

12-2008

The Tennessee Williams Scholars Conference/Tennessee Williams Annual Review

Mary C. Mees
University of New Orleans

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.uno.edu/aa_rpts

Recommended Citation

Mees, Mary C., "The Tennessee Williams Scholars Conference/Tennessee Williams Annual Review" (2008).
Arts Administration Master's Reports. 3.
https://scholarworks.uno.edu/aa_rpts/3

This Master's Report is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by ScholarWorks@UNO with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Master's Report in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you need to obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/or on the work itself.

This Master's Report has been accepted for inclusion in Arts Administration Master's Reports by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@UNO. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uno.edu.

University of New Orleans

**An Internship Report
Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts in Arts Administration**

**The Tennessee Williams Scholars' Conference/
*Tennessee Williams Annual Review***

**by
Mary C. Mees
November 4, 2008**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	2
CHAPTER 1	
Organizational Profile	3
CHAPTER 2	
Internship Description	11
CHAPTER 3	
S.W.O.T. Analysis	14
Strengths	14
Weaknesses	15
Opportunities	19
Threats	21
CHAPTER 4	
Best Practices	23
CHAPTER 5	
Recommendations	33
CHAPTER 6	
Contributions	35
CONCLUSION	37
BIBLIOGRAPHY	38

INTRODUCTION

In December 2007 I began an internship with the Tennessee Williams Scholars' Conference/*Tennessee Williams Annual Review*. The Conference and *Review* are co-produced by Williams expert and professor of English at Middle Tennessee State University Dr. Robert Bray and the publications department of The Historic New Orleans Collection. The majority of my internship took place from my home and at The Collection, where I also currently serve full-time as an editor on book projects and the institution's quarterly magazine. The following report provides an overview of my internship, my analysis of the operation of the Conference/*Review*, and my recommendations for the organization developed over the course of my tenure, which will conclude in December 2008.

CHAPTER 1

Organizational Profile

In 1996, Dr. Bray, in partnership with the Tennessee Williams/New Orleans Literary Festival, established the annual Tennessee Williams Scholars' Conference to be held each March in conjunction with the Festival. Bringing together scholars and students of Tennessee Williams to present papers and readings and to stage performances, the Conference is a full-day academic/literary event. The Festival, a 501(c)3 nonprofit corporation, had been in operation for ten years when it added the Conference to its five-day program. In addition to the Conference the Festival presents panel discussions, theatrical performances, a one-act play competition, lectures, literary walking tours, musical performances, and a book fair.

“Governed by a volunteer board of directors composed of teachers, writers, book-sellers, city government personnel, corporate representatives, and television consultants,” the Festival receives funding from “auxiliary events, fund-raising parties, corporate and individual donations, and public and private foundation donations.”¹ Adding the Conference to its line up of programming made the Festival eligible for a new array of grants because the Conference is considered to be an educational component for the organization. However, the Festival provides no managerial oversight and little funding to the Conference. Dr. Bray sends out calls for papers and selects presenters from the submissions. The presenters are then expected to cover their own travel expenses through the stipends provided by their respective universities. The Festival has agreed to promote the Conference through its website and printed program, provide a venue for the full-day event, sell tickets (tickets are \$10; the proceeds go to the Festival), and supply

¹ www.tennesseewilliams.net, accessed Sept. 23, 2008.

audiovisual support and volunteer staffing. In recent years, the Festival's director, Paul Willis, has increasingly relied upon The Historic New Orleans Collection for assistance in fulfilling these tasks. This will be further discussed later in the Organizational Profile.

In 1998, with financial backing from the University of the South at Sewanee, Dr. Bray founded the *Tennessee Williams Annual Review* as an outgrowth of the Scholars' Conference. Published in the spring of each year (in time for the Conference), the *Review* is dedicated to promoting scholarly research on the literary works of American master Tennessee Williams. The *Review* publishes scholarship on Williams's plays, fiction, and poems and on the film adaptations of his works. Each issue also showcases at least one previously unpublished work by Williams. While the journal features essays presented at the Conference previous to the publication year, this is not the only source; papers are solicited for publication only as well. Dr. Bray has also asked his colleague Philip Kolin, a Williams scholar at the University of Southern Mississippi, to commission theatre reviews for the journal. However, to date, he has not followed through on this responsibility, and none of the last three issues of the journal have included performance reviews.

The first four issues (1998–2001) were published by the University of the South at Sewanee. Before his death in 1983, Tennessee Williams designated the University of the South at Sewanee as the principal beneficiary of his literary estate as a memorial to his grandfather, the Reverend Walter E. Dakin, who studied at Sewanee's School of Theology in 1895. The trust originally provided financial support to Williams's sister, Rose, until her death in 1996. At that point the trust reverted to the University. As the owner of Williams's literary estate, the University controls the rights to publish or

perform any of Williams's works. The University, in turn, receives royalties from the proceeds of publishing or performing the works. In a 1998 press release announcing the groundbreaking for the Tennessee Williams Performing Arts Center, the University estimated the value of the estate at \$7 million.² So, it made perfect sense for the University to support the *Review*'s publication.

As an educational institution, the University of the South is also a tax-exempt nonprofit organization under section 501(c)3 of the Internal Revenue Code.³ The University served as the oversight body for the Conference/*Review* at this time, though its role entailed little more than providing funding for the journal's production. Middle Tennessee State University (MTSU), where Dr. Bray serves as an English professor, agreed to cover the cost of mailing the *Review* and provided a small editorial stipend to Dr. Bray. Dr. Bray served, and continues to serve, as editor of the journal, with the support of an editorial board, which provides content oversight but no management or production support, and as director of the Conference. Dr. Bray employed a graduate student, Chip Barham, with funds from the University of the South, to design and lay out the journal. Although no longer a graduate student, Chip continues to design and lay out the journal on a part-time, contract basis. His role has grown to include design and management of the Conference/*Review*'s website.

