Abstract

We examine literary work as a product of the scholar's 'educated imagination' and review features of this performance culture (i.e., quality, quantity, impact, influence, and importance), which lend themselves to evaluation. Insights are drawn from the research and commentaries of specialists, including scholars of literature and bibliometricians. Peer review as it is seen in book reviews plays a critical role in how literary quality is perceived, while citations from books and journal articles may be used to trace patterns of influence. To evaluate literary work as a whole, we suggest distinguishing between different types of production, vocational and epistemic, and orchestrating data systems that allow for combined measures of quality, scholarly influence, and cultural influence.

1. Introduction

Evaluation procedures in the arts and humanities are a source of debate currently due to financial cutbacks and growing policies towards quantifying scholarly achievement in university departments (Guillory, 2005a,b). A key part in resolving this debate involves optimizing the use of both subjective and objective measures in the recognition of quality. If we are not thoughtful enough, we risk misinterpreting quality “until we begin to see where the imagination belongs in the scheme of human affairs” (Frye, 1964). It is on this basis that Northrop Frye (1964) distinguishes the arts and humanities from the sciences:

Science begins with the world we have to live in, accepting its data and trying to explain its laws. From there, it moves toward imagination: it becomes a mental construct, a model of a possible way of interpreting experience...Literature and music [and] art on the other hand, begin with the world we construct, not the world we see. It starts with the imagination, and then works toward ordinary experience: that is, it tries to make itself as convincingly and recognizable as it can. [Science] starts with the world as it is; [literature and art] with the world we want to have (p. 23).

With the study of literature, outputs may be observed in terms of the “educated imagination”. According to Frye (1964), “every form of literature has a pedigree, and we can trace its descent back to the earliest times” (p. 40). The imagination is educated in the sense that humans have a motive to re-create familiar metaphors. It is the function of the literary critic
then, “to interpret every work of literature in light of all the literature [he/she] knows, to keep constantly struggling to understand what literature as a whole is about” (p. 105). The critic's interpretive framework may be new or it may come from a growing body of theories, including Archetypal criticism, Romanticism, Feminist theory, Psychoanalytic theory, Postmodernism, New Historicism and Narratology. Literary art and criticism are intricately intertwined: there can be no critique without the prior art, regardless of how 'scientific' the critical approach may be. Sometimes it is based on an external framework, as in the use of Feminist theory, and sometimes the axioms and postulates of criticism grow directly out of the art itself, as in Archetypal Criticism or Narratology (Frye, 1957).

The task of persons called upon to evaluate literary outputs has never been more challenging. Note that the work itself may fit within one of two trajectories: it may be a work of art, or vocational in nature (i.e., fiction; prose; poetry), or it may be epistemic (i.e., cultural; theoretical; critical) (Mignolo, 1991). Both trajectories require 'research' and both stem from the educated imagination, but in different ways. The author with the vocational imagination replicates a genre of fiction or poetry, having read and studied many works from these genres. The author with the epistemic imagination uses his or her knowledge of theory in the interpretation of literature, also having studied this well. The role of an evaluator is to establish who is creating or interpreting literature with credible insight, and with a convincing or critical written presentation. An evaluator need not be concerned with valorizing literary work as we do with the sciences. He or she is not there to determine whether or not a literary piece can change society or contribute to the solution of societal problems. The most logical place to start is with the culture of the discipline, as Frye (1964) has done, and to undertake evaluations based on culturally relevant criteria.

The objective of this paper is to examine different criteria for evaluating outputs in literary art, theory and criticism, namely impact, influence, importance, quality and quantity. Our focus is on how the educated imagination works in this discipline and how it is articulated in the individual’s published works. We explain why peer review is a powerful tool in the assessment of literary quality and how fits within an influence-based evaluation system. Orchestrating this system involves observing bibliometric citations as patterns of influence, distinguishing between disciplinary influence and cultural influence, and giving more credit to a visible form of peer review, the book review, which we also define and examine at length. And finally, for all explanations and arguments presented, we draw upon the research and commentaries of specialists in reference to different elements of literary work.

2. Evaluating the ‘educated imagination’

Our view of the arts and humanities relates to what is historically known as the transitory period from the traditional study of the artes liberals to the Renaissance studia humanitatis (1400-1800). As a result of this period, university faculties today possess a mix of arts and humanities disciplines of longer and shorter pedigree (Groenland, 2010). Literary studies have a place in the current academic framework, with literary art now emphasized in creative writing programs [e.g., The University of British Columbia. Creative Writing Program. (2012)] next to more traditional programs in theory and criticism. The practice of literary criticism itself is said to date as far back as ancient Greece, when citizens at the Athens theatre were asked to judge which author had produced the best drama (Habib, 2005).
Evaluating literary outputs is not unlike the judgments undertaken by the early Athens citizens. It is focused on the author’s performance and often done so comparatively. Remarkably, the Athenian drama judges were ordinary citizens: “a testimony to [their] highly literate nature [and ability] to recognize many allusions to previous literary works” (Habib, 2005, p. 10). Nowadays scholarly professionals are called upon to undertake evaluations, and there are options pertaining to direction: an evaluation of the impact of the performance, the importance and quality of the performance, and/or the author's quantity of performances. Ramsden (1994) briefly distinguishes these terms:

