given those confidence intervals, the average percentage of women in the published poets does not appear to be higher for women editors; it is plausibly the same for editors who are women and who are men.

Table 3 shows the data for *Frogpond* averaged by each editor over most issues:²²

<i>Frogpond</i> Editor	% Women	Years Counted
Michael Ketchek	43.6%	2018–2020
Christopher Patchel	42.5%	2016–2018
Aubrie Cox	44.6%	2016
Francine Banwarth	43.4%	2012–2015
George Swede	44.5%	2008–2012
John Stevenson	42.4%	2006–2007
Jim Kacian	41.8%	1998–2002
Kenneth C. Leibman	48.8%	1995–1997
Sylvia Forges-Ryan	44.4%	1991–1993
Elizabeth Seale Lamb	42.8%	1985–1990; 1994
Alexis Rotella	37.5%	1983–1984
Bruce Kennedy	52.3%	1982–1983
Geoffrey O'Brien	47.4%	1981
Lilli Tanzer	47.9%	1978–1980

Table 3

Slightly greater percentages of women were published in *Frogpond's* first six years than subsequently. If a founder effect existed for *Frogpond* in those years, it is equally distributed between male and female editors. Omitting those founder editors, the remaining five primary editors who were women published 42.5% ($\pm 3\%$) women; the six who were men published 43.9% ($\pm 2\%$) women. Those results are very similar.

Chrysanthemum had a male founding editor, Dietmar Tauchner. Under him 49% ($\pm 5\%$) of the published haiku poets were women. In 2012 Beate Conrad succeeded Tauchner. For her, 45% ($\pm 2\%$) were women. With those confidence intervals and only two editors thus far, *Chrysanthemum* also gives no statistically convincing data that the gender of an editor correlates with or against gender of the published poets.

The Heron's Nest has always had a male lead editor, even though its team

of associate editors has tended to have roughly equal numbers of women and men. Therefore, it provided no data to correlate gender of its editors with or against gender of the published poets. It did show a muted though plausible founder effect. For the first four years (1999–2002) under founding editor Christopher Herold, on average 52% ($\pm 3\%$) of the poets were women. During Herold's subsequent five years (2003–2007), on average 48% ($\pm 4\%$) were women; for John Stevenson (2008–present), 46% ($\pm 2\%$) were women.

Prune Juice, however, yielded a little information. Of its five editors, two were female, for whose issues 37% of published poets were women; for its three male editors (I could not access its 2012 issue #10, which I believe would have added a fourth male editor), 38% of published poets were women. The similarity of those numbers again suggests no gender bias.²³

Acorn always had a female editor and so provided no data that might correlate gender of its editor with or against gender of the published poets. It and other journals in this study provided no data that encourage or discourage a perception of gender bias within them.

In my final investigation of editors, I contrasted entire journals as opposed to editors within a particular journal. For journals always edited by women (*Acorn*, *Mariposa*), on average 48.5% (40.7% and 56.3% respectively) of their published poets have been women. For journals whose lead editors were men for all or most issues, on average 45% ($\pm 4\%$) of their published poets have been women. The averages are slightly different, but not significantly so given the wide confidence intervals.

Thus, none of my data show that editors selectively publish poets of their own gender. There are founder effects in some journals but there are no data to prove intentional gender bias.

PERCENTAGES OF WOMEN POETS PUBLISHED COMPARED WITH THE PERCENTAGE OF SUBMISSIONS THAT CAME FROM WOMEN

The potential for gender bias can be studied further by comparing publication data with submission data. This, however, puts a load on editors to collect and share such information, and I am mindful that such extra work was sometimes not feasible. The most considerable data on submis-

sions came from editors for *Mariposa*, *Modern Haiku*, and *Acorn*. In all cases, the percentage of women in the submissions was the same statistically as the percentage of poets published in a journal. Thus, for all three quite different journals and editors, editorial knowledge of a poet's gender did not, in itself, appear to bias acceptance.

Cherie Hunter Day provided me submission totals for *Mariposa* for the twelve issues (numbers 27–38 from 2012 to 2018) under her editorship.²⁴ Her data showed that the submitting poets included on average 57.1% women (between 53% and 63% for different issues). Of the poets she published, on average 56.9% were women (between 49% and 63%). Effectively, the percentage of poets published who were women was the same as the percentage in those submitting.