In 2002 the University of the South withdrew its financial support, and the journal converted to an exclusively online publication, accessed through the organization's website: www.tennesseewilliamsstudies.org. In 2004, Dr. Bray approached The Historic New Orleans Collection, a major repository for Tennessee Williams materials, as a

² www.sewanee.edu/theology/communications/news/Groundbreaking.html

³ Jody Blazek, *Financial Planning for Nonprofit Organizations* (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1996), 218–20.

possible publisher for the journal. A museum, research center, and publisher, The Historic New Orleans Collection is “dedicated to the study and preservation of the history and culture of New Orleans and the Gulf South region.”⁴ The Collection had been a supporter of the Tennessee Williams/New Orleans Literary Festival for years, serving as a venue for the Festival’s master classes and periodically as the site for the Scholars’ Conference. The Collection’s administrative and collections staff had become well acquainted with Dr. Bray through their Festival participation. Indeed, Dr. Bray served as a consultant on The Collection’s acquisition of the Fred W. Todd Tennessee Williams Collection, the largest private collection of Tennessee Williams materials anywhere in the world (Fred W. Todd was an avid collector of Tennessee Williams materials for over 40 years). And, when the acquisition was finalized in 2001, Dr. Bray wrote an extensive article about the collection for *The Historic New Orleans Collection Quarterly*. The Collection’s dedication to the study of Tennessee Williams and strong relationship with Dr. Bray made the journal a perfect fit for their publications schedule. So in 2005, the *Review* returned to print.

With the advent of Dr. Bray’s partnership with The Collection, the Conference/*Review* took on a new management structure. Dr. Bray continued on as the editor of the *Review* and the director of the Conference. However, the publications department of The Collection, with Dr. Jessica Dorman at the helm, received financial, editorial, and marketing oversight in its role as the representative of the larger management body, The Historic New Orleans Collection.

The Historic New Orleans Collection is operated by the Kemper and Leila Williams Foundation, a 501(c)3 private operating foundation. As explained by Bruce R.

⁴ www.hnoc.org, consulted Sept. 27, 2008.

Hopkins in *Starting and Managing a Nonprofit Organization*, a private operating foundation “devotes most of its earnings and much of its assets directly for the conduct of its charitable, educational, or similar purposes.”⁵ In the case of the Kemper and Leila Williams Foundation, its purpose is oversight of the museum, research center, and publisher that is The Historic New Orleans Collection. Eight paid community members make up the board of the Foundation. Priscilla Lawrence serves as executive director of The Historic New Orleans Collection.

Each year, Dr. Dorman works with Dr. Bray to establish a budget for the journal’s layout, printing, and marketing (Conference marketing also falls within this budget). The budget is submitted to Priscilla Lawrence, and it is approved or amended by the board of directors of the Foundation. Since The Collection took over publishing the *Review*, the budget for the journal has been approximately \$10,000, which, for the past two years, has included a \$1,500 editorial stipend for Dr. Bray. Once established, the budget is overseen by Dr. Dorman, with input from Dr. Bray on where to place advertisements and calls for papers. All proceeds from journal sales go to The Collection to defray the cost of publishing the journal. Printing costs average about \$6,000, and marketing expenses average about \$2,000. The individual subscription rate is \$15 and the institutional/library rate is \$30. There were 135 subscriptions and single copies sold in 2005. Since its release year another 68 have been sold. In 2006, there were 122 subscriptions and single copies sold, with another 12 being sold since its release year. And in 2007, there were 99 subscriptions and single copies sold, with another 69 being sold since its release. So, the

⁵ Bruce R. Hopkins, *Starting and Managing a Nonprofit Organization* (Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2005), 173.

journal has obviously not come close to covering its own expenses, much less seeing a profit.

Dr. Bray added Dr. Dorman to the editorial board, which now comprises five members.⁶ All content for the Conference and *Review* is still reviewed and chosen by Dr. Bray and the board. Once the papers are selected for publication, Dr. Bray and Dr. Dorman, along with editors from the publications department, edit the works and choose visuals from the Todd Collection or outside repositories for inclusion in the journal. As stated earlier, Chip Barham lays out the journal, and then it is printed by a New Orleans printer.

The marketing of the journal is conducted by the publications department and distribution is shared by Dr. Bray, the publications department, and the Shop at The Collection. The Collection's publications department operates in conjunction with its marketing department. Staffed by two professionals, the marketing office is responsible for advertising and marketing The Collection's extremely busy exhibition and programming schedule. As a result, book marketing, including that of the journal, is often placed on the back burner, with little time to develop new strategies. A direct-mail postcard is produced and distributed each year to past subscribers—the list of which is now maintained by The Historic New Orleans Collection through their database software, Donor2. In 2006, The Collection also rented lists from the Modern Language Association (MLA) and the American Library Association (ALA) for this direct-mail piece, but uncertainty about the success of this measure kept the staff from repeating the effort and expense. An email blast also goes out to the subscriber list and The Collection's entire email list. Recipients of the postcard and email are directed to the *Review*'s website or to

⁶ www.tennesseewilliamsstudies.org, consulted Sept. 27, 2008.

the Shop at The Collection for ordering the journal. The journal orders are then fulfilled by Dr. Bray, with funding for mailing still provided by MTSU, and by the Shop, which also carries the journal in its store and on its website. The Shop also works with a local wholesaler, Forest Sales, to distribute The Collection's books, including the *Review*, to local and regional bookstores.

Additionally, the publications department promotes the *Review*, along with its other books, at two annual book festivals: the Louisiana Book Festival in Baton Rouge and the New Orleans Book Fair. In 2007, the marketing office employed several new marketing strategies. At Dr. Bray's request, they placed an ad in *Modern Drama*, a scholarly journal focused on dramatic literature published by the University of Toronto. Press releases along with review copies of the journal were sent to radio stations and newspapers in the cities where the journal's contributors live. Letters and copies of the journals were also sent to the publicity departments of the universities and colleges where the contributors teach.

The Conference program is established by Dr. Bray and the editorial board. Once The Collection became the publisher of the *Review*, the Festival began relying on the institution to provide a venue for the Conference. So for the past three years it has taken place in the Williams Research Center, the research facility of The Collection. This year the Festival director also expected The Collection to provide microphones and equipment for recording the Conference's panel discussion, which is then transcribed and published in the *Review*. So, the Festival only provided volunteers, ticket sales, and promotion through their marketing materials. Dr. Bray recently met with the Festival's director to seek funding to provide Conference presenters with an honorarium, to no avail. The

director suggested that he seek half of the funding from The Collection and the Festival would attempt to come up with the rest.

Since the Conference/*Review* has found a fairly stable funding base in The Historic New Orleans Collection, Dr. Bray has been looking to grow the organization's profile in the academic and theater communities; build a larger, consistent subscription base, particularly among libraries; and solicit additional writers and presenters.