*Impact is a measure of the influence of a piece of research, and is evaluated by means of the number of citations made to it by other scholars. This bibliometric measure is most typically used at the aggregate (academic unit or group) level. Importance and quality are evaluated through expert value judgments, typically using peer review; importance may not become clear until time has passed. Quantity is the simplest of measures. It concerns the number of publications or pages produced (p. 208)*

With respect to literary work, impact is known to be the least suitable measure. Bibliometric studies, based on the Thomson Reuters’ Arts and Humanities Citation index indicate that few citation counts can be retrieved from journal articles to develop meaningful indicators. Cited references appearing in books or monographs may present another story (so to speak); however these references have not been included in citation indices. Moreover, few scholars have taken time to count or classify footnoted/cited references in literary monographs because it is too labor-intensive (Cullars, 1985; Frost, 1979). Where cited references in journal articles have been counted (i.e., for English, Dutch, Turkish and Catalan literary studies), researchers note that the majority are to monographs: percentages range between 60% to 95%, with citations from article to article normally less than 20% (Ardanuy et al. 2009; Budd, 1986; Heinzkill, 1980; Nederhof, 1995; Thompson, 2002; Umut et al., 2006). On the whole, it is possible to count and classify citations from monographs or from journal articles separately, but the bibliometrics community has yet to examine citations exchanged between both sources.

Recently, Thomson Reuters (2012) has announced that it will develop a Book Citation Index. If citations can be counted amongst published monographs and journal articles together, can the results be taken as evidence of impact? Citations in literary work are more likely to trace a history of influence, rather than impact. According to Frost (1979) literary scholars normally refer to primary literary texts—i.e., vocational works, such as fiction and poetry— to support a factual statement. Primary texts are often used “for the positive purpose of supporting the work of the citing author than to supply an object for rebuttal” (p. 413). In cases where theories or theoretical works are referenced (i.e., epistemic papers or books), a scholar does so mainly to support a new argument, or to show a range of influential opinions on a subject. Cole (1983) provides a slightly more descriptive account: “if a literary critic is writing an article on the 17th-century sermons of John Donne, some references will be to the works of John Donne (the data source) and others to the work of other literary critics or other sources” - i.e., sources of influence (p. 127).

In the mountain of literature accumulated over time, scholars have shared different ideas on what the ‘imaginative’ world of John Donne means. Frye (1964) reminds us that the language of literature is imagination, which in turn produces conversations. This is different from the language of science, which produces information, practical skill, and factual knowledge.
Scientific information is generally expected to have an *impact*, and by the term *impact* we mean that it is required to meet the test of practicability and may change how we live. The work of a literary artist and critic is useful for "improving one's imagination or vocabulary, [but] it would be the wildest kind of pedantry to use it directly as a guide to life" (Frye, 1964, p. 89). At most, this work can "remind us vividly of the life we know, but in that very vividness there's something unreal" (p. 96). Citations then, measure *influence*, though few individual works, *vocational* or *epistemic*, may become so highly influential (i.e., 100 citations or more over a ten-year period) as to become ‘canonical’ or agreed-upon masterpieces (Hammarfelt, 2011).

While *influence* can be traced by cited references, the general *importance* and *quality* of literary works cannot. The link between *importance* and *quality* may be conceptualized as follows. First, when we encounter any literary document, there is an uncritical or pre-critical response. Next, there is "the conscious, critical response where we compare what we've experienced with other things of the same kind, and form a judgment of value and proportion on it" (Frye, 1964, p. 105). Our initial judgment is about quality, and the significance we attach to it is explained in societal terms. According to Frye (1964), "society attaches an immense importance to saying the right thing at the right time. In this conception of the 'right thing' there are two factors involved, one is moral and one aesthetic. They are inseparable, and equally important" (p. 136).

A literary piece is valued on the basis of how it fits aesthetically or morally into a particular cultural, societal and historical context. If evaluators believe it is of high *quality*, we will see positive conversations about it, and if it comes at the right time, it has potential to be of great importance. In 2011, McGurl (2009) received the Truman Capote award in literary criticism for his monograph titled: *The Program Era: Postwar Fiction and the Rise of Creative Writing*. A collection of ‘conversations’ (i.e., book reviews) helps us to understand why the author has said the right thing at the right time (e.g., Batuman, 2010; Ceresulo, 2010; Clune, 2010; Delaney, 2009; Gewanter, 2009). Ceresulo (2010) explains:

> *The Program Era makes us rethink everything we thought we knew about the effect of writing programs on contemporary fiction and its authors... Mark McGurl’s terrific new book demonstrates [that] it was the forces of democracy and public access—not of isolation, solipsism, or elitism—that led to the formation of creative writing programs and have since colored the American fiction that has flowered there* (p. 123).

