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Chapter 1
Introduction

1.1 The puzzle of artivism
Throughout (Western) art history, the visual arts have developed into a distinctive and relatively autonomous societal sphere. While in the past centuries the visual arts have often been seen as strongly representational, artists in the nineteenth century moved away from portraying societal elites and important historical events in a more or less realist manner towards exploration and experimentation. Art historians such as Gombrich (1950), for example, elaborate in great detail on how Baroque artworks, supported by the Catholic Church in reaction to the Reformation in Europe, propagated Catholic faith and therefore constituted a powerful tool to speak for those in power. With the emergence of the dealer-critic system (White & White, 1965), however, the more abstract modern and contemporary visual art movements came to define themselves as relatively autonomous (Bürger, 1984). Instead of societal elites, multiple intermediary art institutions and actors, such as art museums, curators, galleries, dealers, critics and others each gained a say in the evaluation of art. Based on artistic and therefore primarily internal rather than external (e.g. economic, political) criteria (Bourdieu, 1993), these actors have an important role in determining what is good
art and this autonomous logic is still visible in contemporary art discourse (Roose, Roose & Daenekindt, 2018).

Recently, however, scholars have pointed to social matters increasingly permeating the sphere of visual arts. Bourriaud (2002) introduced the concept of relational art, to point to the development of artistic practices that produce social situations and derive their value from such practices. Bishop (2012) elaborates on what she refers to as a social turn in the arts and contends that the arts are increasingly evaluated on the basis of social and ethical criteria next to artistic ones. Indicatively, concepts such as artivism, as a portmanteau for art and activism (Danko, 2018), are now commonly used in academic literature to capture socially engaged artistic practices that include modes of political activism. Illustrative examples of art movements and practices that include political activism, next to artivism, are discussed in fairly recent studies that deal with activist art (Felshin, 2006), political art (Yarto, 2017) and protest art (Tunali, 2017). In addition, while art advocates increasingly endeavor to demonstrate the social significance of the arts (McCarthy, Ondaatje, Zakaras & Brooks, 2004), the cultural policies of neoliberal governments are seen to increasingly require an instrumental social role from the arts in order to secure funding (Belfiore & Bennett, 2008). Socially engaged artistic practices therefore take social problems as their canvas (Bishop, 2012) and seek attention beyond the art sphere in order to achieve societal change.

There is no short and easy answer to the question as to how or why modes of social engagement such as artivism have become increasingly visible in the visual arts. Belfiore and Bennett (2008: 183) have argued that the art’s very autonomous position came to be seen as a badge of honor during the second half of the twentieth century, allowing artists to take the moral high ground and critically reflect upon society. Art movements such as conceptual art and performance art during the second half of the twentieth century, for which ideas and pressing social topics take preference over aesthetics (Carter, 2009), are perhaps indicative of some of the first art movements for which social engagement constituted
a key characteristic. Particularly in the humanities, scholars have attributed great political power to art exactly because it positions itself autonomously from the constraints and restraints of other societal fields. Rancière (2009), for example, maintains that, through its autonomy, art creates a space from which its audience is able to reconfigure its understanding of the world. He argues that when art becomes indiscernible from social practices, it “eliminates itself as a separate reality” (Rancière, 2009: 44) and merely reproduces the very values and state of affairs it attempts to change.

If artistic status today is indeed still strongly rooted in autonomous artistic evaluation by cultural intermediaries, then socially engaged artistic practices such as artivism present an interesting puzzle: they appear to follow their own logic, yet seek to achieve societal change. This begs the question how practices such as artivism are evaluated and to what extent they have an impact and enjoy some degree of attention beyond the confines of the relatively autonomous sphere of visual art. The growing body of literature that has come to take shape around social engagement in the visual arts, however, remains incapable of fully explaining these questions for two reasons. First, social engagement in general, and notions such as artivism in particular, often remain problematically broad, ranging from artistic practices that are embedded in – and engage local communities to those that raise and fight against pressing global societal inequalities and human rights issues. Beyond conceptual considerations and anecdotal indications that social engagement is progressively pronounced in the arts, however, it remains unclear under which conditions artistic-activist expressions are accepted. Second, current empirical studies (e.g. Roose et al., 2018) are primarily preoccupied with the role of social engagement within the arts and often overlook how and to what extent social engagement from visual artists travels beyond the confines of the art sphere. In the end, any form of social engagement requires two parties: one engaging and one being engaged. Few scholars systematically and empirically address the
questions as to which types of socially engaged artistic practices achieve acceptance not just in the art sphere but in the broader society.