CHAPTER 2

Internship Description

In the year that I have been an intern with the *Conference/Review*, I have been a liaison between the *Conference/Review* and The Historic New Orleans Collection, a marketing assistant, a program coordinator for the Conference, an editorial assistant to the *Review*, and a website redesign assistant. Prior to the year of my tenure, Dr. Bray and Dr. Dorman had decided to skip an issue and devote resources to the redesign of the website. The 2008 Conference would go on, but we were not editing and printing a journal for March. However, toward the end of my internship year, we began receiving essays for the 2009 *Review*. Editing begins in the Summer prior to the journal's publication to allow for ample time for a back and forth with the authors. Often papers are returned to the authors for substantial rewriting.

As a liaison, I operated as Dr. Bray's main point person for all of his needs from The Collection. Early on we worked closely to strategize about new marketing outlets for calls for papers for the *Conference/Review*. In December I placed last minute calls for the March 2008 Conference on free websites, including the University of Pennsylvania's site (cfp.english.upenn.edu); the Association of Writers and Writing Programs' Writers' Circle Forum; and H-Net. In August, I again placed calls on these sites, this time for the 2009 Conference and *Review*. I located a few additional sites, including PapersInvited.com and the Voice of the Shuttle (vos.ucsb.edu). Additionally, I placed an ad in the *Chronicle of Higher Education*'s "Events in Academe" supplement—a publication that is distributed twice a year and is a leading resource for calls for papers in the academic world.

As stated earlier, the website was a major focus of my internship. In early December, I flew to Murfreesboro with Dr. Dorman to meet with Dr. Bray and Chip Barham to review Chip's preliminary redesign of the website. We strategized about ways to improve the information flow, to simplify the structure, and improve the aesthetics. Upon my return, I presented the design to Priscilla Lawrence and relayed her changes back to Chip. During the meeting we also identified two major tasks that I could undertake: compiling a bibliography of all the works cited from the three recent published journals (2005, 2006, and 2007) and creating a pathfinder to The Collection's Todd Collection for linking from the *Conference/Review* website's resources page. The resources page currently links to the three other major repositories for Williams's legacy: Columbia University, University of Delaware, and University of Texas at Austin. Therefore, it is essential that The Historic New Orleans Collection be included as soon as possible.

These two endeavors occupied the majority of my time. The bibliography has been completed and sent to Chip for posting on the site, but he has not done this yet (I will address this fact in the S.W.O.T. Analysis and Recommendations chapters of the report). The pathfinder is still in the works. The Todd Collection is extensive and broken into four categories (manuscripts, correspondence, theatre and cinema materials, and periodicals and books), which are then divided into targeted subsections. I met with the collection's curator to ascertain the collection's structure and compile all of the materials that would need to be incorporated into the website. Using the program Contribute, I've been laying out the multi-page website to be published on The Collection's website by the end of the year.

In February, I began coordinating the logistics of the Conference. Over the course of several phone calls with the Festival's director, I discovered that the Festival would not be providing the audiovisual/recording support that Dr. Bray anticipated. Instead, he expected us to rely on the equipment available through The Collection's oral history program and to go without microphones. I did confirm the Festival's contribution of two volunteers to take tickets at the Conference and provide name tags for the speakers. I met with Mark Cave and Alfred Lemmon of the Williams Research Center to coordinate the set up of the Conference, the recording needs, etc. I coordinated the sale of *Reviews* through the Festival's vendor, Garden District Books, and sold the *Reviews* at the Conference. The Conference welcomed approximately 70 audience members this year—an improvement from past years when the audience typically averaged around 50 participants. Dr. Bray's goal is 100 participants. After the Festival, I input the attendance list into the Conference/*Review* mailing list. And in recent months, I've been editing the recordings from both the 2007 and 2008 Conferences for broadcasting from the website—Dr. Bray has decided to move to an online format rather than publishing the transcripts in the journal.

Papers have begun to come in for the 2009 *Review*, and I am assisting with the editing. I am also compiling images for a piece highlighting photographs from the shooting of *A Streetcar Named Desire* from the Todd Collection to be published in the forthcoming issue.

CHAPTER 3

S.W.O.T. Analysis

Strengths

The *Tennessee Williams Annual Review* remains the only major journal devoted exclusively to the works of Tennessee Williams, and the Scholars' Conference is the only event of its kind. These are obvious strengths for the organization. There are no competitors vying for their audience or stealing from their contributor base.

As a renowned Williams expert, Dr. Bray is well acquainted with scholars working in the field of Williams studies. His connections allow him to always pull together a distinguished group of scholars for the Conference and *Review*, even when submissions are low. His credentials lend the journal a degree of credibility within the academic community. Additionally, he is tapped into the marketing opportunities within the academic world of which The Collection's publications and marketing staff would be otherwise unaware.

The Historic New Orleans Collection's commitment to funding the publication of the *Review* and supporting the Conference through provision of space and staffing is another obvious strength of the Conference/*Review*. Many independent literary journals must rely upon grants, private support, and subscriptions to fund their publication. Even journals funded by universities are still expected to cover their own costs, reimbursing the university from journal sales. Because The Historic New Orleans Collection is funded by the Kemper and Leila Williams Foundation, the administration is able to focus on the mission rather than funding the mission. Therefore, the publications program is seen more as an avenue for achieving the mission rather than as a source of revenue. While the institution's leadership would like to see the books and journal make a profit, the lack of

significant earnings does not affect the funding from the institution. Therefore, in *The Collection*, the *Conference/Review* has found a truly unique funding source that strengthens the organization's potential for growth and likelihood of surviving for the long haul.

Although the Tennessee Williams/New Orleans Literary Festival has provided little in the way of support, the incorporation of the Conference into the Festival's programming schedule has been a strength to the Conference, particularly in the area of audience development. It would be difficult for the Conference to function independently. The lack of a larger event in which to participate would diminish the potential for attracting attendees who travel great distances to attend the Festival and the Conference. And the minimal assistance provided by the Festival would actually be very time consuming for Dr. Bray and the publications department to handle. The Festival can easily incorporate the Conference into its marketing materials, designate volunteers from their large pool, and manage ticket sales alongside those for the Festival.