Another way I checked for similarity was by calculating the ratio of the two percentages (% women published versus % women submitting) for each issue. Under Day, the mean was 1.00 (0.998).²⁵ That is a significant marker of absence of gender bias for this editor and journal. Furthermore, in *Mariposa* issues earlier and later than Day's, the percentage of women published averaged 56.0%, effectively the same as hers. This suggests a life-long absence of bias for the journal, although full submission numbers would be needed to test this hypothesis.

I now turn to *Modern Haiku*. Table 4 details editor Paul Miller's numbers for four recent issues:²⁶

<i>Modern Haiku</i> Volume : Issue (year)	Percent Women of Submitting Poets	Percent Women of Accepted Poets
51:2 (2020)	44%	46%
51:1 (2020)	45%	42%
50:3 (2019)	44%	44%
50:2 (2019)	39%	41%

Table 4

For these issues, on average 43% ($\pm 3\%$) of Miller's submitting poets were women and 43% ($\pm 2\%$) of the poets he accepted were women. These numbers are effectively identical statistically. This is consistent with the

above similarity for *Mariposa* under Day, even though her percentages are both much higher (57% women in both the submitting and the accepted poets).

Acorn is the third journal for which I have submission data for several issues, thanks to Susan Antolin, editor of *Acorn* since 2012. Her percentages of women among the submitting poets for three recent issues are in Table 5:²⁷

<i>Acorn</i> Issue (year)	Percent Women of Submitting Poets	Percent Women of Accepted Poets
44 (Spring 2020)	47.8%	48.7%
42 (Spring 2019)	46.2%	50.0%
40 (Spring 2018)	44.7%	46.4%

Table 5

For these issues, on average 46% ($\pm 2\%$) of Antolin’s submitting poets were women and 48% ($\pm 2\%$) of the poets she accepted were women.²⁸ These intervals overlap. The percentage of women in the submissions was effectively the same as the percentage in the accepted poets.

To summarize, for these journals where I have submission numbers for more than two issues, Table 6 compares women’s percentages in poets submitting and poets published for the same issues:²⁹

Journal (data for more than two issues)	Percent Women of Submitting Poets	Percent Women of Poets Published in these Issues
<i>Mariposa</i> (HPNC)	57.1%	56.9%
<i>Acorn</i>	46.2%	48.2%
<i>Modern Haiku</i>	43.0%	43.4%

Table 6

The ratio of percent published divided by percent submitted averages 1.02 (± 0.03); there is no evidence of inequality statistically. The percentages of women in submitting and published poets are the same.

Additionally, the correlation coefficient is 0.99, which is positive and remarkably high. It means that a higher percentage of women submitting to a journal correlates strongly with a higher percentage of women in the published poets. As ever, correlation is not causation. I do not prove that a higher percentage submitting causes a higher percentage to be published. Neither do I prove that a lower percentage being published discourages women from submitting. Plausibly each cause and several others may be at work. Convincing data would need a survey of hundreds of poets (men as well as women) who do and who do not submit to these haiku journals.

Next, I explored journals for which I had submission data for only one or two issues. Information on *The Heron's Nest* submissions was initially hard to come by.³⁰ However, I now have partial data for one issue (March 2020), generously provided by associate editors Scott Mason, Cherie Hunter Day, Julie Warther, and Jeff Hoagland. Between them these editors received submissions from 260 poets, of whom 48% were women. For this issue, I counted that 49% of the published poets were women. Because these data are for only two-thirds of the editors and for a single issue, any conclusion has (statistically speaking) an adventurous aroma. Nonetheless, the similarity of those two percentages suggests that for *The Heron's Nest* I see no significant difference between the percentages of women in submissions versus in acceptances.

For *Frogpond*, the journal of the Haiku Society of America, I have a single datum. It is for issue 41:1 (2018). *Frogpond's* then-editor Christopher Patchel wrote that 45% of its submitting poets were women.³¹ I counted that 43% ($\pm 5\%$) of that issue's published haiku poets were women. This was similar both to Patchel's submission percentage and also to *Frogpond's* average of 43.7% ($\pm 1.1\%$) women in the published poets for the current decade. The percentage published was slightly lower than the percentage submitting, but not significantly so, considering the confidence intervals of these data. Data on submission for other *Frogpond* issues would be very useful to expand this comparison.

For *Chrysanthemum*, its editor Beate Conrad supplied data on submissions to two of its issues: 26 (Autumn 2019) and 27 (Spring 2020). On average 45.3% of the submissions were from women.³² For those two

issues, I counted that on average 46.6% of the accepted haiku poets were women, effectively the same as for submissions.

