



## UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

### Reviewing art from the periphery. A comparative analysis of reviews of Brazilian art exhibition in the press

Brandellero, A.; Velthuis, O.

**DOI**

[10.1016/j.poetic.2018.10.006](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2018.10.006)

**Publication date**

2018

**Document Version**

Final published version

**Published in**

Poetics

**License**

Article 25fa Dutch Copyright Act

[Link to publication](#)

**Citation for published version (APA):**

Brandellero, A., & Velthuis, O. (2018). Reviewing art from the periphery. A comparative analysis of reviews of Brazilian art exhibition in the press. *Poetics*, 71, 55-70. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2018.10.006>

**General rights**

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

**Disclaimer/Complaints regulations**

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

*UvA-DARE is a service provided by the library of the University of Amsterdam (<https://dare.uva.nl>)*



## Reviewing art from the periphery. A comparative analysis of reviews of Brazilian art exhibitions in the press

Amanda Brandellero<sup>a,\*</sup>, Olav Velthuis<sup>b</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Arts and Culture Studies, Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication, Erasmus University Rotterdam, the Netherlands

<sup>b</sup> Department of Sociology, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands



### ARTICLE INFO

#### Keywords:

Globalisation  
Comparative research  
Evaluative repertoires  
Reception  
Art market

### ABSTRACT

This paper investigates how the reception and evaluation of artists coming from a relatively peripheral and emerging art market might vary in transnational settings. Studies on cultural globalisation have primarily focused on the transnational diffusion of products and the opening up of national fields to cross-border flows. Questions of reception and evaluation of cultural products – particularly as they ‘break out’ of the periphery – remain relatively untouched, and this paper contributes to bridging this gap. Our data consists of reviews of solo shows of the top 50 Brazilian modern and contemporary artists, published in elite newspapers in three countries (Brazil, the UK and the US). We describe how two of the most salient evaluative repertoires are mobilised in the reviews. These repertoires relate to the institutional recognition bestowed upon the artist in Brazil or abroad; and to the associations made with living or deceased Brazilian or international artists. Our findings suggest that recognition bestowed by Brazilian museums and cultural institutions does not easily convert into an internationally valued marker of worth, while quite the opposite is true of international institutional recognition and its use in the Brazilian press.

### 1. Introduction

A recent increase in scholarly interest in the international circulation of art from so-called emerging art markets has drawn attention to the changing degree of their institutional visibility and market circulation, while pointing to persisting stratification and centre-periphery hierarchies (Velthuis & Baia Curioni, 2015; Buchholz, 2016; Quemin, 2013). Other research has offered insights into trends and explanations for the degree and intensity of global flows, exploring how the centrality in cultural production of certain countries might shape the chances of products originating from smaller or more peripheral markets of ‘breaking into’ core markets (Verboord & Brandellero, 2018; Janssen, Kuipers, & Verboord, 2008). Fewer studies have been devoted to the transnational reception of artists and their works, questioning whether they are potentially experienced and unpacked differently by origin and receiving cultures (Bydler, 2004; Griswold, 1987). With this in mind, our aim is to look at how artists from emerging art markets are received and evaluated in transnational settings, taking stock of how they are talked about in the press. More specifically, we ask: how are artists from Brazil, a country with a relatively peripheral position in the global art world in terms of its artists’ international recognition and its market share (Velthuis & Baia Curioni, 2015; TEFAF, 2013), are reviewed in their country of origin and

\* Corresponding author at: Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication, Postbus, 17383000, DR Rotterdam, the Netherlands.  
E-mail address: [brandellero@eshcc.eur.nl](mailto:brandellero@eshcc.eur.nl) (A. Brandellero).

transnationally?<sup>1</sup> Which evaluative repertoires do cultural intermediaries draw upon? Have these repertoires diffused across the transnational field, resulting in highly similar repertoires in the centre as well as in Brazil itself? Or have pluralistic evaluative cultures emerged, which leave space for distinct local repertoires? Do certain localised markers of recognition transfer better than others?

To answer these questions, we analyse how solo exhibitions by top Brazilian modern and contemporary artists are reviewed in elite American, English and Brazilian newspapers. We identify the types of repertoires used to evaluate and draw distinctions between what is more or less valuable, as well how these criteria are deployed (Lamont & Thévenot, 2000:6). The selected countries are among the ones that have hosted the most exhibitions by Brazilian artists over the years. Indeed, top ranking Brazilian artists have not only exhibited widely abroad; a look at their trajectories also signals that many have ‘nomadic’ careers spanning several countries<sup>2</sup>. By analysing how of Brazilian contemporary art we offer insights into the intellectualising discourse (Baumann, 2001), which has accompanied Brazil’s emergence in the global art world over the last twenty years (ABACT, 2015; Brandellero, 2015; Fetter, 2016).

The paper makes three contributions to existing literature on the reception of art and culture. First of all, using both qualitative and quantitative methods, it offers one of the first systematic sociological studies of critical discourse of high art<sup>3</sup>, complementing a burgeoning field of research on secondary discourse on evaluation of popular forms of culture (Cheyne & Binder, 2010; Van Venrooij & Schmutz, 2010) or film (Allen & Lincoln, 2004; Baumann, 2001; Kersten, 2014) and the literary field (Berkers, 2009; Chong, 2011). Secondly, while previous studies tend to focus on reviews published by European and American media outlets (see e.g. Janssen et al., 2008), we include reviews written in a country that is ‘emerging’ within the global field of art. We study if cross-national differences in the evaluation of high culture are found between reviews produced in countries occupying core and emergent positions in the global field of contemporary art (cf. Buchholz, 2016). According to studies on presence and visibility of international artists in top museum collections and art galleries in the world, the visibility of Brazilian artists is relatively meagre (Van Hest, 2012). We would therefore expect the object of the reviews, Brazilian modern and contemporary art, to be relatively unfamiliar to reviewers and audiences in Europe and the United States, enabling us to see how they come to terms with this newness (cf. Antal, Stark, & Hutter, 2015). Our focus allows us to contribute to the understanding of cross-national variations in the classification of high art (Lamont, 1992), by exploring the extent to which repertoires of evaluation have crossed symbolic or actual centre-periphery distinctions in the art world, and how they might be mobilized differently. Finally, when it comes to differences in repertoires of evaluation, previous cross-comparative studies have not always been able to tease out whether these differences are indeed related to the countries where the reviews are produced, or, instead, to variation within e.g. the products which are reviewed or their producers (for an exception, see Kersten, 2014). On the basis of a multilevel binomial regression analysis of reviews, we find that the differences in popularity of repertoires of evaluation can only to a limited extent be attributed to the national level. Instead, those differences are related as well to characteristics of the artist or to the newspaper publishing the review. Our data does not allow us to comment on the state of art reviews in the three countries, though the findings might be in line with the marketization of critical discourse and more commonplace features on artists that are already in the spotlight (Debenedetti, 2006). Moreover, our findings give further substance to studies that have noted persisting hierarchies in cultural flows, by showing how local institutional recognition and artistic associations may or may not translate to transnational settings.

## 2. Evaluation in art worlds and its repertoires

In order to study critical discourse about Brazilian contemporary art, we first turn our attention to the function of critical discourse in art reviews more generally and the specific evaluative repertoires that have been identified in reviews of cultural products. Such repertoires are helpful in drawing distinctions of worth, often relying on widely shared status signals. Afterwards, in Section 3, we focus on the cross-national differences we may expect to find in this critical discourse.

### 2.1. The function of reviews in art worlds

Reviews provide an indication of what an artist ‘is about’ (Griswold, 1987). In doing so, they fill a knowledge gap, providing ‘how-to’ guides to understand art and position it in a wider field of artistic production (Boltanski & Thévenot, 2006; Ten Eyck & Busch, 2012). Reviews generally contain three elements: a descriptive component, an analytical element, which provides the ‘interpretive context for understanding’ and an evaluative element, which sets the compass to good or bad (Shrum, 1991, P. 352; Rees van, 1987). In their evaluative role, critics play a particularly important role in introducing, validating and establishing the worth of new products as they function as mediators between numerous producers and consumers (Becker, 1982; Shrum, 1991). Indeed, if reviews provide a ‘vehicle’ through which readers can ascertain what is good or bad in art (Ten Eyck & Busch, 2012), their authors can be considered as ‘surrogate consumers’, whose taste and opinions afford legitimacy and visibility to cultural products (DiMaggio, 1987; Hirsch, 1972; Van Rees, 1987). This mediating role is particularly important for art because of its singularity (Karpik, 2010): the incommensurable, non-homogeneous and multi-dimensional nature of the product makes it difficult to assess its value, other than in

<sup>1</sup> Throughout the paper, we use the terms ‘local’ or ‘locally’ as a geographical descriptor, denoting ‘in the same country of origin’; so local reviews of Brazilian art, are reviews of Brazilian art published by Brazilian newspapers.

<sup>2</sup> The Itaú Cultural’s online encyclopaedia of the visual arts tracks national and international exhibitions featuring Brazilian artists, from the XIX century to today. Accessible at: <http://enciclopedia.itaucultural.org.br/>

<sup>3</sup> See Ten Eyck and Busch (2012) for a qualitative approach.

an inter-subjective way. Uncertainty regarding both the artistic and economic value of these cultural goods is particularly high (Beckert & Rössel, 2013). This is even more so when, as in our case, cultural products from new, emerging regions make their way into the art field. These products lack ‘cognitive legitimation’ based on shared and diffused knowledge and understanding (Aldrich & Fiol, 1994).

## 2.2. Institutional recognition repertoire

While it is generally accepted that there is no objective, inherent quality waiting to be uncovered by reviewers (Griswold, 1987), the social process of legitimation, consecration or ‘creating the creator’ draws upon relatively stable discursive repertoires of value construction (Bourdieu, 1980). We focus on two key repertoires. The first – which we here term the recognition repertoire – offers insights into the circuits in which an artist and her work circulates and the opportunity space which opens up, where competitors, substitutes and patrons can be found (Baumann, 2001; Bourdieu, 1980). Reviewers contribute to the recognition of artists by devoting scarce attention to them and evaluating their work. In doing so, they frequently invoke a recognition repertoire themselves when they value an artist’s work by referring to the institutions or persons who have already recognized this work or its maker in the past. In a process referred to as ‘social orchestration’, the references to e.g. museums, art schools, prizes, cultural spaces provide markers and send quality signals that help navigate the field and provide a ‘social sense of direction’ (Bourdieu, 1980:P. 278). The collective action of institutional actors and mechanisms of recognition, concertedly ‘makes names’ (Rawlings, 2001) and reproduces reputations (see Becker, 1982; Hirsch, 1972). The perceived relative status of the institutions and actors bestowing such quality signals provide further differentiating cues when assessing the value of art (Beckert & Rössel, 2013; see Podolny, 1993).