Note that we need not look to reviews exclusively written by scholars or professional reviewers to obtain quality judgments. Reviews written by well-read individuals on Google Books and Goodreads demonstrate a return to the days of Athenian drama, except that citizen judges can nominate their participation now from anywhere via the Internet. Clearly, some forms of literary work, monographs in particular, are quite good at eliciting a response from scholarly as well as non-scholarly readers (Hammarfelt, 2011).

Last but not least, we consider the issue of *quantity*. This is said to be the easiest part to assess, but it also has a cultural basis. An investigation into the literary author’s work habits reveals that they tend to work alone and as lone individuals their interpretation is paramount (Stone, 1982). Literary scholars are encouraged to publish books, so quantity of output is not

---

1. 9 written reviews and an average of 4.0/5 stars for 37 ratings on May 10, 2012.
a strong part of their research paradigm, at least not in the same way as it is for the scientist. It takes longer to write a book than a journal article, so if a scientist manages to publish 5 journal articles in one year, the literary author may publish only one book. Literary works may also be highly regional in character (Nederhof, 2006); hence texts written in the Dutch, Italian, Russian, French or Japanese language will not be profuse from a distinct region, nor are they expected to influence many scholars outside that region. Nevertheless, there are examples where a canonical piece -- e.g., Jacques Lacan's (1966) *Écrits* -- has crossed regional and disciplinary boundaries, and in such cases there is usually prior evidence of strong power relations and status (Hammarfelt, 2011). Currency of material is another variable linked to quantity, if we count the number of performances relevant today as they were in the past. With literary work, currency is not an issue because even the lowest amount of production over time is not susceptible to obsolescence (Budd, 1986; Hammarfelt; 2011; Perrault, 1983; Weintraub, 1980). A literary artist or critic may write two to five major works in his or her lifetime, which could influence the thinking and imagination of many generations later. With that said, it is not the quantity of performances (publications) that matter as much in literary work but the type of quality conversations associated with a published piece and how much influence it has over time.

3. Peer review in literary work: ‘much ado about nothing’?

The peer review process is of great concern to university administrators and scholars due to its time-consuming, subjective nature. To review a piece of literary work, time is needed to read, reflect, interpret and comment on details that indicate quality in the culture of the discipline. Guillory (2005) defines peer review as a form of "evaluative discourse" which "constitutes a mode of argument that differs from demonstration [and may be called] an account or description. It gives an enriched description of [the] work by answering to it and for it" (p. 29). Since peer review is subjective, we question the degree to which it is fallible. Quantitative measures like bibliometric citations are objective thus appear to be much less biased. Still, one could argue that

> it is simply a matter of historical wisdom that objective or quantified measures of achievement cannot be regarded as infallible indicators of the enduring significance of scholarly work. Such measures are likely to be just as fallible in the long run as any act of judgment in any area of human enterprise (Guillroy, 2005, p. 30).

Even bibliometricians recognize that quantitative measures should be applied with caution. Data sources that are widely used for scholarly evaluation procedures (e.g., Thomson Reuters Web of Knowledge) are not perfect due to variability in field coverage and specialty datasets often require considerable filtering and/or cleaning to ensure accuracy. Nor are the statistical indicators perfect. They also must be tested periodically for refinement; revised and re-revised to suit new field developments and allow for more reliable comparisons (Moed, 2005; Nederhof, 1988; Van Raan, 1996). In cases where bibliometric approaches are not optimal, or do not lend to clear interpretation, peer review is a welcome co-practice. Both procedures are needed and in combination they serve to reinforce objectivity, transparency, and comparability in the assessment of performance.
With the practice of peer review it is clear then that there is not much ado, rather much to do to make it as optimal as possible. Of primary interest is a framework for establishing literary quality. Thus far, a predominant theme is to make comparative judgments based on the 'canon'. Verboord (2003) explains that "frequently, critics and scholars refer to the 'canon' in the sense of an unspecified 'list of high-quality works we all agree about'" (p. 260). However, there are a few problems with a 'canonical' approach, not the least of which is a lack of consensus upon the definition. Since this term tends to be related more often to vocational works (i.e., fiction; poetry; etc.) rather than epistemic ones (i.e., theoretical and critical texts), it is also difficult for evaluators to agree upon the criteria for inclusion. Another disadvantage is that "the term 'canon' suggests that literary quality is dichotomous in nature: an author either belongs to the 'canon' or s/he doesn't. In reality, more levels can be perceived" (Verboord, 2003, p. 261).