Weaknesses

The strengths and weaknesses of the *Conference/Review* at times overlap. Scholarly research on Tennessee Williams is a rather narrow field. It is not altogether surprising that there is only one journal and one conference devoted exclusively to this topic. As an organization with such a restricted mission, the *Conference/Review* can only expect a limited audience, content contributor base, and donor base, should it seek one in the future.

While the *Conference/Review's* alignment with various oversight institutions has been important to its development and ability to stay afloat, this arrangement has

complicated the organization's management structure and identity. The Collection has given Dr. Bray significant control over the *Conference/Review*, but ultimately the institution's administration has the power to determine funding, marketing, and even content. The organization's association with The Collection and the Festival dilutes its identity and brand. More than likely, many Conference-goers assume that the Scholars' Conference is produced by the Festival, and most journal buyers assume that the *Review* is a product of The Historic New Orleans Collection. Therefore, they are seeing these programs as products of the Festival's and The Collection's missions, rather than the programs of an independent entity, which it seems the *Conference/Review* is striving to be. However, Dr. Bray would be unable to generate enough revenue through ticket and journal sales to operate the *Conference/Review* as its own entity.

The *Conference/Review* also suffers from its lack of a staff person solely dedicated to overseeing the production and marketing of the Conference and *Review*, managing the distribution of the journal, and maintaining the website. All staff currently dedicated to the *Conference/Review* is doing so on a part-time basis. Dr. Bray is a professor. Dr. Dorman manages an extremely busy publication schedule for The Collection. Chip Barham is a high-school teacher. The marketing staff is overextended by its workload without adding book marketing to the mix. As a result, the *Conference/Review* receives extremely divided attention. Work is completed in ebbs and flows. The marketing efforts and website suffer most. No strategically developed, regularly evaluated marketing plan exists. Instead, a range of marketing efforts have been employed throughout the years, as discussed in the Organizational Profile. All have been excellent strategies, but, unless completed with consistency, they will have little long-

term effect. The new website is up, but the information is not up-to-date, much of the content restructuring has not been completed (including the posting of the bibliography I mentioned in the internship description).

Another issue that the Conference/*Review* faces is copyright, and it is becoming increasingly clear that the lack of an individual who has a full grasp of copyright law is a weakness for the *Review*. The works of Tennessee Williams, a twentieth-century artist, are protected by copyright law.⁷ And not just his writings are protected but the photographs of Tennessee and the many actors who performed in his plays and movie versions thereof are also protected. The myriad of promotional materials produced in conjunction with theater and film productions also receive copyright protection.

As stated in the Organizational Profile, each issue of the *Review* features one previously unpublished play by Williams. The University of the South owns the copyright to these works, as described in the Organizational Profile. The University employs Georges Borchardt, Inc. as the literary agent to handle any requests to publish Williams's works. There is no established fee schedule for licensing the materials; all requests are handled on a case by case basis.⁸ Beginning in 1944, New Directions Publishing Corporation was Tennessee Williams's main publisher. In a 2003 agreement with the estate, the publishing company acquired the rights to continue to publish works

⁷ According to the 1976 Copyright Act (17 U.S.C.) and the Sonny Bono Copyright Term Extension Act of 1998, any work that is created on or after January 1, 1978, is automatically protected for the life of the artist/author and for 70 years after his death. Works-made-for hire or anonymous works are protected under copyright for 95 years from publication or 120 years from creation, whichever is shorter. For works created prior to 1978 and published or registered, copyright may be renewed for up to 67 years for a total of 95 years (originally protected for 28 years from date of first publication or date of registration). 17 U.S.C. § 301-304. In turn, virtually all of Tennessee Williams's works are copyright protected.

⁸ Conversation with Celine Little, representative of Georges Borchardt, Inc., Nov. 23, 2006.

by Williams for the life of the copyrights.⁹ When an individual seeks permission from the estate to publish a previously unpublished work by Williams, the agent will offer New Directions the right of first refusal. Therefore, once Dr. Bray has selected the unpublished work that he would like to feature in the *Review*, he must contact both Borchardt and New Directions. To date, he has been granted rights without trouble, and Borchardt has even waived the fee.

Selecting images to run in the journal has been a more complicated copyright clearing endeavor. The Todd Collection has much to offer in terms of visuals—photographs, lobby cards, posters from film productions of his plays. However, the copyright to these materials is held by the production companies—Warner Brothers, Universal Studio, MGM, United Artists (which is now part of MGM), Paramount Pictures, and Columbia Pictures. While all of these companies, with the exception of Warner Brothers, have licensing pages within their websites, neither Dr. Bray nor the publications staff has attempted the process of obtaining permission. Dr. Bray assumed the *Review* fell under fair use. However, because the journal is sold, it may fall outside the first criteria for fair use provided by copyright law: “the purpose and character of the use, including whether such use is of a commercial nature or is for nonprofit educational purposes.”¹⁰ Dr. Bray has chosen a selection of photographs from the filming of *A Streetcar Named Desire* (produced by Warner Brothers) for the 2009 *Review*. For a

⁹ Calvin Reid, “New Directions Inks Tennessee Williams Pact,” *Publishers Weekly*, Nov. 3, 2003 (accessed at www.publishersweekly.com).

¹⁰ 17 U.S.C. § 107. The other criteria are as follows:

- (2) the nature of the copyrighted work;
- (3) the amount and substantiality of the portion used in relation to the copyrighted work as a whole; and
- (4) the effect of the use upon the potential market for or value of the copyrighted work.

discussion of how the publications department plans to handle obtaining copyright clearance, see the Best Practices chapter.

Opportunities

Because the *Conference/Review* is the only one of its kind, there is plenty of room for growth with regard to contributor and audience development. And there is a broad array of marketing and distribution opportunities available to literary journals of which the *Conference/Review* needs to take advantage. The fulfillment of these opportunities, however, is dependent upon the designation or hiring of a staff person to manage all of the issues discussed in the previous paragraph. The *Review* stands to drastically increase its sales by regularly renting lists from MLA and ALA; targeting libraries and college faculty; regularly participating in conferences and other publicity events; maintaining an up-to-date, informative website; sending out review copies; and submitting journals to online vendors (Spdbooks.org, Amazon, Barnes and Noble, and Borders). Additionally, the journal may benefit from contracting with a distributor. And there are a variety of sources where articles from the journal can be abstracted and indexed, including *Humanities International Complete*, *Book Review Index*, *EBSCO Publishing*, *Humanities Index*, and *MLA International Bibliography*.