Greenfeld (1988:916) referred to the use of this repertoire as a transfer of the authority to judge, whereby critics and curators rely on external forms of institutional recognition (e.g. prizes, previous museum exhibitions locally or internationally) as markers of value, resulting in a loss of independence (Pénet & Lee, 2014). For instance, Janssen (1997) noted that reviewers pick up on status signals relating to the context of production of a cultural product, such as the relative standing of a book’s publishing house, while also paying attention to how other critics evaluate a work. The absence of such external markers of recognition in a review could even lead to questioning a critic’s own legitimacy (Johnson, Dowd, & Ridgeway, 2006). In other words, the esteem bestowed upon artists by critics tends to be path-dependent, drawing on previous indicators of achievement: for instance the location and number of solo exhibitions in an artist’s portfolio or whether her artworks have integrated prestigious private collections (Bonus & Ronte, 1997, P. 108). Likewise, for the field of visual art, prestigious biennials and museums offer higher status signals (Moulin, 1995).

## 2.3. Artistic association repertoire

The second helps to categorize and position an artist within other (better-known) artistic movements and fields (see Chong, 2011). It consists of associating the work by an artist with artistic movements or other artists who have already been recognized. These associations can help build a shared understanding of their value, as Khaire and Wadhwani’s work on the development of a market for Indian modern art so skilfully showed (Khaire & Wadhwani, 2010). Associations with known and widely shared categorical schemes, such as genres or movements, offer legitimacy cues that provide a basis for comparison and sense making for audiences (Lang & Lang, 1988; Zuckerman, 1999; see also work on exemplars, Dekker, 2016; Verdaasdonck, 2003). Moreover, the ‘satellite effect’ of being part of a particular group of artists at a specific time (Lang & Lang, 1988, P. 95; Moulin, 1987) affords powerful credentials supporting the survival of artistic reputation over time. Clearly, associations do not always work in a positive sense: work on the emergence of art market niches has shown how setting artists against what they are not, can work as a source of legitimacy in its own right (Ardery, 1997; Rawlings, 2001). In sum, mobilizing learned associations to artworks offers critics tools to introduce audiences to new material (DiMaggio, 1987), helping to define the ‘constituency’ to which an artist belongs (Crane, 1992). Following insights from neoinstitutionalist theory, we would expect similarity to Western artistic movements and figures to be evoked more frequently, in support of the legitimacy of relative newcomers to the field (Powell & DiMaggio, 1987; Zuckerman, 1999).

Recognition and association repertoires position artists relative to their predecessors and peers, and to the wider context of artistic production, introducing homologous or competing positionings that allow audiences to make sense of new art. However, these are not the only repertoires of value that exist. Research on critical or secondary discourse on cultural products has also pointed to the mobilization of two other opposing, Bourdieusian repertoires of evaluation, or aesthetic systems: high and lowbrow repertoires of evaluation (Baumann, 2001; Bielby, Moloney, & Ngo, 2005; Kersten, 2014; Van Venrooij & Schmutz, 2010). Reviews mobilizing the former focus on arcane and intellectual properties of the cultural product at hand, whereas when drawing on the latter, affective, participatory and instrumental dimensions are highlighted (Van Venrooij & Schmutz, 2010). However, these other repertoires are beyond the scope of this paper.

## 3. Establishing worth in a globalising art world

In this study, we are not interested in the occurrence of these evaluative repertoires *per se*, but more specifically in possible differences in their use across countries. In particular, we want to know if art critics in Brazil, an emerging country in the periphery of the global art field, evaluate art produced by Brazilian artists in a different way than art critics located in either the United States or the United Kingdom. Based on our reading of recent cultural sociological and globalization literature, we distinguish three main

possibilities when it comes to geographical differences in the use of these repertoires.

### 3.1. National differences in use of evaluative repertoires

First of all, an emerging body of literature suggests that evaluative repertoires differ across national borders (Lamont & Thévenot, 2000; Van Venrooij & Schmutz, 2010; Lamont, 2012). In their study on the evaluation of popular music, Van Venrooij and Schmutz found that a lowbrow repertoire is frequently drawn on in The Netherlands, while a highbrow repertoire is drawn on in Germany. They attribute these differences to underlying variations in “the hierarchy, universality and boundary strength of their respective cultural classification systems” (Van Venrooij & Schmutz, 2010, p. 400). Similarly, Berkers found that how racial boundaries are drawn in a country trickles down into literary anthologies, where ethnicity is revealed as a powerful classification system (Berkers, 2009). Kersten finds in her study of movie reviews in the Netherlands, the UK, the US and France that although the resemblances between evaluative repertoires are most striking, nevertheless ‘different notions of value’ inform national cultural repertoires of evaluation. Weber (2000) has demonstrated that book publishers in the US use a more utilitarian, business like repertoire in evaluating the worth of books while their French counterparts, even when active in the heteronomous pole, endorse an evaluative repertoire in which the autonomy of the cultural product is sacred. National differences in the use of evaluative repertoires have also been highlighted in studies on audience reception of cultural products. For instance, Griswold’s (1987) transnational comparison (UK, West India and the United States) of reviews of novels from a single author revealed how alternative meanings are given to the same cultural product, thereby contesting the view of a fixed, endogenous essence that is universally understood. She demonstrates how what people value about cultural products results from the interaction between the characteristics of that product and what she calls a societal tenor, defined as “a set of presuppositions, concerns, problems, and associations held by a particular social group in a particular historical and institutional context” (Griswold, 1987, p. 1112).<sup>4</sup> For instance, American readers of the novels whose reception she investigated were likely to emphasize race, while English readers stressed its literary qualities.

The organization of art worlds and the spatial implications thereof might also play a role in shaping transnational differences in evaluative repertoires. Previous research has indicated that galleries predominantly represent artists of their own country (Velthuis, 2013), that museums predominantly show local artists (Quemin, 2006), and auctions sell local artists (Renneboog & Spaenjers, 2015). Reasoning analogously, we may expect for the association and recognition repertoire in particular that they have a local character as well and are not easily transferred from a national context to an international one. More concretely, we expect British critics to refer to British, or, at least, European sources of recognition for a Brazilian artist, and to point out associations with British, or at least European artists, and likewise for American and Brazilian artists.

### 3.2. Centre-periphery differences in use of evaluative repertoires

National repertoires of evaluation may not simply reflect local, contextual cultural factors and classification systems, but should also be seen as reflections of power differences within the global art field. In particular it has been argued that a dominant cultural schema based on aesthetic theory which draws on the canon of Western modernism, and its concomitant values of originality and innovation, has long dominated the global art world (Barriendos, 2009; Mitter, 2008). Evaluations drawing on such schema might at one end of the spectrum recognise an “emerging geoaesthetic region[s] into the historical geography of the Western canon of art” (Barriendos, 2009:98), while at the other end belittle art entertaining ‘a derivative relationship with supposed Western pioneers’ (Favell, 2014, P. 89).

Another frame used in ‘the valorization of cultural forms outside the dominant Western cultural canon’ is exoticism, which captures the unusualness and excitement of products that are foreign to the conventional frame of reference (Johnston & Baumann, 2007: 169). While such a frame is likely to prevail in the centre, we note that the use of this frame in the ‘centre’ can lead to a backlash effect, as the example of Chinese cynical realism and political pop contemporary art movements shows: valued as instances of genuine, political critique in Europe and the United States, they were denounced as ‘export-oriented’ art by local, Chinese art critics, who saw these movements as catering predominantly to Western sensibilities (Kharchenkova & Velthuis, 2015).

More generally, and more relevant for this study, previous research suggests that geographically-patterned power differences within global art fields remain: actors and institutions located in the centres of the global art field continue to decide what is interesting, valuable and worthy of attention (Buchholz, 2016; Quemin, 2006; Johnston and Baumann, 2007, P. 195, footnote 33). From this perspective, we expect to find fewer mentions of instances of recognition from Brazilian museums and biennials or associations with Brazilian artists or artistic movements in reviews in the international press; yet conversely, we anticipate the use of international recognition and associations instances in the Brazilian press, as a device to distinguish among artists’ relative achievements and (international) projection.

### 3.3. No differences in the use of evaluative repertoires

Drawing on different, most notably neo-institutional, strands within globalization theory, a third scenario is that the formation of a transnational cultural field has contributed to the erosion of differences in evaluative repertoires (Buchholz, 2016; Khaire &

<sup>4</sup> Within one same country, evaluative repertoires are also sensitive to the passing of time and changing contexts: works once destined for oblivion are rescued and re-evaluated, as canonical classifications become more diverse (Corse & Griffin, 1997).



Wadhvani, 2010; Kuipers, 2011). Over the last thirty years, the art world has been transformed by globalization, as artistic careers now span continents, and the multiplication of biennials, art fairs and studio programmes has intensified the circulation of artists, curators and dealers among others (Bydler, 2004). Brazil's contemporary art world's interactions and exchanges with its international counterparts are relatively long standing, when compared to other emerging art markets (Brandellero, 2015) Contemporaneously, some authors have pointed to the diffusion of a discourse of borderless 'global art', coupled with calls for contemporary art to be viewed as a genre in its own right (Belting, 2009; Weibel, 2013).

Therefore, our analysis explicitly allows for the possibility that differences in the prevalence of evaluative repertoires do not cluster around nations (cf. Kuipers & de Kloet, 2009) or align along centre-periphery divides but around the artist him or herself, or around the newspapers that may have different identities. Ideally, we would have also studied differences in the use of evaluative repertoires across individual art critics, but the lack of data on characteristics of these critics and the fact that many reviews in our sample are anonymous (sometimes taking the format of relatively short 'agenda' articles) prohibited that.