Monographs or books produced by contemporary literary artists, theorists and critics rarely reach the status of the canon. This means that quality at a variety of levels requires an approach more closely aligned with positive attention rather than ‘canon-like’ prestige. The everyday culture of literary art and criticism demonstrates that quality is often established via the book review:

[For] any work that succeeds in catching (and holding) the attention of reviewers and critics, this critical concern implies that a certain amount of quality is assigned to it. In other words, reviewers and critics, as professional judges of literature, possess the socially accepted authority to ascribe specific properties to a work, to suggest in what literary tradition it might be set and how it is to be ranked. They are entitled, albeit to different degrees, to declare of a book that it is good or interesting and thus to legitimate it as a work that deserves attention (Van Rees, 1987, p. 280)

The advantage of using book reviews as indicators of quality is that they are publically accessible. As a rhetorical piece, the book review is qualitative in how it gives attention, but it may also be 'quantified' if each review is weighted and many are tallied together. Book reviews may also correspond with how we observe influence in literary work when we count or trace patterns of citations. For instance, Nicolaisen (2002a) has found that books receiving positive or favorable reviews tend to be cited more often in journal articles than those receiving neutral or negative comments from a reviewer. It is not necessary then for an evaluator to choose to strictly between peer review and bibliometrics. The reviewing author is the “agent of consecration” (Van Rees, 1987); while the citation serves as the agent of corroboration.

4. Reviews of quality

Reviews and citations can work together in an evaluation system, where the book review serves both a rhetorical function and grand citation to quality, and the citation proper (in articles and books) as measure of disciplinary influence. The normative goal of a book review is to alert readers to the value of a newly published text. It is a short piece, approximately 600 to 2000 words in length, about one book written by one or more co-author(s). Traditionally reviews have been used as aids in the development of library
collections (e.g., Blake, 1989; Parker, 1989; Serebnick, 1992); however, there has been a growing interest in role that they play in academic scholarship (Hartley, 2006; Nicolaisen, 2002b; Spink et al, 1998; Zuccala & van Leeuwen, 2011). The features that academics look for in a good review include a well-known person as the review author, the presentation of a straightforward overview of the book, a strong critique of the book’s main argument, and a strong evaluation of the book’s academic credibility (Hartley, 2006). When a professional reviewer is asked to write a review, (s)he generally refers to (‘cites’) the author, title, date, publisher of the book and evaluates parts of its content. Generally the reviewer and the reviewed author of a monograph are peers from the same discipline or scholarly culture, but not necessarily. Research has shown that a significant number of book reviews published in one disciplinary journal are reviews of books originating in other disciplines (Lindholm-Romantschuk, 1998).

Professional or scholarly book reviews are organized on the basis of rhetorical moves and sub-functions (Motta-Roth, 1998). The reviewer first introduces the book and provides details regarding the topic, the author(s), and the field in which the book is situated. The second ‘move’ is to present an outline of the book, its organization and the topic of each chapter. In the third rhetorical move, the reviewer highlights specific parts for appraisal, commenting how well these parts are written or how credible they are as contributions to growth of knowledge in the discipline. The final paragraph of a review is normally reserved for an overall evaluation of the book - i.e., one last move towards accepting it or disqualifying it in positive or negative terms (Motta-Roth, 1998; Nicolaisen, 2002c).

Structural interpretations of book reviews are of interest because each rhetorical ‘move’ that we recognize may also be viewed as ‘cites’ of recognition within the grand citation to the full book itself. General citation theory points to a many-to-one approach where citations to various works play a specific function in the context of one research paper. Some scholars view research-oriented citations in terms of taxonomies or tiers: different elements of information are cited at “different levels of granularity or aggregation” (Cronin, 1994, p. 537). The book review, as grand citation, is clearly different from a research paper. It is not meant to add knowledge, but to add value to knowledge that has already been produced. It does this on the basis of a parts-to-one approach: many ‘cites’ to parts of a book translate into a judgment of the book’s quality.

Here we examine the book reviews written for two acclaimed literary texts, The Program Era: Postwar Fiction and the Rise of Creative Writing, written by Mark McGurl (Professor of English at Stanford University) and The Life of Pi written by Yaan Martel (Scholar-in-residence at the University of Saskatchewan, Canada). Both authors have used their educated imagination for different purposes (i.e., the first epistemic and the second vocational) and both have received literary awards: McGurl is the recipient of the Truman Capote award in literary criticism, and Martel, the Man Booker Prize for fiction. The two authors have also received reviews published in scholarly journals; six reviews for Martel and nine for McGurl, as well as citizen ‘reader’ reviews on Amazon and Goodreads. Despite their differences, we have evidence to suggest that they may fit within a similar type of evaluation. Due to the rise of creative writing programs across university campuses in America, more vocational scholars are likely to be evaluated alongside theorists and critics. Note that an announcement for a tenure-track assistant professorship in creative writing at the University of British Columbia, Faculty of Arts (2012) requires applicants to have
at least five years of experience in the teaching of university-level creative writing courses at both the undergraduate and graduate level [and] publication of at least three book-length works of fiction.