Dr. Bray has undertaken the process of licensing the journal for inclusion in EBSCO's full-text online database. EBSCO is the "largest intermediary between libraries and publishers." Their online database is a tool for both selling the journal online, via the database, and encouraging print subscriptions. Royalties from database sales are shared by the publisher and EBSCO.¹¹ However, the license agreement is quite extensive and includes clauses such as, "Licensor (the *Review*) grants to EP (EBSCO Publishing) the

¹¹ EBSCO Publishing Content Licensing.

non-exclusive right and license to reproduce, distribute reproductions of, display, publicly perform, and adapt the Content (journal) for purposes of incorporating the Content into the Products (information products distributed by EP)....”¹² Dr. Bray and the publications department may need to consult The Historic New Orleans Collection’s legal counsel before signing such an agreement.

There is also a great potential for funding growth—tapping into Tennessee Williams enthusiasts such as Fred Todd, applying for grants, researching government funding opportunities, identifying corporations that might have funds set aside to support the literary arts. How this would be approached depends on whether the Conference/*Review* continues as a product of The Collection or incorporates as its own entity with 501(c)3 status. It is necessary to be a nonprofit to solicit such funding. So, it would be the responsibility of The Collection to investigate and approach potential donors. The Council of Literary Magazines and Presses provides a Database for Literary Publishers and Presenters to its membership. The database contains “information on funders of literary projects, including those supporting book and magazine publishing, live literary programming, translation projects, and other literary programs.”¹³ This source would be an excellent starting point for building a funding base for the *Review* and the Conference.

Additionally, the *Review* should consider establishing a membership program. That of *The Southern Review*’s “Friends” program is an excellent model. Based at Louisiana State University, *The Southern Review* “publishes fiction, poetry, critical

¹² Ibid.

¹³ www.clmp.org, consulted Oct. 5, 2008.

essays, interviews, book reviews, and excerpts from novels in progress, with an emphasis on contemporary literature in the United States and abroad, and with a special interest in southern culture and history.” *The Southern Review*’s Friends program offers “those who understand and appreciate the importance of literature and the arts” an opportunity to support *The Review* by joining at one of eight membership levels. All donors are recognized in each issue, and the higher level donors receive a lifetime subscription to *The Southern Review*.¹⁴

Threats

A range of threats hamper the growth of the Conference/*Review*. As the world becomes more and more reliant on the internet for access to resources such as scholarly journals, will there be a need for a printed edition? As college students increasingly turn to online databases, such as JSTOR and Project MUSE, for access to scholarly research in the humanities and social science fields, libraries may choose to decrease their subscriptions to print editions. The *Review*’s narrow scope does not make it a good candidate for inclusion in such sites which have fairly rigorous and selective standards for which journals they will feature on their sites.¹⁵

Also, how will the country’s economic crisis affect the stability of The Historic New Orleans Collection as a funding source? As stated earlier, The Collection is endowed by the Kemper and Leila Williams Foundation. A decline in the stock market affects the level of funding, and the board may choose to reevaluate which programs it will continue to fund.

¹⁴ www.lsu.edu/tsr, consulted Oct. 16, 2008.

¹⁵ Conversation with JSTOR representative, Museum Publishing Conference, June 2006.

There is also the possibility of a competitor coming forward to establish a similar publication/conference before the *Review* is well enough established to deter such a move. If Dr. Bray decided to step down as director of the Conference because of the Tennessee Williams/New Orleans Literary Festival's lack of support, the Festival may choose another director who might the grow the Conference to the scale of the University of Mississippi's Faulkner and Yoknapatawpha Conference. The University of Mississippi Press annually publishes a book of the papers from this lauded five-day conference. An equivalent conference and publication would severely threaten the success of the *Review*.

CHAPTER 4

Best Practices

The Tennessee Williams Scholars' Conference/*Tennessee Williams Annual Review* is a member of a broad network of literary magazines. There are approximately 600 active literary magazines in the United States. Literary magazines serve a vital role in world of literature. According to the Council of Literary Magazines and Presses (CLMP), "Literary magazines and presses accomplish the backstage work of American literature: discovering new writers; supporting mid-career writers; publishing the creative voices of communities underrepresented in the mainstream commercial culture; and preserving literature for future readers by keeping books in print."¹⁶ The *Review* is a very specific type of the literary magazine. Dedicated to publishing scholarship on the works of a great American playwright, the *Review* serves a targeted group from the larger literary world that CLMP describes—theatre scholars. The academic world requires the proliferation of scholarship from its members. Therefore, though its reach is limited, the *Review* provides a very important service to its academic community—an avenue for publishing.

In order to analyze how the *Review* is performing in this larger network of literary magazines, it is important to look at the development of the industry. CLMP provides an overview of the industry's growth:

Many magazines are supported by a university sponsor. Most university-based magazines were founded in the 1930s and 1940s when various "schools" of writing and literary criticism were formed and outlets were needed for their expression. Magazines brought prestige and a national image to the universities which provided them with a home, staff and a generous operating subsidy. In more recent decades, the majority of magazines have been founded outside the academy and thus are known as "independents."¹⁷

¹⁶ www.clmp.org, accessed Oct. 5, 2008.

¹⁷ Ibid.

The *Review* falls somewhere in between a university-based magazine and an “independent.” Dropped by its university sponsor, the *Review* is now overseen by an independent, museum press. Therefore, there are a variety of standards which apply to the *Review*. The literature put forward by two professional organizations—CLMP and the Independent Book Publishers Association (formerly PMA)—is a good current academic resource for evaluating the *Review*’s operation.

Founded in the late 1960s, CLMP provides “services and resources designed to develop each member’s publishing capacity through increased marketing and organizational skills, while CLMP also serves as a nexus of communication, promoting shared learning across the entire field.”¹⁸ While many of its resources—including a monograph series on marketing and organizational topics—are only available to members, its website provides a range of information about industry standards. The Independent Book Publishers Association (IBPA) was founded in 1983 and strives to “advance the professional interests of independent publishers....[by providing] cooperative marketing programs, education and advocacy within the publishing industry.”¹⁹ Its website also provides a plethora of information, including access to *IBPA Independent*, the organization’s monthly newsletter.