In summary, for these journals where I have submission numbers for one or two issues, Table 7 compares women's percentages in poets submitting and poets published:

Journal (data for one or two issues)	Percent Women of Submitting Poets	Percent Women of Poets Published in Same Issues
The Heron's Nest	48% ³³	49%
Chrysanthemum	45% ³⁴	47%
Frogpond (HSA)	45% ³⁵	43%

Table 7

Despite the considerable limitations of these data, the ratio of percent published divided by percent submitted averages 1.04 (± 0.05). Again, there is no evidence of inequality statistically. The percentages of women in submitting and published poets are effectively the same. Also, their correlation coefficient is positive, 0.81. Thus, for these journals too, a higher percentage of women submitting correlates with a higher percentage of women being published.

Lastly, I requested information on *Bottle Rockets* submissions from founding editor Stanford Forrester. He responded that for issue #43 (in-progress 2020), 52% of his acceptances went to women, and that he accepted 66% of the submissions received from men and 71% of the submissions from women.³⁶ I suggest, then, that the significantly lower one-decade average of 37% women of published poets for *Bottle Rockets* would be associated with a lower percentage of women submitting for the earlier issues.

GENDER OF SUBMITTING POETS COMPARED WITH GENDER OF JOURNAL SUBSCRIBERS OR SOCIETY MEMBERS

For five journals I obtained data on the percentages of women who subscribed or were members of a journal's society. I compared those numbers with the percentages of women submitting.

The journal with the highest percentage of women submitting was *Mariposa* (HPNC). Between 2013 and 2017 (covering most of Day's editing years), 57% ($\pm 2\%$) of submitting poets were women.³⁷ For those years, HPNC membership averaged 110 people of whom 58% ($\pm 1\%$) were women. On average 64 poets submitted per issue in those years, a little over half the membership.

For *Acorn*, Antolin told me that 48% of the subscribers for Fall 2019 were women; around that time 47% of the submissions were from women.³⁸ Here also, the percentages were close.

For *Frogpond*, lacking data on HSA membership, I used the HSA's annual members' anthology to provide a plausible proxy for membership. Each HSA member is awarded publication in an anthology if they submit haiku whereas they are not guaranteed publication in *Frogpond*. For 2019 (corresponding to the year for which *Frogpond* submissions were 45% women), 54% of the HSA anthology poets were women, the percentage of women in the anthology being significantly higher than in *Frogpond* submissions.

For *Modern Haiku*, in December 2019, 49% of its subscribers were women; in May 2020, 46% were women.³⁹ The average was 47.5%. This can be compared with Miller's data above for four 2019 and 2020 issues, when 43% of the submitting poets were women. The percentage of women subscribing to *Modern Haiku* averaged slightly higher than in its submissions.

For *Blithe Spirit* (BHS), I lacked BHS membership data so I used its anthology as proxy. For the 2017 BHS anthology, 49% of the poets were women. Averaging over all that year's four issues of *Blithe Spirit*, 42% of the published haiku poets were women. Lacking submission data but leveraging the similarity I showed earlier (percentages of women in published and submitting poets are approximately equal), I approximated it to the percentage published. Then, the percentage of women in the BHS anthology was also greater than in its journal. These data are summarized in Table 8.

The percentage of women in the submissions for each journal is consistently less than the percentage of women in the subscribers to a journal and members of a journal's society. The average for submissions is 46.8%.

Journal (society)	Women in Submitting Poets	Women in Subscribers	Women in Membership ("A" if used anthology)
<i>Mariposa</i> (HPNC), 2013–2017	57%		58%
<i>Acorn</i> , 2019-2020	47%	48%	
<i>Frogpond</i> (HSA), 2019	45%		A 54%
<i>Modern Haiku</i> , 2019–2020	43%	47.5%	
<i>Blithe Spirit</i> (BHS), 2017	42% ⁴⁰		A 49%

Table 8

The subscribers and membership average 51.3% women. The ratio of the percentage in submitters divided by the percentage in subscribers and members averages 0.91 (± 0.06). Thus, it is statistically measurable that a smaller percentage of women have submitted than have been subscribers or members.

For individual journals, that ratio tends to be lower when the percentage of women in the submitters is lower and may relate to the size of an organization or journal. Specifically, the ratio is smaller for large national organizations averaging 0.85 for HSA and BHS versus 0.98 for HPNC. It is 0.91 for *Modern Haiku* versus 0.98 for the highly regarded but smaller *Acorn*.