Professional reviewers who have written about both McGurl's work as well as Martel's have made positive or negative comments about their credibility (C +/-) and writing style (WS +/-). Figure 1, below, illustrates an approach to coding a review of The Program Era, published in the Twentytenth Century Literature (Cerasulo, 2010).

Cerasulo's (2010) review leaves its mark on the reader as being highly favorable. In terms of coding this review, we locate all rhetorical moves in the text pertaining to judgments of credibility, noting if they are either positive or negative (Cpositive/Cnegative). We combine these credibility judgments, by subtracting the total negative comments from those that are positive, then divide the final number by the number of sentences overall in the text. The same is done for judgments of McGurl’s writing style (WSPositive/WSNegative). The measure is constructed as follows:

\[
Credibility\ (C) = 0.5 \left( \frac{C_{positive} - C_{negative}}{AllSentences} \right) = 0.5 \left( \frac{8 - 1}{100} \right) = 0.5(0.07) = 0.035
\]

\[
WritingStyle\ (WS) = 0.5 \left( \frac{WSP_{positive} - WSN_{negative}}{AllSentences} \right) = 0.5 \left( \frac{2 - 0}{100} \right) = 0.5(0.02) = 0.01
\]

Where, \( C + WS = 0.045 \)

If we code additional reviews of the same book, using the same technique we have an approach to quantifying judgments of ‘quality’ by summing perceptions of credibility and writing style. Every published review is counted as a grand citation (\( n=1 \)), and may be multiplied by its own ‘quality’ indicator, which is a value somewhere between 0-1. Combined ‘quality’ indicators assist us in determining reviewer consensus, and “in the world of art and criticism the approval of colleagues constitutes the highest conceivable ‘confirmation’ of a value judgment” (Van Rees, 1987, p. 283).

A similar approach may be taken with The Life of Pi, where credibility (C) is based on how convincing the author’s contribution is to a chosen genre of fiction. Note that reviewer Linda Morra (2003) place’s Yann Martel’s book in a broader context by making a judgment of analogy; she compares Martel’s work to Daniel Defoe’s Robinson Crusoe (see Figure 2). When a parallel is drawn between an author’s latest work and the work of an eminent author it is a form of praise, and tends to occur predominantly in reviews of widely covered authors (Verdaasdonk, 1994).
Figure 1. *The Program Era* (McGurl 2009). Review coded for credibility (C+/-) and/or writing style (WS+/-).

- "As Mark McGurl's terrific new book demonstrates it was the forces of democracy and public access—not of isolation, solipsism, or elitism—that led to the formation of creative writing programs" ||||  Credibility +
- "The Program Era makes us rethink everything we thought we knew about writing programs on contemporary fiction" |||  Credibility +
- "So convincing are McGurl's explications of a wide range of literary voices and visions that were all honed by higher education" |||  Credibility +
- "Charles McGrath's New York Times review of *The Program Era* found it overly jargony (unfairly, since it was published by an academic press), but McGurl's spirited prose code switches smoothly among literary shoptalk" |||  Writing Style +

Figure 2. *The Life of Pi* (Martel 2001). Review coded for credibility (C+/-) and/or writing style (WS+/-).

- "Martel's novel, however, is no simple variant of the Crusoe adventure story. In fact, *Life of Pi* seems designed to impugn the bourgeois Puritan ideology that underlies *Robinson Crusoe* |||  Credibility +
- "Martel's novel is a kind of fictional biography...the book also seems to critique the confessional, instructional facet of Defoe's book, which derives its moral orientation from its resemblance to Puritan moral tracts" |||  Credibility +
- "the narrator's claim at the opening of the book is somewhat overwrought: that this is a 'a story that will make you believe in God' seems to suggest a level of profundity and sophistication that the novel does not quite attain" |||  Credibility -
- "While *Life of Pi* is, at times, interesting, clever, and layered, it is also inconsistently compelling and occasionally contrived" |||  Writing Style -
5. Citations of influence

Measures of scholarly impact are most reliable when cited references from all sources – i.e., journal articles, letters, proceedings articles and books – can be used in a bibliometric evaluation. However, as explained earlier, impact is not the best term for describing how knowledge is developed and transmitted in literary culture. Literary work is about how artistic visions and critical theories influence our appreciation of and insight into the human imagination. One way to observe this influence is to ‘map’ the citations that individual works receive in co-citation with other works (i.e., two works appearing in the same reference list of a journal article are said to be ‘co-cited’). Traditionally, co-citation maps have been used to identify ‘intellectual’ similarities between authors or journal articles from specific fields or research areas in science (McCain, 1986; Small, 1999; White & Griffith, 1981). In this paper, we experiment with this analytic method in order to test the visibility of literary artists and theorists in the journal literature related to their discipline (see Figure 3).