The *Review*’s basic management structure, made up of an editorial board and editor, mirrors that of most literary magazines. However, the staff of a magazine also typically includes a business manager, as well as associate and assistant editors. And some larger magazines have both advisory and editorial boards. According to CLMP,

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Mission statement, www.ibpa-online.org, accessed Oct. 5, 2008.

boards should be called upon to assist with the marketing and distribution of the magazine—an expectation that the *Review* has not used to its advantage.

The *Review*'s processes for the soliciting and reviewing journal submissions line up with those employed by other magazines and the recommendations of CLMP, but they are considerably more basic. Dr. Bray's calls for papers simply ask that submissions be sent as Word attachments, following MLA style. There is no attempt to maintain the anonymity of the author to avoid preferential treatment of a journal supporter. Dr. Bray's reasoning for not using this measure is that the journal is so focused that there are just a handful of scholars writing in the field. And each of those scholars specializes in a particular area of Williams research. Therefore, even if the journal used a blind-review process, the editorial board would still be able to identify the author. Unless the *Review* can find a way to expand its writing pool, this measure may be a moot point. Once received, the papers are reviewed by Dr. Bray and the editorial board; no outside readers are employed—a measure that may make the blind-review more useful. Additionally, Dr. Bray's submission guidelines fail to address issues such as copyright and the possibility that an author may have submitted the paper to several publishing sources. The submission guidelines provided by the Modern Language Association's scholarly journal *PLMA* are an excellent example that the *Review* should follow:

Each article is submitted to two reviewers, usually one consultant reader and one member of the advisory committee. Articles recommended by these readers are then sent to the members of the editorial board who meet periodically with the editor to make final decisions. Until the final decision is reached, the author's name is not made known to consultant readers, to members of the advisory committee and the editorial board, or to the editor.

The journal does not review articles that are under consideration by other journals.

If contributions include materials taken from another source that exceed fair use, the author must obtain written permission to reproduce them in print and electronic formats.²⁰

When it comes to standards for marketing and distribution, the *Review* has a lot of room to improve. According to CLMP, “Editing and publishing good literature is only half of your responsibility. You also have an obligation, to your writers and to your mission, to distribute and promote your magazine or titles to your potential readers.”²¹ And according to publishing consultant Bob Erdmann, “A book should be considered a financial asset....That means selling to all possible venues.”²² Unfortunately, the *Review*’s limited staff only has time for the editing and publishing portion of its responsibility. And The Collection’s approach to its book publication program, discussed in the S.W.O.T. Analysis, is in direct opposition to Erdmann’s assertion.

Magazine consultant and editor of *The Women’s Review of Books*, Linda Gardner, lays out a marketing calendar for the literary magazine.²³ Its major components that the *Review* is not putting into practice include:

- Regularly updating the website
- Researching conferences and other publicity events
- Including gift subscription solicitations in the journal
- Producing a holiday season gift subscription brochure
- Researching potential subscribers among college faculty via the Internet; mailing samples or brochures and telemarketing if you think you can develop bulk classroom sales
- Regularly renting lists

The major marketing tool utilized by the *Review* is direct mail, which is an important marketing strategy. According to Kim Klein, a grassroots fundraising expert,

²⁰ www.mla.org/pmla_submitting, accessed Oct. 5, 2008.

²¹ www.clmp.org/resouces/guide, accessed Oct. 7, 2008.

²² Bob Erdmann, “The Wisdom of Successful Publishers,” *IBPA Independent* (Sept. 1999), www.ibpa-online.org/articles, accessed Oct. 5, 2008.

²³ www.clmp.org/resources/gardner, accessed Oct. 5, 2008.

“A well-designed and well-written direct mail piece sent to a good list can still yield a 1% response—though small, this is far greater than any other way of reaching large numbers of people who do not know about your [product].”²⁴ “Good list,” however, is the key phrase. By only sending the annual direct-mail postcard to previous subscribers and The Collection’s mailing list (which does include local and regional libraries), the *Review* is not reaching a broad enough audience for the return needed. Renting lists each year from MLA and ALA, as well as other pertinent sources, is important.

Library subscriptions are essential to the literary magazine industry. They are a market the *Review* has been unable to reach in an effective way. According to both CLMP and IBPA, direct mail is not a successful tool for the targeting the librarian. “Most libraries have strict quotas for journal acquisitions, and librarians are far more responsive to ‘user’ requests than direct mail.”²⁵ CLMP recommends having contributors or editorial board members put in requests at their local public and university libraries. On the other hand, Jenny McCune, a writer for *IBPA Independent*, warns that “librarians do not take kindly to authors or publishers masquerading as library patrons and emailing requests for their books.”²⁶ She recommends submitting one’s publication for review in *Booklist* (published by the ALA), *CHOICE: Current Reviews for Academic Libraries*, *Library Journal*, and *Publishers Weekly*—all sources that librarians trust and use when choosing journals and magazines to order. Additionally, placing ads in library catalogues is a good way to reach the librarian.

²⁴ Kim Klein, *Fundraising for Social Change* (San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001), 54.

²⁵ www.clmp.org, accessed Oct. 5, 2008.

²⁶ Jenny McCune, “Getting Librarians to Buy Your Books,” *IBPA Independent* (June 2006), www.ibpa-online.org/articles, accessed Oct. 5, 2008.

In addition to its standards for marketing, the CLMP recommends the use of a distributor. As stated in the Organizational Profile, The Collection distributes its books through a local wholesaler. “A wholesaler’s responsibility is to the stores and libraries it serves. It will take orders and stock books, but it does not create a demand for those books. A distributor, on the other hand, will not only take and fill orders but uses sales representatives for their accounts and creates a demand for the books it represents. In this regard, a distributor’s primary responsibility is to the publisher.”²⁷ Furthermore, the *Review* certainly needs to reach a national audience and the wholesaler used by The Collection only services regional bookstores. CLMP provides a list of distributors and recommends that literary magazine publishers prepare a basic tip sheet for the distributor they choose. This sheet should include the book’s vital statistics, five to ten sales handles, a description of the target audience, specific retail venues that will be interested in the book, organizations that would be interested in the book, and the specific region in which representatives should concentrate.

Finally, when it comes to the copyright issues of the *Review*, discussed in the S.W.O.T. Analysis, there are a plethora of resources for how to best handle “getting permission.” The U.S. Copyright Office and the Publishing Law Center (www.publaw.com) are both good places to start.