The percentage of women in submissions tends to be larger when their percentage is larger in subscribers or members. The correlation coefficient for that effect is 0.81.

PROPORTIONS OF WOMEN PUBLISHED IN HAIKU JOURNALS WITH THE PROPORTIONS APPEARING ELSEWHERE

The above results, with the addition of data from other anthologies and contests⁴¹, are summarized in Table 9. The highest percentages of women appear in HSA anthologies, in the entrants of haiku (non-senryu) contests, and in winners in contests where I know the percentage of entrants. Earlier, I demonstrated the similar percentages of women

	Percent Women ⁴²	Years
Haiku Society of America anthologies	57% ($\pm 2\%$)	1993–2019
Entrants in 4 haiku (non-senryu) contests	55% ($\pm 6\%$)	1978–2020
Top three of winners in 4 haiku (non-senryu) contests for which I obtained entrant gender data	55% ($\pm 9\%$)	1978–2020
HSA haiku and senryu contests judges	51% ($\pm 13\%$)	1976–2020
Published in 11 haiku journals	45% ($\pm 2\%$)	1970–2020
8 <i>Red Moon Anthologies</i>	42% ($\pm 3\%$)	2012–2020
<i>Best American Poetry</i> anthologies ⁴³	41% ($\pm 3\%$)	1988–2019
Top three of winners in 2 haiku (non-senryu) contests for which I was denied entrant gender data	39% ($\pm 8\%$)	1976–2020
Top three of winners in 2 senryu contests	39% ($\pm 7\%$)	1976–2020
9 independent haiku anthologies	38% ($\pm 5\%$)	1993–2019
<i>Haiku 2014, 2015, 2016, 2020</i> (Modern Haiku Press)	36% ($\pm 5\%$)	2014–2016, 2020
Haiku and senryu contest judges excluding HSA	33% ($\pm 7\%$)	1978–2020

Table 9

submitting to and being published in journals. Here, I affirm the similar percentages for the entrants and the top-three winners of four haiku contests. In general, then, a lower percentage of women being published in a journal or winning a contest is correlated with their making a lower percentage of submissions. If women want to be published more and to win more, they need to submit more often to journals and enter more contests.

One unexpected difference is that women do well in contests whose organizers shared with me the gender information on their entrants:

women took 55% of the places. For contests that declined to share that information, women took only 40% of the places. As always, correlation is not causation, but I am intrigued by this difference.

The lowest percentage of women is for contest judges, only 33%. I exclude the HSA contests from this count because the HSA has an unusually strong tendency to invite both a female and a male judge for many an annual contest.

Women are under-represented in non-society anthologies compared to their presence in journals and contest wins. Even in the yearly *Red Moon Anthology* (arguably the anthology of record for English-language haiku), while women appear in a higher percentage than in other non-society anthologies, they are still slightly underrepresented.

GIVEN THE DATA, WHAT NEXT?

Throughout this research I have taken a binary male/female view of gender. I acknowledge that some poets do not place themselves in either of those two categories. I apologize to them for the limitation in my research: it was beyond my expertise to explore other aspects of potential discrimination, and I hope that others with appropriate skills could extend my study.

Overall my results show that women have been widely published in journals and haiku-society anthologies, but have been less likely to appear in non-society haiku anthologies or to be contest judges. This could suggest a pro-male preference among compilers of some anthologies and (despite notable exceptions) the solicitors of contest judges. Although women have not reached their full potential in haiku and senryu journals, I did not find gender bias in the hands of editors. Instead, bias seemed to be in the fingers of women who decided not to submit. I therefore challenge all women haiku poets to increase their submissions to haiku and senryu journals, to put themselves forward as contest judges, and to question anthologists that seem to under-represent women. Also, I call upon other contests to join with HSA's practice and invite more women to judge.

It is reasonable for women and their allies to alert non-society anthology editors of their concerns for more equitable representation of women,

and to support and purchase anthologies that are the most gender-balanced. Some anthologists might be privileging male poets in their selections, not yet fully representing the decades-long success of women in journals and contests.