Figure 3. Co-citation network of 544 texts in literary theory and literary art.

Our starting point was a list of contemporary authors; sixteen novelists awarded the Booker prize (1996 to 2011) and sixteen authors who have received the Truman Capote award for literary criticism (1996 to 2011). All novelists/authors possess a similar degree of accomplishment (relatively) and all have received at least one journal article citation since the time of receiving their award (see Table 2 in Appendix). Citations to the novelists/authors oeuvres, including texts referenced in co-citation were extracted from the Thomson Reuters Arts and Humanities journal citation index up to and including the month of June 2012 (i.e., a total of 149,537 references). Only reference strings (n=544) based on 10 or more citations, excluding self-citations, were used in the VOSviewer document co-citation, mapping and
clustering technique (Van Eck, N.J., & Waltman, L., 2009; 2010). Multiple iterations of the same reference string were matched in a data cleaning process so that all were merged together as one node (e.g., "booth wayne, 1961, rhetoric fiction" = “booth wc, 1961, rhetoric fiction"). In Table 1, below, we present some descriptive statistics associated with the literary co-citation map, shown in Figure 3.

Table 1. Citation statistics for co-cited vocational and epistemic literary works.

| Percentage of epistemic works cited (i.e., books) | 87% |
| Percentage of vocational works cited (i.e., novels; collections of poems and prose) | 10% |
| Percentage of journal articles cited | 3% |
| Most frequently cited epistemic works | scary e, 1985, the body in pain: the making and unmaking of the world (330)  
fletcher a, 1964, allegory: the theory of a symbolic mode (238)  
hartman gh, 1964, wordsworth’s poetry 1787-1814 (230)  
hartman gh, 1981, saving the text: literature/derrida/philosophy (113)  
stewart s, 1984, On longing: narratives of the miniature, the gigantic, the souvenir, the collection (107)  
derrida j, 1967, grammatologie (106) |
| Most frequently cited vocational works | ovid, metamorphoses (109)  
coetzee jm, 1999, disgrace (79)  
shakespeare w, hamlet (65)  
heaney s, 1980, preoccupations: selected prose, 1968-1978 (63)  
stevens w, 1954, collected poems (55)  
atwood m, 1985, the handmaids tale (53) |
| Cited works published before 1950 | n=20 |
| Cited works published between 1950-1970 | n=86 |
| Cited works published between 1970-1990 | n=336 |
| Cited works published between 1990-2010 | n=102 |
| Cited works published after 2010 | n=0 |

In Figure 3 there are 11 clusters with varying degrees of membership (i.e., from 109 works in cluster 1 to 13 works in cluster 9), and in each cluster the texts are representative of a broad timeline. Some texts were published as far back as the 1950s, and others published in later years up to and including 2010. Time of publication is clearly less significant to literary culture than it is in science, since it appears that the text’s ‘importance’ is a strong motivation for citation, regardless of how recent it has appeared on the literary scene.

Only a literary scholar with a strong pedigree can detect relationships of influence amongst the clustered texts; however, to the average viewer it is clear that a number of well-known epistemic works dominate the map’s center (e.g., the work of Jacques Derrida, Paul de Man, Northrop Frye, Harold Bloom, and Geoffrey H. Hartman). Many of the vocational works, for example, the novels of Margaret Atwood and poetry collections of Seamus Heaney, are clustered in distinct ‘branches’, separate from the core. These vocational authors also seem to be co-cited repeatedly with their own works (as oeuvres), and with newer texts in theory and criticism, rather than older ones. For instance, in Atwood's case, the epistemic texts from the same co-citation cluster (cluster 6) were mainly published between 1970 and 1997; the same time period in which she was most active as a novelist. We can compare what we have seen with Margaret Atwood in Figure 3 with the research findings of Hargens (2000) who examined the network of literary criticism related to Toni Morrison's oeuvre. From the period of 1975 to 1993, this was found to be a rapidly growing area, with a fairly low-
research front density\textsuperscript{2}. According to Hargens (2000), there was neither an under-citation of the research front (i.e., newer papers), or an over-citation of foundational papers (i.e., classics). At present, we know very little about why particular vocational pieces, more than others, become a regular object for theoretical/critical discussion. Hargans (2000) suggests that in specific areas where scholars continuously pursue questions relevant to classic texts there is likely a competition going on to offer new insights or to show "how ideas in classic texts can elucidate new topics" (p. 846). Naturally very recent texts require time to grow in terms of importance. Some prize winning vocational works, (e.g., Yann Martel’s novel, The Life of Pi) have yet to become or may never become a highly referenced data source in networks of scholarly theory and interpretation. The work of John Maxwell Coetzee, a novelist, essayist, linguist and translator from South Africa possesses a slightly more central position on the map, having received many more citations compared to Atwood, Heaney or Martel. This is because of his varied background as both literary artist and critic and broader contribution to scholarship as a whole.