Dr. Bray has done a good job of following copyright law in obtaining rights to publish Williams’s previously unpublished plays in the *Review*. He always contacts New Directions and the literary agent of the Williams estate. How to handle reproductions of images from the Todd Collection is a newer issue. Attorney Richard Stim recommends examining movie stills for a legend or copyright warning, i.e.: “Permission to reproduce

²⁷ www.clmp.org/resources/wholesalers, accessed Oct. 7, 2008.

this photograph is limited to editorial uses in regular issues of newspapers and other regularly published periodicals and television news programming.”²⁸ Many of the movie posters in the Todd Collection do have a warning of this type and the journal is a periodical, but it can be assumed that the production company is referring to periodicals promoting the movie. Also, the photographs from the production of *Streetcar* that Dr. Bray has chosen for the 2009 *Review* do not have a copyright warning. Based on the information accompanying the albums in which they were housed, The Collection’s curators have assumed that the copyright to these photographs is held by Warner Bros.

Stim recommends “a conservative approach. Unless you are certain that the material is in the public domain [which we know the Tennessee Williams materials are not] or that your use is legally excusable, seeking permission is worth your time. If you are not sure [which we are not], you’ll have to either make your own risk assessment or obtain the advice of an attorney knowledgeable in copyright or media law.”²⁹ At the insistence of Dr. Dorman, the *Review* intends to heed this advice. Dr. Bray and Dr. Dorman have chosen to consult The Collection’s legal counsel, and if necessary, write to Warner Bros. for reproduction rights. They are following the best practices for copyright clearance.

In addition to looking at how well the *Review* is performing the best practices of its industry, it is important to evaluate how other similar organizations are operating. Such an analysis helps determine the viability of the *Review* and what practices the organization should adopt to secure its success. The Faulkner and Yoknapatawpha Conference and the *Arthur Miller Journal* are good sources for comparison.

²⁸ Richard Stim, *Getting Permission: How to License & Clear Copyrighted Materials Online & Off* (Berkeley, CA: NOLO, 2004), 3/8.

²⁹ Stim, 1/3–1/4.

Established in 1974, the Faulkner Conference is produced each summer by the English Department and the Center for the Study of Southern Culture at the University of Mississippi. In addition to lectures about Faulkner by renowned scholars in a variety of academic disciplines, the five-day conference offers dramatic readings of Faulkner, tours of the area, panel discussions about William Faulkner by friends and family members who knew him, and film screenings.³⁰ So, the complete experience is not unlike the combination of the Tennessee Williams Festival and the Scholars' Conference. However, the major difference is that at the Faulkner Conference, the scholarly portion is the main attraction, whereas with the Festival, the panels, tours, and readings are the focus.

According to one of the staff members in the Outreach and Continuing Education Department of the University of Mississippi, Conference registration was approximately 150 in 2008—a significant increase from previous years. The price of registration is considerably more than that of the Tennessee Williams Scholars' Conference: \$150 for students, \$250 for Friends of the Conference, and \$275 for the general public. Each year the University Press of Mississippi publishes the papers presented at the Faulkner Conference in book form. However, according to the representative, these are mainly distributed to Conference attendees, and sales are minimal. There are approximately three staff members from the Outreach and Continuing Education Department and two from the English Department who are dedicated to producing the Faulkner Conference.³¹

Published twice a year by the English department of St. Francis College in cooperation with the Arthur Miller Society and the Arthur Miller Centre at the University of East Anglia, the *Arthur Miller Journal* is dedicated to “provid[ing] a lasting legacy to

³⁰ www.outreach.olemiss.edu/events/faulkner/, accessed Oct. 15, 2008.

³¹ Representative, Outreach and Continuing Education department of the University of Mississippi, interview by author, Oct. 16, 2008.

Miller's significant contributions to American drama." The *Arthur Miller Journal* shares a similar mission, focus, and comparable management structure with the *Review*. The Arthur Miller Society and the Arthur Miller Centre provide oversight and no financial support. The college, like The Collection, provides the financial backing needed to maintain the journal. The journal is published twice annually, and subscription rates are \$20 for individuals and \$30 for institutions and libraries.³² According to the managing editor, the journal's subscriptions, particularly its library subscriptions, play a major role in financial support, but they do not do the whole job. On average the journal has a circulation of approximately 100 copies—on par with that of the *Review*. They print on demand, and lately the print run has been approximately 250.³³ Whereas, the *Review* prints 500 to 600 each year and is left with a large surplus.

The journal's staff is made up of an editor, managing editor, performance review editor, and book review editor. So, its content expands beyond scholarly essays into the more popular genres of book and performance reviews. While the *Review* should consider such avenues to grow its audience, these practices do not seem to have increased the demand for the *Arthur Miller Journal*. The essays for the journal are also blind-vetted. So, perhaps Dr. Bray's argument that the limited field of Williams studies limits the pool of authors and diminishes the importance of blind review does not hold up. It would seem that there would be no more scholars of Arthur Miller than there are of Tennessee Williams.

In conclusion, although there are practices that the Tennessee Williams Scholars' Conference/*Tennessee Williams Annual Review* could improve upon to meet the

³² www.ibiblio.org/miller/journal, accessed Oct. 15, 2008.

³³ Ian Maloney, Managing Editor, *Arthur Miller Journal*, interview by author, Oct. 16, 2008.

standards of its industry, the Conference's attendance and the *Review*'s circulation matches up closely with similar organizations. Therefore, the small audience may simply be the result of the limited scope of the Conference and *Review*. If that is the case, Dr. Bray and The Collection need to evaluate whether or not publishing the journal is a worthwhile endeavor. It has already been established that The Collection sees the publishing of the journal as a way to further its mission rather than as a profit-making endeavor. And Dr. Bray sees the world of Tennessee Williams studies, though narrow in scope, as important field. Therefore, I assert that the *Review* should continue for as long as The Collection is willing to fund it, with the following recommendations adopted.

CHAPTER 5

Recommendations

Although the Conference/*Review*'s management structure is at times trying, the support of the Festival and The Collection are critical to the endeavor's success. Therefore, the Conference/*Review* should continue in its partnerships with both The Collection and the Festival. However, there are a number of steps that Dr. Bray should take to ensure that the Conference/*Review* is run more smoothly and is funded into perpetuity.

First, a meeting between Dr. Bray, Dr. Dorman, and Paul Willis needs to be scheduled to map out the responsibilities of each organization, particularly the Festival. Somehow the Festival needs to be convinced that it must provide a certain level of consistent support. In addition to all of the its original responsibilities, the Festival should provide an honorarium for Conference speakers and a small stipend to Dr. Bray for serving as the Conference's director (he is currently unpaid for this role).