Regarding journals, could it be that some women are less comfortable submitting work to a journal than to a haiku-society anthology where they are guaranteed publication? Might a few more women than men subscribe to *Modern Haiku* with the intent to read and study it but not submit, as Miller has wondered.⁴⁴ Perhaps women are more modest in self-assessment of their skills and accomplishments and hence less likely to submit to a haiku journal-of-record than to a regional journal where they feel more a part of the organization? Or (even at the risk of ambling into stereotype territory) are they more preoccupied with family chores than male haiku poets, resulting in their having less time to create and submit their poetry? Are they creating lots of haiku but are less ambitious or competitive or otherwise less motivated to submit work? Perhaps submissions are higher for a journal of a local organization where women feel a stronger tribal connection, due to frequent group meetings, excellent meeting refreshments, and a profusion of inter-member side projects and collaborations. But speculation is not proof. A survey, at least of *Modern Haiku* subscribers and the members of the HSA, the BHS, and HPNC, could be one way to get facts.

Lastly, and I cannot repeat enough: I do challenge all women haiku poets who are up for it, to increase their submissions to haiku and senryu journals and especially to senryu contests, to put themselves forward as contest judges, and to question anthologists that seem to under-represent women.

THANKS

Throughout this project, Charles Trumbull has been extremely supportive, not only by providing me with various subsets from his database but also by leading the way with publication statistics in his *A History of Modern Haiku*. The core comparison of women being published with women sending submissions was only possible with generous contributions from the many journal editors mentioned above, and particularly Cherie Hunter Day, Paul Miller, and Susan Antolin. I am profoundly grateful to Judy Kendall and Ian Storr of *Presence* who encouraged and published my initial article on haiku and senryu contests. Patricia J. Machmiller's insightful comments on my first draft improved this paper enormously.

NOTES:

¹ Trumbull, Charles. *A History of Modern Haiku*. Lincoln, IL: Modern Haiku Press, 2019, 54.

² Zimmerman, J. "Gender of Poets Winning Haiku and Senryu Contests" in *Presence* 64 (2019), 80-90.

³ Each average applies to the set of contests studied. Each confidence interval predicts the range of values in which the average is likely to lie when data are added for not-yet-measured contests. I use the traditional 95% probability. For more on confidence intervals, see Newcombe, Robert G. *Confidence Intervals for Propositions and Related Measures of Effect Size*. Boca Raton, FL: CRC Press, 2013, 1, 3: "[T]he purpose of performing statistical analyses is not primarily to tell us something about that particular sample, but about a wider population from which the sample has been taken." "A confidence interval (CI) is a range of values, derived from the sample [the poets of the journals in this study], which is intended to have a pre-specified probability ... of including the population proportion [poets in all haiku journals]."

⁴ Trumbull. *Ibid.*, 54–55, augmented by his errata slip dated 8/29/2019.

⁵ Charles Trumbull and I differ in our criteria for what we count. Therefore, our numbers differ. I count only stand-alone poems, in order to compare data from journals with the results of haiku contests. I exclude many that Trumbull includes, particularly haiku in book reviews, articles, contest results, and linked forms.

⁶ Although the journals are a convenience sample (primarily those I read and to which I subscribe), they represent contrasting groups: run by national haiku organizations versus not; national and international groups versus predominantly regional; originating in the USA versus elsewhere; on-line versus paper; and predominantly

senryu versus not.

⁷ I excluded a poet when I was unfamiliar with the poet and the given name was unisex or spelled with initials-only, as well as when a given name was unfamiliar (most often a name associated with Africa, India, or Eastern Europe). I spot-checked names of over a hundred poets on-line for self-identification in biographies and similar; that led to small (under 1%) changes for a few individual issues and changes of no more than 0.1% in any average above.

⁸ In view of the confidence intervals ($\pm 2\%$), a difference of 1% between adjacent journals may be transient. Also, not all 2020 journal issues had been received at the time of writing; and some back-issues were not on-hand.

⁹ Began 2016.

¹⁰ Omits data for 2011, whose issues are not on hand.

¹¹ Omits data for 2011, 2012, and 2020, whose issues are not on hand.

¹² Omits data for 2017, whose issues are not on hand.

¹³ Omits data for 2011 and 2017–2019; those issues are not on hand.

¹⁴ Omits data for 2003–2005. A few years were missing from some other journals. The author can send details on request.

¹⁵ My access to issues of the long-running *Blithe Spirit* is limited to this decade (starting 2013).

¹⁶ Trumbull. *Ibid.*, 55: “The large percentage of women in Mormino’s *Modern Haiku* issues was surely a projection of those who had submitted to Mormino’s earlier publications.”

¹⁷ These data include 2019–2020 data, updating that in Zimmerman. *Ibid.*, 81–82.

¹⁸ Mike Rehling, personal email, 2020.

¹⁹ A.C. Missias, personal email, 2020.