6. Orchestrating the literary evaluation system

A reasonable approach to literary evaluation requires access to citation indices developed for both journal articles and books, access to full-text ‘quality’ reviews for interpretation and coding, mentions of works in public media beyond scholarship, information about prizes, and data pertaining to ‘cultural’ distribution in national/international library catalogs. In fact, regarding data access, much has been said in recent years about the development of special datasets for the arts and humanities (e.g., Hicks & Wang, 2009; Moed et al., 2009). Hicks and Wang (2009) suggest that it is best to rely on national research documentation systems, where “universities submit bibliometric records of their publications” (p. 18). Another recommendation is to persuade publishers to submit records to a “database of published scholarly books with records that include book author affiliation” (p. 20). Moed et al. (2009) advocate the Web (e.g., Google Scholar) as a source of data, emphasizing the role of open access and the development of institutional repositories. In this paper, we use our ‘educated imagination’ to visualize what we would wish for in a well-orchestrated literary data system (see Figure 4).

In Figure 4, note that literary work possesses either a vocational or epistemic function, and depending on this function, it may receive more or less scholarly (professional) reviews compared to citizen reviews. The status of the professional reviewer, his or her background experience and reviewer consensus is critical to how ‘quality’ is perceived, and can be translated into ‘objective’ indicators when full-text reviews are counted and coded.

Reviews also assist librarians in the development of book collections (i.e., cultural presence). Recently the traditional library catalog has been examined as a tool for bibliometric analysis, where an analogy is made between journal-based citations and library holdings (Torres-Salinas & Moed, 2009; White et al., 2009). Torres-Salinas and Moed (2009) studied the number of catalog inclusions per book title in WorldCat® and White et al. (2009) have introduced the term ‘libcitation’ as “an indicator of perceived cultural benefit” (p. 1087).

---

\textsuperscript{2} In Hargens (2000), the research front consists of “the set of possible references to the R most recent papers that could possibly be cited by each paper in the network” (p. 851).
Depending on the literary work’s function, we expect it to receive more or less citations in new books and journal articles. Hammerfelt (2010) has found that the most frequently cited works (i.e., in journal articles published from 1978 to 1987 and 1998 to 2007) have been theoretical texts as opposed to works of fiction. Figure 3, above, demonstrates that theoretical texts do tend to dominate networks of literary influence, even though vocational works are and can be well-cited with time. Naturally vocational texts do not produce cited references or footnotes between them; hence the bi-directional nature of the citing act is limited to epistemic-epistemic works. This opens up many questions pertaining to fiction and poetry, and how ‘important’ a work must be before it becomes incorporated into scholarly thinking. What makes new literary art more or less worthy of scholarly analysis or critique? Is it a property of the text itself or is it based on who the author is, the historical or social context of the text, or the type of attention it has received?

The author of the literary work is significant, especially in terms of his or her earlier works. Janssen (1988, 1997) has found that with fiction, the critical reception of an author’s earlier piece can determine how well his or her new book is received, and often this is more important than the size of the publishing house or its marketing strategy. With respect to epistemic works, similar variables may also be observed. An epistemic text may have an earlier versus later, or stronger versus weaker reception due to the author's academic standing (i.e., as tenured professor or not), or it could be more or less easily accepted depending on the university/academic press that published it and its review policy.

**Figure 4.** Optimal data system for evaluating literary work.
Last but not least, the amount of public attention a literary work receives, in newspapers, on the Web, on television and in film is introduced to the ‘wished-for’ data system. Here we view these as alternative indicators of influence i.e., ‘cultural’ influence as opposed to ‘disciplinary’ influence. While libraries play a role in preserving and distributing the cultural benefit of literary work, newspapers, the Web, television and film demonstrate how influential ‘educated’ persons can be in shaping the ordinary citizen's literary experience. For example, The Life of Pi, written by Yann Martel is a prize winning novel that has been adapted by David Magee as a screenplay for a new film directed by Ang Lee (IMDb. Internet Movie Database, 2012). In terms of culture influence, Frye (1964) claims that there are "two halves to literary experience. Imagination gives us both a better and worse world than the one we usually live with, and demands that we keep looking steadily at them both" (p. 97).

7. Conclusion

In this paper we focus on the discipline of literary art, theory and criticism where vocational and epistemic works are recognized as products of the educated imagination. When Frye (1964) first coined the term ‘educated imagination’ his aim was to distinguish literary work from science, and to describe a culture of performance devoted to "possible models of human experience" (p. 22). The role of the evaluator is to observe how these models of experience are judged in terms of quality, and identify areas in scholarship and society where they have the most influence.