#### 4. Brazilian art's emergence in the art in a global field

Brazil has, compared to other emerging regions, been relatively well integrated with art scenes in Europe and the United States. This is unlike e.g. China, India or Russia, thanks to its lively internationally oriented art scene for a good part of the 20th century (Brandellero, 2015; Durand, 1989). In 1951, the São Paulo Biennial, after Venice the world's second oldest biennial, was established there, with a purported mission to stimulate an artistic dialogue between Brazilian and international modernist movements. By the end of the 1950s dozens of galleries were already operating in São Paulo and Rio de Janeiro, often established by Italian, German, or Romanian immigrants who had fled Europe during World War II. Competing with auction houses, these galleries not only sold to the local middle-class, but also to foreign buyers. The country's economic (mis)fortunes and political turmoil of the second half of the 20th century resulted in a series of phases of expansion and contraction of the art market, while censorship placed serious constraints on Brazilian artists' national and international institutional exposure (see Author 1., 2015; Durand, 1989).

Since the turn of the 21st century Brazilian artists have achieved greater visibility abroad, both in cultural institutions and in the commercial market. A number of developments can account for this. Brazilian contemporary art has benefitted from the general interest in art from 'emerging markets' (TEFAF, 2013), their 'outsider' status offering an alternative to oversaturated markets (Arderly, 1997). The Brazilian art world has also become increasingly embedded in international networks, for example by appointing prestigious foreign curators to head its Biennials, and hosting top art dealers, such as the New York based Gagosian Gallery and David Zwirner or the London-based White Cube, at its art fairs, in turn strengthening the international reputation of these events (see Fetter, 2016). Meanwhile a number of the most highly recognized Brazilian artists have settled abroad permanently or longer periods of time, as in the case of Vik Muniz (who lives between Rio de Janeiro and New York) or Antonio Dias (who has lived in Paris and Milan).

Yet the visibility of Brazilian artists in museum collections, art galleries and biennials remains puny when compared to the size and importance of the country on the world scene. Van Hest, (2012) has shown that Brazil features meagrely among the artists on display of top international museums<sup>5</sup>. Discounting for artists born in the same country as the location of exhibiting museum, a survey of 2007-08 found only two Brazilian artists on display, compared to 90 from the US (Van Hest, 2012: 118). In more recent years, international museums have – though arguably belatedly – contributed to the consecration of Brazilian artists in recent years. In 2009, the Tate Modern organized the first UK retrospective of Cildo Meireles, "widely recognized as one of the leaders in the international development of Conceptual art"<sup>6</sup> since the 1960s. The same year, Mira Schendel "considered among the most significant artists working in Latin America during the second half of the twentieth century"<sup>7</sup> received a similar accolade with her first, posthumous, exhibition at the New York Museum of Modern Art. While Brazilian institutions and galleries remain by far the largest hosts of exhibitions by Brazilian artists, a survey of the top fifteen artists amongst those reviewed for this paper shows that, in order of number of solo shows hosted, New York, London, Lisbon and Madrid also feature regularly in their CVs<sup>8</sup>. Brazilian art has also gained renown among the wider public with the 2014 World Cup and 2016 Olympic Games, such prominence being a prerequisite for reputation building (cf. Lang & Lang, 1988). The public limelight has indeed opened up an opportunity space for Brazilian artists as museums and cultural centres - from Beelden aan Zee in Scheveningen, The Netherlands to the Wexner Center for the Arts at Ohio State University – marked the occasion with Brazil-themed exhibitions.

#### 5. Methodology

This paper draws on an analysis of national press articles and reviews of exhibitions of Brazilian artists in Brazil and abroad. We based our selection of countries on the locations where Brazilian artists have exhibited the most over the past decades. Using Artfacts.net, an online database which tracks careers of modern and contemporary artists, we looked up the exhibition history of the top 50 Brazilian artists by prestige of commercial and institutional exhibition history<sup>9</sup>. Secondly, we searched for reviews of solo

<sup>5</sup> The museums surveyed were: Museum of Modern art (New York), Centre Pompidou (Paris), Musée d'Art Moderne de la Ville de Paris, Hamburger Bahnhof (Berlin) and Tate Modern (London).

<sup>6</sup> <http://www.tate.org.uk/whats-on/tate-modern/exhibition/cildo-meireles>. Last visited: 6 February 2018.

<sup>7</sup> <https://www.moma.org/calendar/exhibitions/299>. Last visited: 6 February 2018.

<sup>8</sup> Data drawn from Itaú Cultural Enciclopédia das Artes Visuais, covering exhibition histories for fifteen top ranked artists, up to the year 2013.

<sup>9</sup> We collected data on the exhibition histories of the top 50 artists, resulting in a total of 1009 exhibitions in Brazil and across the world. The data was cross-checked with the online database of Brazilian visual arts centre Itaú Cultural, which contain detailed artists' biographies and exhibition

**Table 1**  
Overview of solo exhibition reviews for top 50 Brazilian artists per newspaper.

Newspaper	Number of articles	Year range
Globo	164	2005-2014
Estado de São Paulo	94	2009-2014
New York Times	113	1987-2015
Washington Post	24	1992-2008
The Times	60	1993-2013
The Guardian	58	2000-2015
Total	513	1987-2014

exhibitions by the top 50 artists in elite newspapers with high to middle-brow readership (see Janssen et al., 2008) in the three countries where they exhibited the most: Brazil, the United States and the United Kingdom. While Brazil is considered as ‘emerging’ in the global art field (Velthuis & Baia Curioni, 2015; Quemin, 2006), the United States and the United Kingdom are established centres, home to galleries and museums widely recognized as mustering the symbolic capital to consecrate artists and shape the art canon (Pénet & Lee, 2014; Braden, 2009).

We selected the newspapers based on the following three criteria: first of all, we were looking for newspapers with a national circulation, given that this paper is not about evaluative dynamics on e.g. the city or provincial level. Secondly, the newspaper needed to have a strong tradition in reviewing modern and contemporary art. Thirdly, for pragmatic reasons, the newspaper needed to be available in a digital format via the online database LexisNexis as of September 2014. For Brazil, historically *Folha de São Paulo* is the newspaper with the highest national circulation, with *Globo* and *Estado de São Paulo* in second and third place respectively<sup>10</sup>. However only a restricted part of *Folha de São Paulo* is available on LexisNexis. As a result, we opted for *Globo* and *Estado*. For the UK, we selected the *Times* and the *Guardian*.<sup>11</sup> While the *Daily Telegraph* has a higher circulation (see Audit Bureau of Circulation data), we found a low number of articles mentioning top 50 Brazilian artists. For the US, we selected the two main elite newspapers with a national circulation and a strong tradition in art criticism: *New York Times* and the *Washington Post*.

The Brazilian newspapers were only available from 2005 and 2008 onwards, which could potentially impact the comparability with American and British newspapers, which are available for older publication dates. However, the vast majority of the articles in our sample (803 percent) has a publication date of 2005; only 33 articles (6,4 percent) in our sample were published before 2000. The reason is that, in spite of the process of globalization of art markets, Brazilian artists only became visible internationally very late.

The data collection proceeded along the following stages: first, we searched the selected newspapers for mentions of the artists; second, we filtered out articles which reviewed solo shows from all other references to the top 50 artists. While some articles presented page-long, detailed interpretations and evaluations of an artist’s work, others were part of e.g. the newspaper’s culture section where exhibitions are recommended to readers. Some articles were written by well-known art critics such as Adrian Searle (Guardian), Michael Kimmelman or Holland Cotter (New York Times), while others concerned anonymous pieces of art journalism.

The three countries have different traditions in cultural journalism. An in-depth discussion of these traditions goes beyond the scope of this paper, however we note here a number of differences that emerged during the coding process. In the Brazilian newspapers, some reviews included interview excerpts with the artist her of himself or with the exhibition’s curator. The interviewees discussed the creative process and the genesis of the exhibition (note: we did not code the interview material). Brazilian newspapers were also more likely to include a review of an exhibition that took place abroad (in Europe or the United States) – though there were only few occurrences of this.

Our search generated 513 reviews of solo shows (Table 1). The breakdown of reviews per artist is included in online appendix 1. For seven artists, no reviews of solo shows were retrieved, limiting the analysis to 43 artists. The data analysis proceeded according to the following steps. In order to identify both evaluative repertoires in the reviews, we took a quantified approach by means of lists of keywords. For the association repertoire, we created six sub-repertoires by making a distinction between Brazilian and international associations, which we then subdivided into associations with living artists, deceased artists and art movements. Moreover, we distinguish an unqualified association sub-repertoire, containing terms like ‘influential’ or ‘pioneering’, which associate an artist with her peers or followers without identifying the latter by name. For the recognition repertoire, we distinguish two sub-repertoires: unqualified recognition, which signals recognition without mentioning a specific institution that has bestowed this recognition (identified by keywords such as ‘famous’, ‘acclaimed’ or ‘great’) and qualified recognition. Within the latter category, we make a distinction between recognition from cultural institutions (e.g. museums or art prizes) and professionals within the art world (e.g. curators or art critics). Additionally we distinguish whether these institutions and professionals are Brazilian or not. We also look at recognition by commercial institutions (e.g. galleries or fairs).

In order to compile the lists of keywords for each sub-repertoire, we first read the articles multiple times. Each keyword identified in the English-language newspapers was translated into Portuguese and vice versa. For the lists of keywords involving names of

(footnote continued)

histories. The countries which appear to have hosted the highest number of exhibitions from these artists are: Brazil, the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Spain and Germany.

<sup>10</sup> Associação Nacional de Jornais, National Newspaper association: <http://www.anj.org.br/maiores-jornais-do-brasil/> accessed on 15 October 2016

<sup>11</sup> We included *The Observer*, which is *The Guardian*’s Sunday newspaper.

**Table 2**  
Use of repertoires of evaluation in reviews of Brazilian art.

Repertoire	Frequency (percentage)
Association with Brazilian art movement	75 (4,0)
Association with Brazilian deceased artist	117 (6,3)
Association with Brazilian living artist	93 (5,0)
<i>Total Brazilian associations</i>	<i>285 (15,4)</i>
Association with international art movement	262 (14,1)
Association with international dead artist	293 (15,8)
Association with international living artist	72 (3,9)
<i>Total international associations</i>	<i>627 (33,8)</i>
Association, unqualified	55 (3,0)
Recognized by Brazilian institutions	198 (10,7)
Recognized by Brazilian persons	95 (5,1)
<i>Total Brazilian recognition</i>	<i>293 (15,8)</i>
Recognized by international institutions	237 (12,8)
Recognized by international persons	57 (3,1)
<i>Total international recognition</i>	<i>294 (15,8)</i>
Recognition, unqualified	254 (13,7)
Recognition, commercial	48 (2,6)
<b>Total</b>	<b>1856 (100,0)</b>

institutions, persons, or art movements, results were checked against results from Stanford Named Entity Recognizer (<https://nlp.stanford.edu/software/CRF-NER.shtml>), which automatically identifies names of e.g. persons or organizations in texts. This procedure resulted in lists of 28–129 both English and Portuguese keywords per sub-repertoire (see online Appendix 2). These lists were then used to run searches using the corpus analysis software AntConc in the corpus of articles, generating a list of quotes where the keywords appeared. We proceeded to clean the list of quotes, removing instances in which the keywords were not used to evaluate the artist under review (for instance, when a recognition keyword did not concern the artist whose solo show was reviewed in the article, but another artist).