I aim to address both problems by conducting research into the reception of artivism within and beyond the arts through the following overarching research question:

_How is artivism evaluated within the fields of art, news media and social media in a cross-national context?_

In order to answer this research question, I bring together literature from various disciplines. I draw on art-historical literature to place social engagement in the arts more elaborately and concretely within an art-historical context. Combining this with sociology of culture literature, second, provides insight into how works of art are produced, consumed and distributed. By drawing on Bourdieu (1984, 1993) in particular, I will approach the field of art as a historically developed domain with its own logic and status markers. Furthermore, by drawing on the concept of boundary work, such as the work by Lamont and Fournier (1992), I will address the practices of classifying objects and actors within the art field. This provides theoretical ground on which to study how artistic status is attributed and how distinctions within the arts are made in relation to artivism. Through literature from political sciences, third, I will outline how modes of artistic expression can function as avenues for social and political engagement. In combination with insights from media studies, finally, I will theorize more concretely how news media and social media afford different ways of social and political engagement and how news and social media attention have become important for the question of societal impact with regards to the arts.

Empirically, I conduct four interrelated studies which in the end will be integrated on the level of outcomes. Even though these four studies each have a distinct theoretical approach and research design, which are outlined in more detail in the following chapters, they each have the same theoretical footing. In this chapter, therefore, I will first elaborate on the
theoretical starting position from which to address the central research question. Along the same line, second, I will outline the overarching methodological approach. This is followed by a section on academic and societal relevance and finally an outline of the chapters in this dissertation.

1.2 Theoretical background
Any study into art requires an understanding of what constitutes a work of art, an artist or an art institution. In this dissertation, therefore, I employ multiple approaches and explore findings from several academic disciplines. A considerable part of this is explained in detail in later chapters that represent the empirical studies that have been conducted. It shall start here, however, with an elaboration of the theoretical foundation that runs throughout the entire dissertation. Below, therefore, I will first employ literature in the sociology of culture to develop a framework from which to view the arts as a distinctive sphere with interrelated actors and institutions. I then draw on insights from humanities and art-historical research to address how this sphere developed into a relatively autonomous field with its own distinctive rules and practices. Combining insights from these academic disciplines allows me to contextualize the current prevalence of social engagement in the arts sociologically as well as art-historically and to provide a somewhat chronological overview of how social engagement came to permeate the current-day art field. Thereafter, I employ political science literature and media studies to explore how socially engaged artists achieve some degree of impact in today’s media-saturated society. Artistic expressions that are socially engaged, such as artivism, ultimately presuppose impact beyond their own sphere. By employing insights from these different disciplines, I work towards a theoretical framework that details and explains how political activism by artists travels from the relatively autonomous arts to the domain of news and social media.
Artworks, artists, art museums and galleries constitute a particular social domain aimed at the production, consumption and distribution of cultural objects. Sociologists of culture often link this understanding of the arts as a separate sphere to field theory, which owes a great deal to the work of Pierre Bourdieu. He considers a field to be a separate social domain within society (e.g. the field of politics, of law, of media, of art, etc.) characterized by its own logic and status markers (Bourdieu, 1993). A field, therefore, can be understood as a relatively autonomous sphere with institutions that are specific to it and actors struggling for status according to the set of rules that govern it. Of course, fields do not emerge out of a vacuum. They are shaped by historical and socio-economic conditions. In the field of art, accordingly, such conditions have shaped the way in which works of art are produced, consumed and distributed and in which artists achieve artistic status. The art field, therefore, can be seen to consist of the actors and organizations involved in the production, distribution and reception of artistic expressions (Bourdieu, 1993; DiMaggio, 1979). More concretely, this entails the artist as art producer, an audience of art consumers and institutions through which artworks are distributed and accorded status, such as art museums and galleries with their art curators and other cultural intermediaries.