Many types of literary outputs, both qualitative and quantitative, are needed for an optimal and reliable evaluation system. Evaluators are not simply hired to give credit where credit is due, but to ensure that literary scholarship can continue with adequate support and without unnecessary compromises to quality. To some extent bibliometric citations are useful to the evaluation process. In the past, journal articles have been examined more often for traces of literary influence, than books and monographs. The benefit of Thomson Reuter's (2012) new book citation index is that it may lead to stronger bibliometric measures. New work is needed also in the digital humanities to assist researchers with large-scale studies of footnotes and analyses of how vocational versus epistemic works are used as citations-in-context.

Peer review in the arts and humanities has often been questioned due to its subjective nature; however, reviewers play a major role in the literary system and we are not likely to ascertain quality without their input. One of the key roles of an evaluator then, is to understand the social politics of the review system, and study book reviews in depth, both as rhetorical pieces and grand citations to an author's credibility and style. The works of Mark McGurl and Yann Martel are introduced as examples of credibility and writing style to show an interesting trend in literary art, theory and criticism. At a glance, one would not think to link the two authors; however in the context of the present paper, both represent opposite sides of the same coin. McGurl is a professional theorist and historian of literature who understands how writing programs have changed societal views of modern fiction, and Martel is a contemporary author who has published fiction during the time this new program era. University departments, particularly in North America, are developing broader approaches to the creation and interpretation of literature; hence the role of professional evaluator has never been more valuable to this unique culture of performance.

Additional performance-based cultures in the arts and humanities, such as fine art, art theory and criticism, as well as theatre and film studies were not included in the scope of this paper,
although elements of these scholarly disciplines may also fit our framework for evaluation. In some areas of study; however, it is perhaps best to re-think or re-interpret expectations associated with terms like "publish" or "citation" and focus on different criteria for recognizing quality and influence. For instance, when literary artists allude to other authors or re-create familiar metaphors from the classics, they are 'citing', but in the fine arts, we might observe how a painter references (cites) an older master in visual terms. In sum, the emphasis needs to be placed on that which is a critically valued and made 'public' across different parts of the arts and humanities, rather than requiring scholarly output to always be in the form of an article, book or monograph.
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Appendix A.

Table 2. Scholarly reviews for and citations to 16 scholars awarded the *Truman Capote* award for literary criticism and 16 novelists awarded the *Booker Prize* for fiction. Thomson Reuter's Arts & Humanities Citation Index, 1980 to 2012.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Truman Capote Award for Literary Criticism</th>
<th>PubDate</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Press</th>
<th>Scholarly Reviews</th>
<th>Citations (1980 to June 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Charles Rosen</td>
<td>Romantic Poets, Critics, and Other Madmen</td>
<td>Harvard University Press</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Elaine Scarry</td>
<td>Dreaming by the Book</td>
<td>Princeton University Press</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Declan Kiberd</td>
<td>Irish Classics</td>
<td>Granta Books</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Susan Stewart</td>
<td>Poetry and the Fate of the Senses</td>
<td>University of Chicago Press</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Geoffrey Hartman; Daniel T. O'Hara</td>
<td>The Geoffrey Hartman Reader</td>
<td>Edinburgh University Press</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>William H. Gass</td>
<td>A Temple of Texts</td>
<td>Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Helen Small</td>
<td>The Long Life</td>
<td>Oxford University Press</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Geoffrey Hill</td>
<td>Collected Critical Writings</td>
<td>Oxford University Press</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Seth Lerer</td>
<td>Children's Literature: A Reader's History from Aesop to Harry Potter</td>
<td>University of Chicago Press</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Booker Prize (now Man Booker Prize) for fiction</th>
<th>PubDate</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Press</th>
<th>Scholarly Reviews</th>
<th>Citations (1980 to June 2012)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Anundhati Roy</td>
<td>The God of Small Things</td>
<td>IndiaLink India</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Ian McEwan</td>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>Jonathan Cape</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>J. M. Coetzee</td>
<td>Disgrace</td>
<td>Sacker &amp; Wurzburg</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Margaret Atwood</td>
<td>The Blind Assassin</td>
<td>McClelland and Stewart</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Peter Carey</td>
<td>True History of the Kelly Gang</td>
<td>University of Queensland Press</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Yann Martel</td>
<td>Life of Pi</td>
<td>Knopf Canada</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>DBC Pierre</td>
<td>Vernon God Little</td>
<td>Faber and Faber</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Alan Hollinghurst</td>
<td>The Line of Beauty</td>
<td>Picador Books</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>John Banville</td>
<td>The Sea</td>
<td>Picador Books</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>Anne Enright</td>
<td>The Gathering</td>
<td>Jonathan Cape</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>Hilary Mantel</td>
<td>Wolf Hall</td>
<td>Fourth Estate/HarperCollins</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Howard Jacobson</td>
<td>The Finkler Question</td>
<td>Bloomsbury</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>Julian Barnes</td>
<td>The Sense of an Ending</td>
<td>Jonathan Cape/Knopf</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>