In the next section, we describe the repertoires of evaluation in qualitative detail and explain their meanings. Afterwards, we present our quantitative findings, indicating whether differences across regions, countries, newspapers or artists exist and testing if these differences are statistically significant. Then we try to explain these differences by looking at the results of separate binomial, multilevel regression analyses for each repertoire.

## 6. Framing Brazilian art

In total, the 13 sub-repertoires were invoked 1856 times in the corpus of 513 articles (Table 2). One hundred and fifty nine articles (31,0% of the entire corpus) do not display any of the anticipated repertoires of evaluation. As Table 2 demonstrates, associations to international art movements or deceased international artists are the main ways in which value gets attributed to Brazilian artists, followed by references to recognition bestowed by Brazilian and international art institutions. By contrast, associations to Brazilian art movements or artists, or, more generally, to artists who are still alive, are relatively infrequently made, which makes sense given that living artists are unlikely to have accumulated that much prestige that would allow them to serve as anchors of valuation of for others.

### 6.1. Association repertoires

Associations with Brazilian art movements are primarily used for artists who were contemporaneous and exemplary contributors to the movement itself, as is the case for the neo-concrete and concrete movements of the 1950s and 60 s. Articles reviewing exhibitions by members of the *‘triade carioca’* (the Rio triad, constituted by Lygia Pape, Lygia Clark and Oiticíca) fall into this category. Associations with deceased Brazilian artists generally point to personal or professional bonds between contemporaneous artists: going back to the *‘triade carioca’*, reviews on one of the members usually mention the other two as ‘friends and colleagues’ (NYT, 7 June 2007) or ‘fellow stars’ (Guardian, 11 December 2011), with Pape’s talent being unduly ‘eclipsed’ by the other two (Estado, 15 June 2011). Alongside other artists, they were part of the Rio-based Grupo Frente which embraced geometric abstraction while rejecting figurative and nationalistic modernism (Amaral, 1977; Pedrosa, 1998). While not explicitly belonging to the movement, Mira Schendel’s *‘shared themes’* and friendship with neo-concrete artists are also discussed in her reviews (Guardian, 14 September 2013).

More rarely, when artists from younger generations are associated with Brazilian artistic movements or bygone artists, it expresses



**Table 3**  
Subrepertoires per newspaper.

Repertoire	Estado	Globo	Guardian	Times	NYT	WP	All
Association, Brazilian art movement	5,7%	3,4%	6,8%	2,6%	3,0%	0,0%	4,0%
Association, Brazilian deceased artist	6,4%	6,2%	12,1%	0,0%	5,6%	0,0%	6,3%
Association, Brazilian living artist	5,9%	8,1%	1,0%	2,6%	2,2%	8,2%	5,0%
Association, international art movement	7,7%	8,9%	29,0%	15,4%	20,1%	6,1%	14,1%
Association, international deceased artist	6,4%	6,2%	16,9%	34,6%	30,6%	26,5%	15,8%
Association, international living artist	1,7%	1,6%	1,4%	5,1%	8,9%	6,1%	3,9%
Association, unqualified	2,2%	3,4%	6,3%	3,8%	1,6%	2,0%	3,0%
Recognition, Brazilian institutions	14,9%	21,8%	1,0%	0,0%	0,4%	0,0%	10,7%
Recognition, Brazilian persons	9,9%	8,3%	0,5%	0,0%	0,6%	0,0%	5,1%
Recognition, international institutions	16,8%	12,8%	7,7%	11,5%	11,3%	16,3%	12,8%
Recognition, international persons	5,4%	2,4%	1,4%	1,3%	2,8%	4,1%	3,1%
Recognition, commercial qualified	3,5%	4,4%	0,5%	0,0%	1,2%	0,0%	2,6%
Recognition, unqualified	13,4%	12,4%	15,5%	23,1%	11,7%	30,6%	13,7%
Total	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	100,0%	

an aesthetic continuity and lineage in the works. So we read that Meireles is ‘one of the most important heirs to Clark and Oiticica’ (Guardian, 11 October 2008), while ‘Brazil’s rich history of Conceptual art movements, including Neo-concretismo and Tropicália, guides [Rivane Neueschwander’s] work but doesn’t script it’ (NYT, 25 June 2010). Similarly, in the Brazilian press, the work of concrete artist Waldemar Cordeiro is an ‘unmissable reference’ when viewing Edouardo Kac’s digital poems (Globo, 3 February 2013). Such lineage only works retrospectively: in other words, when discussing the work of deceased artists we do not find references to how their art ‘lives on’ in the work of younger generations.

Contemporary Brazilian artists are more frequently mentioned alongside one another in the Brazilian press (8,1% and 5,9% of repertoires used by Globo and Estado respectively; see Table 3), particularly as having crossed career paths (e.g. having studied or exhibited together), having collaborated on or exchanged artworks. For instance, the short-lived (1966-67) yet ‘iconic Rex group’ in São Paulo (Globo, September 2 2011), formed by Nelson Leirner, Geraldo de Barros and Wesley Duke Lee, was an alternative art space and gallery intended as a convivial place of encounter and as a poignant critique of the growing commodification of art.<sup>12</sup> Bruscky – a representative of the international Fluxus and postal art movement – prides himself of his collection of over 70 thousand items, including artworks and correspondence, symbolizing the ‘emerging network of artists in the 70s’ (Estado, November 17, 2009). Associations among living Brazilian artists are rarer in the international press.<sup>13</sup>

Associations with international artistic movements or international deceased artists were in general more prominent in the international press compared to the Brazilian newspapers, suggesting that national differences between evaluative repertoires persist. In the Guardian for instance, international art movements represented 290% of all repertoires used by the paper, compared to 201% in the New York Times. References to artistic movements show a high degree of overlap, yet generations of artists are linked to different references. Older generations were inspired by European modernism, constructivists and geometric abstractions that they had contributed to ‘bring to Brazil’ (Estado, 30 December 2013) or seen at exhibitions and at the first São Paulo Biennial, and allegedly contributed their own take to the styles: ‘What Brazilian artists made of this geometric rationalism was as sensuous as Gilberto’s music- suave constructions, floating grids, paintings that fairly danced’ (Guardian December 11, 2011), ‘freed from northern, protestant restraint’ (Guardian, 7 June 2007). The juxtaposition of external influences and local styles tends to reproduce cliché distinctions between a rational north and a vibrant south, as we see in the case of da Cunha: ‘At the heart of his practice is a power struggle between the cold, hard rigours of modernism and the vibrancy of tropicana’ (Guardian, 18 July 2009). The suggestion that stylistic genealogy originated in Europe and was filtered through local culture fits in with dominant art historical narratives of centre-periphery relations (cf Mitter, 2008)<sup>14</sup>. Reviews also allude to the expansion of canonical art history written by and in the West to include hitherto peripheral voices, albeit noting “compatibility with the avant-garde discourse in the West” (Belting, 1987, 2003; Mitter, 2008:531): so for instance we find work that is grounded in or expressing a “familiar modernist idiom” (NYT, 2 August 2002).

Younger generation on the other hand are more frequently identified as conceptual artists, though the Brazilian press is more sparing with the use of such identifier, using it consistently for just two artists, Bruscky and Meireles – as opposed to a wider group in the international press. Younger generations are also more frequently associated as critically engaging with Brazil’s baroque heritage, as exemplified by Varejão stinging exegesis of colonial art.

Associations to international artists feature more frequently in the international press compared to Globo and Estado, and they function on various levels. Some artists explicitly engage in a conversation with other artists through their work, such as Muniz’s ‘referential’ take on the Western canon, or Leirner’s homage to Fontana. Yet associations function also allow the reader to visualize an

<sup>12</sup> GRUPO Rex. In: ENCICLOPÉDIA Itaú Cultural de Arte e Cultura Brasileiras. São Paulo: Itaú Cultural, 2017. Available at: < <http://enciclopedia.itaucultural.org.br/grupo434025/grupo-rex> > . Accessed on: 19 April 2017. ISBN: 978-85-7979-060-7

<sup>13</sup> It is primarily the artistic collaboration between Cão Guimarães and Rivane Neueschwander that helps to explain the presence of this repertoire in the *Washington Post*.

<sup>14</sup> In the *New York Times* we read that “Gerhard Richter may have introduced the technique, but Ms. Milhazes brings her own cultural references to it” (New York Times November 7 2008).

artwork by suggesting aesthetic similarities with or echoes of other well-known artists' styles. By this token, graffiti by Os Gêmeos is 'Escher like', while Tunga's pieces 'build on the vocabularies of body-oriented Surrealist types- young Dali, Yves Tanguy, Hans Bellmer and Balthus – abstracting them into suggestive three-dimensional shapes' (NYT, 24 May 2014). More rarely do associations suggest comparisons in the status of artists, and indeed Oiticíca appears to be a primary target of such analogies, as a 'Brazilian cultural hero on the order of Warhol and Beuys in their own countries' (NYT, 9 September 2001).

Sometimes Brazilian artists are placed ahead of developments in Europe and the United States in international reviews, as we see in the unqualified association sub-repertoire (2% overall), albeit with few exceptions: for instance Oiticíca<sup>15</sup>, whose paintings were seen as prefiguring developments in American art during the 60s and 70s (Guardian, 7 June 2007), or Pape who 'got there first', relative to op art and Frank Stella's work (Guardian, 8 December 2011). The pioneering role of certain artist is more often related to specific styles or movements, as with the neo-concrete artists or Cordeiro's contribution to computer-based art, or the wider repercussion of their art on younger generations.