²⁰ Trumbull. *Ibid.*, 55.

²¹ Avid readers of fine print might note differences in the numbers from Trumbull and myself. For Mormino, I reported 63% women; Trumbull reported 54%. This considerable difference arose because, as summarized in Note 5, we used different criteria. For the five *Modern Haiku* editors to date, I averaged 12% more women than Trumbull counted. My smallest difference from Trumbull was for the current editor, Paul Miller: 2%. Perhaps *Modern Haiku* is letting women catch up to men with respect to reviews and articles, which I eyeballed as slanted toward male poets historically.

²² This includes data I counted for *Frogpond*’s first 25 years (1978–2002) on an

excellent CD that I purchased from HSA: “Index of *Frogpond* (1978–2002)” by Charles Trumbull.

²³ I present these data rather demurely compared with the data for *Frogpond*, not only because there is less certainty to the data with 5 rather than 14 editors, but also because, although I have counted issues in almost all of *Prune Juice*'s years, I have counted only two-thirds of its issues.

²⁴ Cherie Hunter Day, personal emails, 2018 and 2019. Of the submitting poets, on average 72% had a haiku accepted.

²⁵ This is despite the ratio ranging from 0.90 to 1.15 per issue, the wideness being attributable to the small numbers involved.

²⁶ Paul Miller, personal emails, 2019 and 2020. I count poets of stand-alone haiku only, and exclude poems in haibun, haiga, series, articles, and book reviews. Miller counted the same as I did except that he included poets with haiku sequences; I included those poets only if they had a stand-alone haiku in the same issue. Miller reported that for Issue 51:1 (2020), 55% of all the poets submitting were accepted; this ratio varied for issues.

²⁷ Susan Antolin, personal emails, 2018-2020. From Antolin's submission data, she accepted haiku for 33% ($\pm 4\%$) of the submitting poets.

²⁸ The percentage of accepted poets during that period is slightly higher than the average over Antolin's tenure, where the percentage of women in the published poets is 45.2% ($\pm 1.3\%$). The difference highlights the importance of comparing percentages of submissions and acceptances for the same issues, as is done here.

²⁹ The data for poets published are for the same issues as the submissions data. I include the decimal point (even though the standard deviations are typically $\pm 2\%$) because I use that degree of precision in calculating the correlation coefficient.

³⁰ In 2018 and 2019, I queried managing editor, John Stevenson, for submission numbers. He told me he would forward my request to his associate editors and no one responded. In 2020, I felt green-lighted to approach the current associate editors individually. Four responded with data. Fay Aoyagi declined, commenting that a poet's gender is irrelevant to her acceptance decisions. John Stevenson emailed that he considered it would be wrong to make acceptances based on gender; he sent data on acceptances in the submissions he received, but he did not retain submissions if not accepted and did not have gender information about them.

³¹ Christopher Patchel, personal email, 2018. From Patchel's raw data, I calculate that he accepted haiku for 36% of his submitting poets.

³² Beate Conrad, personal emails, 2020. Using her raw data on submissions with my counts of published haiku poets, I find that she accepted haiku from 38% of the submitting poets for these issue.

³³ Data are for only a single issue and for four of the six editors so the uncertainty is very large.

³⁴ Data are for two issues and were very similar.

³⁵ Data are for only a single issue so the uncertainty is large.

³⁶ Stanford Forrester, personal emails, 2020.

³⁷ Based on data from Cherie Hunter Day, personal emails, 2018 and 2019.

³⁸ Susan Antolin, personal emails, 2019 and 2020.

³⁹ Paul Miller, personal emails December 20th, 2019, and May 26th, 2020.

⁴⁰ Earlier, I showed the similarity of the percentages of women in submissions and in published poets. Therefore, I approximate here the *Blithe Spirit* percentage of women submitting, using as proxy its percentage of women published.

⁴¹ Data on contest entrants, winners, and judges are current through early-2020; these extend by a year or more the data in Zimmerman. Ibid.

⁴² The confidence intervals do not indicate uncertainty in the data reported, which are (except for errors on my part) reliable for the items measured. Instead they denote where the average might be when I add data for different anthologies, journals, or contests. The confidence intervals are especially large when a sample size is small, such as there being only two types of contest (haiku contest and senryu contest) for HSA.

⁴³ The annual *Best American Poetry* anthologies are an efficient way to learn about mainstream or western poetry, just as the *Red Moon Anthologies* are for haiku.

⁴⁴ Paul Miller, personal communication, 2020.