Dr. Bray needs to join the CLMP. Utilizing the resources made available to this organization's members, he can begin researching possible outside funding sources so that a full-time business/marketing associate can be hired for the Conference/*Review*. It is unlikely that The Collection will put up the funding for such a position, as they already have unfulfilled staffing needs, particularly in the area of book marketing. So, the idea of hiring someone just to market the journal probably would not go over so well. Dr. Bray needs to become more independent on this front. The full-time business/marketing associate would work for him at MTSU and coordinate marketing efforts with The Collection. The publications department's role would become solely editorial, with a limited amount of marketing work being undertaken when marketing the journal overlaps

with marketing its own books. If enough funding is raised, Dr. Bray may even begin to receive a salary for his role as editor.

All of the development and marketing strategies outlined in the opportunities section of the S.W.O.T. Analysis and the Best Practices chapter could be put into action by the business/marketing associate. The associate must first write comprehensive development and marketing plans for the Conference/*Review*. The goals of which should include increasing grants and government funding; growing journal subscriptions, particularly in libraries and among college professors; and researching and implementing marketing opportunities, such as book reviews, conferences and festivals, and online vendors. The associate should probably replace Chip as website manager, but if Dr. Bray is hesitant to let him go, the associate must have the capability to update website content. Chip can oversee the design, but it is essential that someone is maintaining the accuracy of information on a regular basis.

The *Review* should adopt the more thorough submission standards outlined in the Best Practices chapter. Additionally, Dr. Bray needs to change Philip Kolin's role from commissioner of theatre reviews to theatre review editor. Theatre review submissions should then be solicited in calls for papers. A book review editor and submission program should also be adopted.

With regard to legal issues, Dr. Bray should continue to rely on The Collection's oversight and the guidance of their legal counsel. And, Dr. Bray should also work closely with The Collection and Dr. Dorman, in particular, to further develop the *Review's* submission guidelines and come up with strategies for how to build the writer/contributor pool for the *Review* and Conference.

CHAPTER 6

Contributions

The limited marketing strategies that I implemented during my internship are already taking affect. Dr. Bray reports having received an increased number of submissions for the 2009 Conference and *Review*, which he attributes to the calls for papers that I placed.

My website restructuring suggestions have been implemented, making the relationship between the *Review* and Conference more clear for the uninformed visitor and allowing for future content development. Although my contributions to the website—the bibliography and Todd Collection pathfinder—have not been incorporated yet, they will be major assets to the site.

My service as intern allowed Dr. Bray to step back from Conference logistical duties and spend more time on the content-specific needs of the Conference. I handled all of the coordination with the Festival and The Collection, assisted speakers with their audiovisual needs, made sure that the *Review* was available for sale at both the Conference and the Festival, and made the event run smoothly overall.

As an experienced editor, I was valued as another reader in the editorial process of publishing the journal. Often Dr. Dorman is unable to spare one of her editors for journal proofreading and copy editing, so my assistance was greatly appreciated.

My knowledge of copyright law garnered in the Arts Law course was an asset to the *Review*. I was able to provide pertinent aspects of the law to Dr. Dorman and Dr. Bray, facilitating their discussion of how to handle clearance for the journal. I also reviewed the EBSCO contract and pointed out areas of concern that are now being researched.

My greatest contributions to the Conference/*Review* are yet to be implemented. They are found in this report. Dr. Bray and Dr. Dorman are both open to suggestions, and I am confident that some of the opportunities outlined and recommendations made will be incorporated into the Conference/*Review*'s operation in the years to come.

CONCLUSION

The internship with the Tennessee Williams Scholars' Conference/*Tennessee Williams Annual Review* was tremendously enlightening. Having worked in the arts publishing field for almost 10 years, I did not realize that I had so much to learn. Over the last year I became intimately acquainted with the history of the Conference/*Review* and the basics of its management. Then, in writing this report, I learned about the literary-magazine industry as a whole and was able to critically analyze the *Review's* operations.

As a student in the arts administration program, I was able to explore the various opportunities for employment in the arts. In the end, I have chosen to remain in the world of publishing. This internship has provided me with invaluable experience that will only strengthen my career opportunities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Arthur Miller Journal* website. www.ibiblio.org/miller/journal (accessed Oct. 15, 2008).
- Blazek, Jody. *Financial Planning for Nonprofit Organizations*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1996.
- Council of Literary Magazines and Presses website. www.clmp.org (accessed Oct. 5, 2008).
- Copyright Act (17 U.S.C.), 1976. www.copyright.gov (accessed Oct. 5, 2008).
- Erdmann, Bob. "The Wisdom of Successful Publishers." *IBPA Independent* (Sept. 1999). www.ibpa-online.org/articles (accessed Oct. 5, 2008).
- The Historic New Orleans Collection website. www.hnoc.org (accessed Sept. 27, 2008).
- Hopkins, Bruce R. *Starting and Managing a Nonprofit Organization*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, 2005.
- Independent Book Publishers Association website. www.ibpa-online.org (accessed Oct. 5, 2008).
- Klein, Kim. *Fundraising for Social Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2001.
- McCune, Jenny. "Getting Librarians to Buy Your Books." *IBPA Independent* (June 2006). www.ibpa-online.org/articles (accessed Oct. 5, 2008).
- Modern Language Association website. www.mla.org (accessed Oct. 5, 2008).
- Reid, Calvin. "New Directions Inks Tennessee Williams Pact." *Publishers Weekly*, Nov. 3, 2003. www.publishersweekly.com (accessed Oct. 5, 2008).
- Stim, Richard. *Getting Permission: How to License & Clear Copyrighted Materials Online & Off*. Berkeley, CA: NOLO, 2004.
- The Southern Review* website. www.lsu.edu/tsr (accessed Oct. 16, 2008).
- Tennessee Williams Annual Review* website. www.tennesseewilliamsstudies.org (accessed Sept. 27, 2008).
- Tennessee Williams/New Orleans Literary Festival website. www.tennesseewilliams.net (accessed Sept. 23, 2008).
- The University of Mississippi Division of Outreach & Continuing Education website. www.outreach.olemiss.edu/events/faulkner/ (accessed Oct. 15, 2008).