## 6.2. Recognition repertoires

Reviews of Brazilian art most frequently deploy repertoires of evaluation connected to international institutional recognition and the association of artists with international (deceased) artists and movements, as well as unqualified recognition. In art reviews, the recognition repertoire is widely used to provide cues as to the level of recognition achieved as well as the circuits which have bestowed such recognition. In the Estado and Globo recognition by Brazilian institutions is frequently used, as opposed to the British and American newspapers, where they are almost completely absent (Table 3). We also note that articles in the Brazilian press are more likely to mention the curator of an exhibition, or to present the views of a renowned Brazilian art world personality (a critic or museum director for instance) on the artist under review. Our findings suggest that recognition bestowed by Brazilian museums and cultural institutions does not easily convert into an internationally valued markers of worth, while quite the opposite is true of international recognition: both in the Brazilian and in the British and American press, it is frequently referred to.

The only form of recognition which is used across the board with comparable frequency is that of unqualified recognition (9,4% of total repertoires use). Such evaluative sub-repertoire is not framed in relation to specific institutions or mechanisms of recognition, and are thus devoid of attachment to identifiable cultural producers. Yet they convey the notion of a shared appreciation of the artists. Similarly to Chong (2011), we find that identifiers of unqualified recognition are not used as interpretive tools, but more as nominal markers of accomplishment, encouraging readers to visit an exhibition. Ernesto Neto is thus presented as being 'widely admired' in the New York Times (10 November 2006), while Beatriz Milhazes has 'gained increasing recognition' (New York Times, July 2 2001). When using the sub-repertoire of unqualified recognition critics therefore tend to draw upon a consensus and validation about the quality of the artist (Johnson et al., 2006), rather their subjective praise. Only rarely is this repertoire used to refer to specific works by an artist, as for example in the case of Oiticíca's 'acclaimed' work Tropicália.

In some cases, spatial and temporal identifiers are mobilized to qualify the diffusion of such recognition. When the Times presents Sebastião Salgado as being "without doubt the most famous living Brazilian photographers" (Times, September 7 2002), the renown is not disputed, though the 'Brazilian' identifier suggests its international scope can be questioned. A Guardian review of Mira Schendel's posthumous retrospective at the Tate Modern states how the artist "is extremely famous in Brazil, where she eventually found a foothold, but practically unknown here" (Guardian, September 29, 2013). This notion is even more pronounced in the following excerpt taken from a review of an Oiticíca exhibition in New York. "Oiticíca (pronounced oy-tee-SEE-kah) remained on the margins of Europeans' and Americans' consciousness at best" (New York Times, August 2 2002) – while his show is "like a large stone dropped into the calm waters of European-American art history". The phonetic transcription and the metaphor of the calm waters add to the sense of hitherto distinct and disconnected art worlds. We also find contradictory statements about just how recognized and well-known an artist is in Brazil and abroad: Lygia Clark for instance is reviewed in the Estado as 'one of the most celebrated in the country and the international scene' (Estado, 26 August 2012), while two years later the New York Times writes 'Though she was one of Brazil's most celebrated artists of the post-World War II era, Lygia Clark (1920-88) is not well known in the United States' (Johnson, New York Times, 4 May 2014).

Echoing research that suggests that curatorial practices of museums and galleries in the centre are catching up on a representational blind spot when it comes to art from the periphery (Quemin, 2006. See also Coffey, 2017), our results suggest a process of synchronization of separate evaluative systems. Yet our findings also show how reviews reflect on varying levels of exposure of and familiarity with Brazilian artists in different art world centers and core institutions. Commenting on the career of Waltercio Caldas, one review states that he "has already participated in several Venice Biennials and other important exhibitions abroad, he enjoys a stable position in the art market, and is a key figure in Brazil, yet a more concerted action in the USA was missing" (Estado, February 5 2013). Participation in the most prestigious biennial in the artistic calendar apparently does not necessarily convert into museum and gallery exhibitions.

Brazilian institutions themselves are also reported as lagging behind in recognizing artists: thus Caio Reisewitz's reviewed exhibition is seen as completing a process of recognition, a missing piece in the artist's career: 'Despite having participated in the 2004 São Paulo Biennial, and having represented Brazil at the Venice Biennial the following year, it is the first time that Reisewitz, 42, displays his playful representation of reality in a big exhibition in this country' (Globo, January 2 2010). When evaluative repertoires take the form of

<sup>15</sup> Hélio Oiticíca indeed is seen across the board as very innovative and influential, "hailed not only as one of his country's most innovative artists but as one of the most innovative artists of the postwar era, full stop" (Times June 6 2007). And again, the "textbook significance of Oiticíca's work is its foreshadowing of current video installations and other multimedia creations" (NYT August 2 2002).

specific mentions of institutions or mechanisms of recognition - notably past exhibitions in museums, prizes and awards, and purchases by prestigious institutional collections - they are deployed in either a factual or interpretative form. In the case of the former, previous exhibitions are simply mentioned – leaving their value to be assessed by the reader. Thus Maiolino ‘*was among the artists representing Brazil at the last Documenta in Kassel*’ (Globo, December 15, 2012). Readers will either know or not that Documenta is considered one of the most prestigious non-commercial art events in the world (Morgner, 2014).

However, the status of specific instances of recognition can also be made explicit in the text, particularly in the Brazilian press. Thus in the *Estado* we learn that Maiolino represented Brazil at Documenta, “*one of the most important contemporary art events*” (*Estado*, June 6 2012). Specifying that the source of recognition is widely validated adds an additional marker of worth: the prestige of the institutions ‘rubs off’ on the artist. Thus in 2013 Renata Lucas did not simply win the Absolut Art Award: she “*was awarded one of the most coveted international contemporary art prizes*” (Globo, September 11, 2014).

Mentions of commercial recognition are rare in the reviews, fitting in with a wider disavowal of the economy logic that pervades the field of high arts (Bourdieu, 1983). However, by way of comparison, when Chinese artists are discussed, commercial success is often highlighted (Author 2 et al., 2015b; Pollack, 2010). Recognition by art galleries, fairs and auctions featured in the Brazilian press (around the mark of 3% of sub-repertoires in *Estado* and *Globo*) while more rarely were artists described as having become ‘rich’ from their art. Similar to the institutional recognition sub-repertoire, commercial success is also qualified in relation to specific instances of success: for instance the *New York Times*’ reference to Os Gêmeos’ ‘*debut*’ at Art Basel (the most prestigious art fair in the world) or their sold-out opening night at a Manhattan gallery. While this suggests that a Bourdieusian habitus of denegation of commerce and economy has been internalized in the Brazilian art field but not in e.g. the Chinese one, further research would be necessary to establish this (cf. Shin, K., & Lee, 2014).

## 7. Binomial multilevel models

While the previous section looked at the (sub)repertoires in qualitative detail, in the present section we will scrutinize quantitative patterns in the occurrence of these repertoires in Brazilian, English and American newspaper articles. First of all, a closer look at the standard deviations and coefficients of variation (which is the standard deviation divided by the mean) of each subrepertoire’s frequency suggests that differences in the mobilization of repertoires are particularly big on the level of artists, followed by the level of newspapers and countries (see online appendix 3). Instead, standard deviations are relatively small on the level of regions (periphery versus centre), suggesting that the ways in which Brazilian artists get evaluated, is not, or not exclusively, structured by the newspaper country or region after all. In other words, the fact that e.g. Brazilian artists frequently get associated with international deceased artists in the American and British press, may in other words be a selection effect: it may be related to the type of artists that get exhibited and reviewed in the international press, not with the use of repertoires of evaluation across the board. Likewise, the fact that Brazilian newspapers tend to invoke recognition bestowed by Brazilian institutions when evaluating artists, may be related to characteristics of these artists. For instance, if an artist has a predominantly local career (meaning exhibitions in Brazilian art institutions) it can be expected that reviewers will refer more frequently to these local forms of recognition, in the absence of international equivalences.

To explain more systematically which repertoires of evaluation are used in art reviews, and tease out in particular if differences should be attributed to newspapers or artists, we ran a series of binomial multilevel regression models (Guo & Zhao, 2000). Multilevel analysis is warranted given that two different levels of analysis are nested in the data: the level of newspaper articles nested in the level of artists. For each artist, we have on average 120 newspaper articles in the dataset (515/43). Ignoring this nested or clustered data structure would result among others in overconfident statistical inferences and erroneous estimates of regression coefficients.<sup>16</sup>

The unit of analysis in the regressions are newspaper articles. The models express the likelihood that a specific sub-repertoire (the dependent variable) is used in a newspaper article. The independent variables are dummies for each newspaper title, the (international) reputation of the artist and a dummy indicating if the artist is deceased. We expect the reputation to have an impact on the repertoires of evaluations in the reviews for several reasons. Brazilian artists with a strong reputation are more likely to be evaluated through the lens of international recognition or association with foreign artists or styles. In short, these artists are more likely to be identified as ‘international’ instead of ‘Brazilian’ (cf. Chong, 2011: 77), which is meaningful in a contemporary art world where ‘international’ or ‘global’ is a form of praise in itself. We expect deceased artists to be evaluated in different ways since they may have had more possibilities to become part of the canon.

The reputation of the artist is measured through a dummy variable (*Highrank*) which indicates if the artist was ranked by artifacts.net among the world’s top 1750 artists. This ranking is based on the artist’s international exhibition history, where the prestige of the exhibition venue is taken into account. The 22 artists in the dataset ranking among the top 1750 have an active, international career, and regularly participate in solo or group exhibitions in main modern and contemporary art museums. In the analysis we control for the artist’s gender; for commercial success (measured through the dummy *Auctionsale* which indicates that at least four works by the artist have been sold at auction); and for the length of the newspaper article (through the variable *Articlesize*; we do so because in longer articles, any evaluative repertoire may be more likely to be incurred than in shorter articles).

For each of the thirteen subrepertoires a model is estimated. Table 4 reports the log odds (which is the coefficient  $\beta$  in the multilevel binomial models), the standard error (S.E) as well as the likelihood II. The results should therefore be read as follows: for

<sup>16</sup> We fit the model using the second order, penalized quasi-likelihood (PQL) method using the MLwiN multilevel modelling package (Rasbash et al., 2009).

**Table 4**  
Binomial multilevel regression models for repertoire of evaluation.

	Association with Brazilian movements			Association with deceased Brazilian artists			Association Brazilian living artist			Association with international movements			Association with international deceased artist		
	$\beta$	S.E.	$\Pi$	$\beta$	S.E.	$\Pi$	$\beta$	S.E.	$\Pi$	$\beta$	S.E.	$\Pi$	$\beta$	S.E.	$\Pi$
Cons	<b>-4,164</b>	0,825	0,015	<b>-4,312</b>	0,751	0,013	<b>-2,804</b>	0,654	0,057	<b>-1,879</b>	0,567	0,133	<b>-4,038</b>	0,720	0,017
Globo	0,705	0,589	0,031	0,775	0,442	0,028	0,149	0,450	0,066	-0,263	0,370	0,105	-0,137	0,450	0,015
NYT	0,845	0,644	0,035	0,364	0,511	0,019	-0,851	0,585	0,025	<b>1,214</b>	0,377	0,340	<b>1,361</b>	0,438	0,064
Guardian	0,142	0,679	0,018	0,280	0,649	0,017	-1,621	0,908	0,012	<b>1,194</b>	0,450	0,335	0,790	0,560	0,037
Times	-0,956	1,006	0,006				-1,226	0,892	0,017	-0,535	0,607	0,082	0,878	0,599	0,041
WP							0,339	0,759	0,078	-1,096	1,016	0,049	0,520	0,840	0,029
Articlesize	0,000	0,000	0,015	0,000	0,000	0,013	0,000	0,000	0,057	0,000	0,000	0,133	0,001	0,000	0,017
Highrank	1,161	0,884	0,047	-0,809	0,660	0,006	0,323	0,622	0,077	0,108	0,521	0,145	0,513	0,633	0,029
Auctionsale	-1,734	0,916	0,003	0,751	0,788	0,028	-0,123	0,675	0,051	-0,788	0,553	0,065	-0,231	0,684	0,014
Deceased	<b>2,906</b>	0,572	0,221	<b>1,234</b>	0,582	0,044	0,023	0,583	0,058	0,389	0,539	0,184	0,171	0,614	0,020
Male	-0,783	0,502	0,007	-0,070	0,493	0,012	-0,624	0,445	0,031	-0,357	0,413	0,097	-0,164	0,478	0,015

  

	Association with international living artist			Association, unqualified			Recognition from Brazilian institutions			Recognition from Brazilian persons			Recognition international institutions		
	$\beta$	S.E.	$\Pi$	$\beta$	S.E.	$\Pi$	$\beta$	S.E.	$\Pi$	$\beta$	S.E.	$\Pi$	$\beta$	S.E.	$\Pi$
Cons	-4,423	0,973	0,012	<b>-5,031</b>	0,978	0,006	<b>-2,270</b>	0,560	0,094	<b>-2,871</b>	0,663	0,054	<b>-2,429</b>	0,532	0,081
Globo	-0,482	0,732	0,007	0,334	0,636	0,009	<b>1,124</b>	0,304	0,241	0,642	0,346	0,097	-0,499	0,328	0,051
NYT	1,195	0,631	0,038	-0,269	0,789	0,005	<b>-3,449</b>	0,852	0,003	<b>-2,519</b>	0,859	0,005	<b>-1,148</b>	0,388	0,027
Guardian	-1,564	1,362	0,003	0,853	0,704	0,015	<b>-4,457</b>	1,297	0,001	<b>-3,170</b>	1,261	0,002	<b>-1,602</b>	0,536	0,017
Times	0,311	0,893	0,016	-0,863	1,015	0,003							<b>-2,597</b>	0,708	0,007
WP	0,587	1,157	0,021	0,078	1,360	0,007							-1,176	0,749	0,026
Articlesize	0,000	0,000	0,012	0,000	0,000	0,006	0,000	0,000	0,094	0,000	0,000	0,054	0,000	0,000	0,081
Highrank	-0,576	0,749	0,007	-0,213	0,825	0,005	-0,253	0,570	0,074	0,364	0,669	0,075	0,777	0,489	0,161
Auctionsale	-0,040	0,864	0,011	-0,438	0,940	0,004	0,316	0,619	0,124	-0,148	0,710	0,047	0,492	0,538	0,126
Deceased	-0,139	0,823	0,010	<b>2,893</b>	0,625	0,105	0,954	0,562	0,211	0,751	0,644	0,107	-0,022	0,458	0,079
Male	0,525	0,644	0,020	0,640	0,613	0,012	-0,530	0,434	0,057	-0,319	0,505	0,040	-0,630	0,357	0,045

  

	Recognition from international persons			Recognition, commercial			Unqualified recognition		
	$\beta$	S.E.	$\Pi$	$\beta$	S.E.	$\Pi$	$\beta$	S.E.	$\Pi$
Cons	<b>-2,389</b>	0,612	0,084	<b>-1,993</b>	0,681	0,120	<b>-1,648</b>	0,388	0,161
Globo	<b>-1,253</b>	0,442	0,026	0,181	0,472	0,140	-0,425	0,292	0,112
NYT	<b>-1,579</b>	0,523	0,019	-1,209	0,675	0,039	-0,527	0,322	0,102
Guardian	<b>-3,497</b>	0,845	0,003	-1,432	1,205	0,032	-0,581	0,394	0,097
Times	<b>-3,865</b>	1,207	0,002			0,120	<b>-1,000</b>	0,424	0,066
WP	-1,282	0,937	0,025				0,470	0,508	0,235
Articlesize	0,000	0,000	0,084	0,000	0,000	0,120	0,000	0,000	0,161
Highrank	<b>1,832</b>	0,644	0,364	-0,417	0,719	0,082	-0,128	0,329	0,145
Auctionsale	<b>-1,413</b>	0,620	0,022	-0,835	0,734	0,056	0,179	0,358	0,187
Deceased	<b>1,780</b>	0,417	0,352	-2,190	1,282	0,015	<b>0,938</b>	0,273	0,330
Male	<b>-1,420</b>	0,373	0,022	-0,313	0,533	0,091	0,269	0,230	0,201

the average article published in the Brazilian newspaper *Estado* (which is the reference value when it comes to newspapers), on a low rank, female, living artist without an active auction market, the log odds that her work will be evaluated by associating it with international art movements, are -1,879, which equals a likelihood of 133 percent. If, on the other hand, the article on such an artist is written by a critic of the *New York Times*, the likelihood jumps to 340 percent. In the table, significant results ( $Z > 2$ ) are reported in bold. Table 5 reports the same results, but in a reduced format: it only displays predictors which are significant, and indicates if this predictor increases or decreases the likelihood that a repertoire will be encountered in an article.

Overall, it is striking that many predictors in the models are not significant. On the level of artists, this may be related to the

**Table 5**  
Binomial multilevel regression models for repertoire of evaluation (reduced format).

	Association, Br. movements	Association, deceased Br. artists	Association, Br. living artist	Association, int. movements	Association, int. deceased artist	Association, int. living artist	Association, unqualified
<b>Globo</b>							
<b>New York Times</b>				↑	↑		
<b>Guardian</b>				↑			
<b>Times</b>							
<b>Washington Post</b>							
<b>High artifacts rank</b>							
<b>Auction sales</b>							
<b>Deceased</b>	↑	↑					↑
<b>Male</b>							
	Unqualified recognition	Recognition, Br. institutions	Recognition, Br. persons	Recognition, int. institutions	Recognition, int. persons	Recognition, commercial	Unqualified recognition
<b>Globo</b>		↑			↓		
<b>New York Times</b>		↓	↓	↓	↓		↓
<b>Guardian</b>		↓	↓	↓	↓		↓
<b>Times</b>	↓			↓	↓		↓
<b>Washington Post</b>							
<b>High artifacts rank</b>					↑		
<b>Auction sales</b>					↑		
<b>Deceased</b>	↑				↓		
<b>Male</b>					↓		

relatively low number of cases (43), but this does not apply to the level of newspaper articles. If a critic will associate a Brazilian artist with a living international artist (whether Brazilian or foreign) is particularly unpredictable: for this repertoire, none of the independent variables has a significant effect (see Table 5). By contrast, critics value Brazilian artists by referring to foreign curators, museum directors or other art experts in highly patterned ways. Its frequency of occurrence differs significantly across both living and deceased artists, low and high reputation artists, male and female artists, as well as across newspapers: it is typically used in the Brazilian newspaper *Estado*, for high-ranked, deceased female artists.

Table 5 shows that some predictors have predominantly positive effects (e.g. ‘deceased artist’, which increases the likelihood that an artist will be associated with Brazilian movements, with other Brazilian deceased, but also with international living artists, and will be praised in unqualified ways). This suggests that the deployment of evaluative repertoires is no zero-sum game in which the occurrence of one repertoires in a newspaper article decreases the chances of other repertoires to occur. We also find predictors which have predominantly negative effects. For instance, reviewers writing for the British newspaper *Guardian* are significantly less likely to value Brazilian contemporary art by drawing on any of the recognition repertoires. To a lesser extent, this also holds for the *New York Times*. One interpretation of this result is that critics of these two newspapers possess sufficient symbolic capital of their own in evaluating art, and therefore do not need to invoke the recognition bestowed by other actors or institutions in doing so. Instead, they attribute value to the work of Brazilian artists by either associating it with international art movements and, in the case of the *New York Times*, with deceased artists.

Another important result is that region structures the ways in which artists get reviewed only to a limited extent: Brazilian newspapers do not review artists in consistently different ways than American and British newspapers. One of the few exceptions in this respect are the sub-repertoires of recognition by Brazilian institutions and by Brazilian persons: both repertoires are more frequently used by Brazilian than by American or English critics. This finding fits in a wider, emerging body of research indicating the local character of art worlds (e.g. Velthuis (2013) on local gallery representation, Renneboog & Spaenjers, 2015 on auction sales of local artists). Local recognition does not seem to travel easily: American and English critics and their audiences may not be aware of recognition awarded by a local Brazilian museum or curator. These differences do not point at differences in evaluative practices between Brazilian and international critics per se, but more at a home-bias in the sources of recognition which are used in evaluations (see Author 2 et al., 2015b for similar instances of home bias in the global field of art).

We interpret the relative absence of national patterns in evaluative patterns in the following way: on the one hand, this suggests that evaluative practices have converged to some extent in the global field of contemporary art, along with the infrastructures of e.g. art fairs, private art galleries, and contemporary art museums which have been established in emerging art scenes such as the one of Brazil (cf. Brandellero, 2015), China, or India (Komarova and Velthuis, 2017) and which make these scenes look similar to some degree. Indeed, there seems to be more cross-national convergence of repertoires of evaluation for contemporary art than, for instance, for movies (Kersten, 2014) or popular music (van Venrooij & Schmutz, 2010; see also Janssen et al., 2008).



On the other hand, the evaluative landscape which we have encountered in this study is certainly not all ‘flat’. But the structure that this landscape has been endowed with, does not take nationality as its origin. Instead, we find that the way an artist gets evaluated depends as well on her own characteristics. In particular, deceased artists get consistently evaluated in different ways than living artists. More importantly, the differences *between newspapers of the same country* (e.g. New York Times vs Washington Post, Guardian vs Times, Estado vs. Globo) seem to be as big as differences *between newspapers of different countries*. The New York Times and, to a lesser extent, the Guardian, stand out, not just vis-à-vis Brazilian but also the other American and British newspapers, because it is much more likely than others evaluate an artist through the highbrow repertoire (cf. Kersten, 2014) of familiarity with international artistic movements and deceased international artists, i.e. by localizing Brazilian artists in the Euro-American canon of modern art. By contrast, New York Times reviewers are less likely to refer to recognition bestowed upon the artist by others institutions or persons in the past. Instead, it prefers to cast a judgment of its own. These differences may also be related to differences in the amount of cultural capital possessed by the respective newspapers’ readerships.

In short, evaluative cultures develop around single newspapers and artists as much as around nations. While previous studies of reviews have sometimes only selected the New York Times for American newspaper reviews (see e.g. Jansen et al., 2008; Chong, 2011), our study suggests that it cannot be seen as representative, not even for American elite newspapers. Its reviews expect even more extensive cultural knowledge of its readers, and seem to have been written by critics who are steeped in art history.

## 8. Conclusions

Transnational flows of cultural products challenge the notion of locally-bounded repertoires of evaluation practices (Lamont, 2012). As the geography of prestige shifts to a transnational sphere, status dynamics within artistic fields are allegedly increasingly decoupled from their physical clustering in places (English, 2009). This paper offers an innovative comparative perspective to extant research based on critical reviews, comparing how a relatively peripheral cultural product in the global art world is reviewed at home and in two more central countries.

Our paper explores the process of evaluation in a transnational cultural field by studying the reception of internationally recognized visual artists from one country, Brazil, which is increasingly becoming integrated into the global field of art. At least since the 1950s, the country has to some extent been part of this field, with a biennial and art museums modelled on counterparts in Europe and the United States, and the growing interconnectivity of its art world institutions with their international counterparts, as well as the international experience of Brazilian artists. While the format of the Brazilian newspaper reviews differed from that of their American and British counterparts, insofar as they often combined interviews with the artist or art world luminaries, the repertoires which were mobilised did not differ in consistent ways. Our research analysed how two main repertoires of evaluation of visual art (based on associating an artist’s work with already consecrated fellow artists or art movement; or referring to an artist’s recognition bestowed by institutions or persons) are mobilized in English, American and Brazilian critical reviews of exhibitions by Brazilian artists.

We found only limited national differences in reviews of Brazilian artists. The most striking national differences relate to the type of institutional recognition which critics refer to in order to evaluate an artist’s work; we noted that recognition by Brazilian institutions or associations with Brazilian artists transfers less frequently to an international context. To the contrary, international references to recognition prevail in the UK and US press. On the one hand, this can be interpreted as evidence for the continued relevance of local institutions in artistic career building in times of globalization. On the other hand, as Rawlings’ (2001) study on the emergence of a market for African contemporary art in New York has pointed out, such associations raise the prospect of a potential bias in gatekeepers from more central art worlds. Indeed, in the process of ‘making names’ they might consciously or unconsciously tend to reproduce Western aesthetics in their selections and afford prestige to artists who more easily fit within a Western canon.

Our findings need to be contextualized against the condition of nomadism as a feature of artistic careers (Bydler, 2004). Artists have traditionally been footloose and travelled for work and commissions (Vasari, 1965); similarly, a number of highly recognized Brazilian artists have sojourned or moved abroad, raising questions about the influence this has had on their status and critical reception. Vik Muniz, the highest ranked Brazilian artist according to Artfacts has lived in New York for a large part of his career; he has received acclaim for engaging in a powerful conversation with European and North American modernism in his art, playfully reworking their canon by using unlikely materials<sup>17</sup>.

Another key finding of our paper relates to the extent to which repertoires of evaluation are structured by artists – and not merely by the country of the paper reviewing them – calls us to question the level at which comparative studies of cultural flows can be meaningful. In particular, we find that whether an artist is deceased or not, as well as the artist’s gender, reputation and commercial success, co-determine the repertoires which are applied. In short, our paper can be read as warning against the implicit reliance on methodological nationalism when studying repertoires of evaluation (Kuipers & de Kloet, 2009; Wimmer & Glick Schiller, 2002), and a call for more fine-grained research on the reception of specific artists and products.

The results of our study may not be directly generalizable. Brazil, as previous studies have borne out, cannot be compared to other countries that are emerging in the global arts field, such as India and China (cf. Velthuis & Baia Curioni, 2015). Its rather prominent role in the development of international modernism may explain why the association repertoire is relatively frequently applied. Future cross-comparative research on the reception of visual arts should therefore include other emerging nations. The fact that many of the relations in our multilevel model turned out not to be significant, could mean that we did not have the right predictors on the

<sup>17</sup> <https://www.metmuseum.org/art/collection/search/281947> accessed 26 March 2018.

level of artists. Moreover, we do not have information on properties of the work of art, while it is not farfetched to think that these properties can impact the repertoires of evaluation which a reviewer mobilizes. Also, the small number of newspaper titles in the dataset, makes it impossible to relate differences in repertoires across newspapers to e.g. demographic characteristics of the newspaper's readership or its production budget. To study these, data including larger numbers of newspapers would need to be collected.

Future research could also fruitfully extend the comparative angle further, notably by comparing periphery-to-periphery reception. While we find that the UK and US critics are more likely to relate Brazilian artists to modernist aesthetics, we can wonder whether such dominant Western paradigms would be as pervasive in less central countries.

Finally, in-depth interviews with art critics of the newspapers could add to our understanding of the issues we study. In interviews, critics could explain themselves why, how and in which cases they use some repertoires of evaluation rather than others, and explain the nuance behind their choice of words when it comes to the aesthetic association and familiarity repertoires in particular. Combined with this, symbolic network analysis, which relates the artist under review to specific local and international artists, may contribute to a further understanding of the ways in which artists from emerging regions get integrated into the global field.

## Acknowledgements

The project was financed by a VIDI-grant from the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO). The authors wish to thank Dr Jennifer Lena, four anonymous reviewers and participants of the University of Amsterdam's Culture Club for their valuable feedback and detailed comments.

## Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary material related to this article can be found, in the online version, at doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2018.10.006>.

## References

- ABACT (2015). *Fourth sectoral study. The contemporary art market in Brazil*. Available at: [media.latitudebrasil.org/uploads/publicacoes/issuu/4-latitude-sect.pdf](http://media.latitudebrasil.org/uploads/publicacoes/issuu/4-latitude-sect.pdf).
- Aldrich, H. E., & Fiol, C. M. (1994). Fools rush in? The institutional context of industry creation. *The Academy of Management Review*, 19(4), 645–670.
- Allen, M. P., & Lincoln, A. E. (2004). Critical discourse and the cultural consecration of american films. *Social Forces*, 82(3), 871–894.
- Amaral, A. (1977). *Projeto Construtivo Brasileiro na arte (1950-1962)*. Rio de Janeiro: Museu de Arte Moderna; São Paulo: Pinacoteca do Estado de São Paulo.
- Antal, A. B., Stark, D., & Hutter, M. (2015). *Valorizing dissonance*. Oxford: Oxford University Press 2015.
- Arderly, J. S. (1997). Loser wins: Outsider art and the salvaging of disinterestedness. *Poetics*, 24(5), 329–346.
- Baumann, S. (2001). Intellectualization and art world development: Film in the United States. *American Sociological Review*, 66(3), 404–426.
- Becker, H. S. (1982). *Art worlds*. Oakland, CA: University of California Press.
- Beckert, J., & Rössel, J. (2013). The price of art. *European Societies*, 15(2), 178–195.
- Belting, H. (1987). *The end of the history of art?* Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Belting, H. (2003). *Art history after modernism*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Belting, H. (2009). Contemporary art as global art: A critical estimate. In H. Belting, & A. Buddensieg (Eds.). *The global art world. Audiences, markets, and museums* (pp. 38–73). Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz Verlag.
- Berkers, P. (2009). Ethnic boundaries in national literary histories: Classification of ethnic minority fiction authors in American, Dutch and German anthologies and literary history books, 1978–2006. *Poetics*, 37(5–6), 419–438.
- Bielby, D., Moloney, M., & Ngo, B. Q. (2005). Aesthetics of television criticism: Mapping critics' reviews in an era of industry transformation. In C. Jones, & P. H. Thornton (Eds.). *Transformation in cultural industries (research in the sociology of organizations, volume 23)* (pp. 1–43). Emerald Group Publishing Limited.
- Boltanski, L., & Thévenot, L. (2006). *On justification: Economies of worth*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1980). The production of belief: Contribution to an economy of symbolic goods. *Media Culture & Society*, 2, 261–293.
- Bourdieu, P. (1983). The field of cultural production, or: The economic world reversed. *Poetics*, 12(4–5), 311–356.
- Bonus, H., & Ronte, D. (1997). Credibility and economic value in the visual arts. *Journal of Cultural Economics*, 21(2), 103–118.
- Braden, L. E. A. (2009). From the Armory to academia: careers and reputations of early modern artists in the United States. *Poetics: Journal of Empirical Research on Culture the Media and the Arts*, 37(5–6), 439–455. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.poetic.2009.09.004>.
- Brandellero, A. (2015). The emergence of a market for art in Brazil. In O. Velthuis, & S. Baia Curioni (Eds.). *Cosmopolitan Canvases: the Globalization of Markets for Contemporary Art* (pp. 215–237). Oxford University Press: Oxford.
- Buchholz, L. (2016). What is a global field? Theorizing fields beyond the nation-state. *The Sociological Review Monographs*, 64(2), 31–60.
- Bydler, C. (2004). *The Global World, Inc.: On the globalization of contemporary art*. Uppsala: Acta Universitatis Upsaliensis.
- Cheyne, A., & Binder, A. (2010). Cosmopolitan preferences: The constitutive role of place in American elite taste for hip-hop music 1991–2005. *Poetics*, 38(3), 336–364.
- Chong, P. (2011). Reading difference: How race and ethnicity function as tools of critical appraisal. *Poetics*, 39(1), 64–84.
- Coffey, M. K. (2017). Great Masters of Mexican Folk Art in Los Angeles: Transnational exhibition, diasporic emplacement, and the expedient politics of display. *Cultural Studies*, 32(2), 194–222. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09502386.2017.1298640>.
- Corse, S. M., & Griffin, M. D. (1997). Cultural valorization and African American literary history: Reconstructing the canon. *Sociological Forum*, 12(2), 173–203.
- Crane, D. (1992). High culture versus popular culture: A reconceptualization of recorded cultures. In M. Lamont, & M. Fournier (Eds.). *Cultivating differences. Symbolic boundaries and the making of inequality* (pp. 58–74). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Debenedetti, S. (2006). The role of media critics in the cultural industries. *International Journal of Arts Management*, 8(3), 30–42.
- Dekker, E. (2016). Exemplary goods: Exemplars as judgment devices. *Valuation Studies*, 4(2), 103–124.
- DiMaggio, P. (1987). Classification in art. *American Sociological Review*, 52(4), 440–455.
- Durand, J. C. G. (1989). *Arte, privilégio e distinção: artes plásticas, arquitetura e classe dirigente no Brasil, 1855/1985*. São Paulo: Editora Perspectiva.
- English, J. F. (2009). *The economy of prestige: Prizes, awards, and the circulation of cultural value*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Favell, A. (2014). Creative East-West cosmopolitanism? The changing role of international mobility for young Japanese contemporary artists. In Y. NUHOĞLU SOYSAL (Ed.), *Transnational trajectories in East Asia: Nation, citizenship, and region* (pp. 83–105). Routledge: Abingdon-on-Thames.
- Fetter, B. (2016). *Narrativas conflitantes e convergentes: as feiras nos ecossistemas contemporâneos da arte*. Doctoral thesis. Porto Alegre: Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul. Instituto de artes.
- Greenfeld, L. (1988). Professional ideologies and patterns of “gatekeeping”: Evaluation and judgment within two art worlds. *Social Forces*, 66(4), 903–925.
- Griswold, W. (1987). The fabrication of meaning: Literary interpretation in the United States, Great Britain, and the West Indies. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 92(5), 1077–1117.
- Guo, G., & Zhao, H. (2000). Multilevel modeling for binary data. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 26, 441–462.
- Van Hest, F. (2012). *Territorial factors. A globalized art world? The visibility of countries in international contemporary art events*. PhD Dissertation. Erasmus University Rotterdam.
- Hirsch, P. M. (1972). Processing fads and fashions. An organization-set analysis of cultural industry systems. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 77(4), 639–659.
- Janssen, S. (1997). Reviewing as social practice: Institutional constraints on critics’ attention for contemporary fiction. *Poetics*, 24(5), 275–297.
- Janssen, S., Kuipers, G., & Verboord, M. (2008). Cultural Globalization and arts journalism: The international orientation of arts and culture coverage in Dutch, French, German and U.S. Newspapers 1955 to 2005. *American Sociological Review*, 73(5), 719–740.
- Johnson, C., Dowd, T. J., & Ridgeway, C. L. (2006). Legitimacy as a social process. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 32, 53–78.
- Johnston, J., & Baumann, S. (2007). Democracy versus distinction: A study of omnivorousness in gourmet food writing. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 113(1), 165–204.
- Karpik, L. (2010). *Valuing the unique. The economics of singularities*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Kersten, A. (2014). National cultural repertoires of evaluation in a global age: Film discourse in France, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom, and the United States. *European Sociological Review*, 30(6), 717–727.
- Khaire, M., & Wadhvani, R. D. (2010). Changing landscapes: The construction of meaning and value in a new market category—Modern Indian art. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 53(6), 1281–1304.
- Kharchenkova, S., & Velthuis, O. (2015). Evaluative Biography of Cynical Realism and Political Pop. In Berthoin Ariane Antal, Michael Hutter, & David Stark (Eds.). *Moments of Valuation: Exploring Sites of Dissonance* (pp. 108–130). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Komarova, N., & Velthuis, O. (2017). Local contexts as activation mechanisms of market development: Contemporary art in emerging markets. *Consumption Markets & Culture*, 21(1), 1–21.
- Kuipers, G. (2011). Cultural globalization as the emergence of a transnational cultural field. Transnational television and national media landscapes in four European countries. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 55(5), 541–557.
- Kuipers, G., & de Kloet, J. (2009). Banal cosmopolitanism and the Lord of the Rings: The limited role of national differences in global media consumption. *Poetics*, 37(2), 99–118.
- Lang, G. E., & Lang, K. (1988). Recognition and renown: The survival of artistic reputation. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 94(1), 79–109.
- Lamont, M. (2012). Toward a comparative sociology of valuation and evaluation. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 38(1), 201–221.
- Lamont, M., & Thévenot, L. (2000). Introduction: Toward a renewed, comparative cultural sociology. In M. Lamont, & Thévenot (Eds.). *Rethinking comparative cultural sociology. Repertoires of evaluation in France and the United States*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Mitter, P. (2008). Decentering modernism: Art history and avant-garde from the periphery. *The Art Bulletin*, 90(4), 531–548.
- Morgner, C. (2014). The Biennial: The practice of selection in a global art world. *Empirical Studies of the Arts*, 32(2), 275–282.
- Moulin, R. (1987). *The French art market: A sociological view*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Moulin, R. (1995). The museum and the marketplace. The constitution of value in contemporary art. *International Journal of Political Economy*, 25(2), 33–62.
- Pedrosa, M. (1998). *Acadêmicos e modernos: textos escolhidos III*. São Paulo: Edusp: Organização Otilia Beatriz Fiori Arantes.
- Pénet, P., & Lee, K. (2014). Prize & price: The Turner Prize as a valuation device in the contemporary art market. *Poetics*, 43, 149–171.
- Podolny, J. M. (1993). A status-based model of market competition. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 98(4), 829–872.
- Pollack, B. (2010). *The wild, wild east: An American art critic’s adventures in China*. Blue Kingfisher Limited.
- Quemin, A. (2006). Globalization and mixing in the visual arts: An empirical survey of ‘High culture’ and globalization. *International Sociology*, 21(4), 522–550.
- Quemin, A. (2013). International contemporary art fairs in a ‘globalized’ art market. *European Societies*, 15(2), 162–177.
- Rawlings, C. M. (2001). Making names’: The cutting edge renewal of African art in New York City, 1985–1996. *Poetics*, 29, 25–54.
- Rees van, C. J. (1987). How reviewers reach consensus on the value of literary works. *Poetics*, 16, 275–294.
- Renneboog, L., & Spaenjers, C. (2015). Investment returns and economic fundamentals in international art markets. In O. Velthuis, & S. Baia-Curioni (Eds.). *Cosmopolitan canvases. The globalization of markets for contemporary art* (pp. 129–146). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Shin, D., K. L., & Lee, H. (2014). Neoliberal marketization of art worlds and status multiplexity: Price formation in a Korean art auction, 1998–2007. *Poetics*, 43, 120–148.
- Shrum, W. (1991). Critics and publics: Cultural mediation in highbrow and popular performing arts. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 97(2), 347–375.
- TEFAF (2013). *Art market report. The global art market, with a focus on China and Brazil*. Prepared by Dr. Clare McAndrew, arts economics.
- Ten Eyck, T. A., & Busch, L. (2012). Justifying the art critique: Clement Greenberg, Michael Kimmelman, and orders of worth in art criticism. *Cultural Sociology*, 6, 217–231.
- Vasari, G. (1965). *The lives of artists: A selection*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
- Velthuis, O. (2013). Globalization of markets for contemporary art: Why local ties remain dominant in Amsterdam and Berlin. *European Societies*, 15(2), 290–308.
- Velthuis, O., & Baia Curioni, S. (2015). Making markets global. In O. Velthuis, & S. Baia Curioni (Eds.). *Cosmopolitan canvases. The globalization of markets for contemporary art* (pp. 1–28). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Venrooij, van A., & Schmutz, V. (2010). The evaluation of popular music in the United States, Germany and the Netherlands: A comparison in the use of high art and popular aesthetic criteria. *Cultural Sociology*, 4(3), 395–421.
- Verboord, M., & Brandellero, A. (2018). The globalization of popular music, 1960–2010: A multi-level analysis of music flows. *Communication Research*, 45(4), 603–627.
- Verdaasdonck, H. (2003). Valuation as rational decision-making: A critique of Bourdieu’s analysis of cultural value. *Poetics*, 31(5–6), 357–374.
- Weber, D. (2000). Culture of commerce? Symbolic boundaries in French and American book publishing. In M. Lamont, & L. Thévenot (Eds.). *Rethinking Comparative Cultural Sociology: Repertoires of Evaluation in France and the United States* (pp. 127–147). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Weibel, P. (2013). Global art. Rewritings, transformations, and translations. Thoughts on the project GAM. In H. Belting, & A. Buddensieg (Eds.). *The global art world. Audiences, markets, and museums* (pp. 74–85). Ostfildern: Hatje Cantz Verlag.
- Wimmer, A., & Glick Schiller, N. (2002). Methodological nationalism and beyond: Nation–State building, migration and the social sciences. *Global Networks*, 2(4), 301–334.
- Zuckerman, E. W. (1999). The categorical imperative: Securities analysts and the illegitimacy discount. *The American Journal of Sociology*, 104(5), 1398–1438.

**Amanda Brandellero** is Assistant Professor at the Department of Arts and Culture of the Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication, in Rotterdam, The Netherlands. Her background is in economic geography. Her current research focuses on global cultural flows, and the emergence and globalisation of a market for contemporary art in Brazil. Her PhD research was awarded the Dutch Boekman Award and the European Cultural Policy Research Award for its contribution to academic and policy discussions on migrant cultural entrepreneurship in Europe. Her academic work has been published in *Poetics*, *Communication Research*, *Area and Environment and Planning A*.

**Olav Velthuis** is Professor at the Department of Sociology of the University of Amsterdam, specializing in economic sociology, sociology of the arts and cultural sociology. In a cross-comparative fashion, he has recently studied the emergence and development of art markets in the BRIC-countries (Brazil, Russia, India and China). Velthuis is the author of *Talking Prices. Symbolic Meanings of Prices on the Market for Contemporary Art* (Princeton University Press, 2005), which received the Viviana Zelizer Distinguished Book Award of the American Sociological Association for the best book in economic sociology (2006). Together with Stefano Baia Curioni he edited the book *Cosmopolitan Canvases. The Globalization of Markets for Contemporary Art* (Oxford University Press, 2015). His academic work has appeared in leading journals in social science including *Theory & Society*, *Socio-Economic Review*, *Economy & Society*, *Journal of Consumer Culture*, *Journalism*, and the *Journal of Cultural Economics*.