Among and between these actors in the art field there is a constant struggle for symbolic capital – or, in this case, recognition – as a legitimate artist and hence to be consecrated as an artist whose work will be canonized (Bourdieu, 1993). Similarly, the reputation of intermediary actors, such as curators, depends strongly on the legitimation of artists they endorse. In general, capital entails a variety of resources, primarily in the form of possessions, attributes and personal qualities (DiMaggio, 1979), often conceived of as economic, cultural or social capital, that can be exchanged for goods and services as well as status (Bourdieu, 1984). Symbolic capital, in particular, is a resource of recognition and represents
the symbolic value that an actor can leverage in advantage to others in the field. According to Bourdieu (1993: 40-43), artistic actors endowed with symbolic capital are able to enforce their own norms of artistic production and hence enforce an autonomous hierarchization and definition of art. With such an autonomous principle of hierarchization, artists are affected less by external hierarchies such as, for example, economic profit or market demand. As a result, the field of art is governed primarily by a hierarchy of artistic criteria and is largely insensitive to criteria unrelated to the arts. Recognized artists, in this example, would enjoy status on the basis of the artistic value of their work rather than of the economic value it represents within a market system. Similarly, recognized curators would enjoy status on the basis of the artistic value of the works they endorse.

An important strength of this field theory approach to art is, first, that it stands in stark contrast to the idea that works of art are purely an act of individual creativity, captured by Bourdieu's (1996) notion of charismatic ideology. Instead, art is almost never the product of isolated production (Wolff, 1981). Curators, for example, bring artists in touch with dominant artistic criteria within the art field and can therefore be seen as co-creators (Janssen & Verboord, 2015). Works of art, in this sense, are inherently a social product and many actors within the field of art are linked to – and mediate the production of artworks in some way or another at any given moment in time. Second, this field theory approach refrains from conceptualizing the notion of aesthetics, which relates to the nature of art and the criteria of artistic judgement (Wolff, 1983). Instead, such criteria, and hence aesthetics in general, are perceived similarly to be socially and historically constructed (Bourdieu, 1984; Wolff, 1983) and therefore change over time. Criteria of aesthetic evaluation, for example, at times have overlapped with criteria of political value (Todd, 1981). Indeed, studying how social engagement has become an important criterion of artistic evaluation and how activism is accepted within the arts, is only possible when we consider aesthetics to be socially and historically constructed.
1.2.2 The emergence of an autonomous art field

Some degree of art-historical context is required at this point. Fortunately, great volumes have been written about (Western) art history, even though this makes it a challenging task to reduce centuries of history to a mere few paragraphs detailing how the art field emerged and developed. The following historical overview of the (Western) art field, therefore, certainly jumps in time and therefore inevitably overlooks relevant developments. Its aim, however, is to highlight those moments in time in which two advancements in particular become apparent. First, changes in the art field’s relatively autonomous position will be discussed. As already alluded to, field theory assumes a relational approach, between actors within fields and between fields. According to Bourdieu (1993), fields are never entirely autonomous from each other but are characterized by their relative autonomy. Seen from this sociology of culture perspective, we can point out more concretely how the art field has been related to other societal fields throughout art history. Secondly, and strongly related to this process of (relative) autonomization, the following overview details how dominant artistic criteria gradually transitioned from representational – realistic and figurative reflection of reality (Bolt, 2004: 12) – towards abstract, non-representational depiction. This created more space for the visual arts to incorporate and elaborate certain ideas and concepts and hence to critically reflect on societal developments.

According to Bourdieu (1984), a field is a specialized sphere of action, in this case of artistic production. We can only speak of an art field, let alone its relationship to other societal fields, therefore, once the concept of art and, perhaps more importantly, the figure of the artist and other key actors who are involved in the arts have emerged. Surely, cultural and artistic expressions through painting, sculpture, architecture, music, poetry and other genres date back to the earliest of human civilizations (Gombrich, 1950). Roughly before the fourteenth century, however, the vast majority of cultural objects were produced in anonymity. During the
Middle Ages, the craftsmen who produced cultural objects such as frescoes, murals, sculptures and works of architecture were restricted by the traditional rules of the professional guilds for which they worked. Wolff (1981: 85) argues that in such highly ritualistic forms of artistic production, there is little room for innovation and new, original or even radical content, restricting the effects or transformative power of cultural objects.

The Renaissance period, however, marks an important moment in time in which the production of such cultural objects is explicitly linked to those who produced them and in which those producers gained some degree of autonomy within their own sphere (Bourdieu, 1993: 113). The anonymous craftsmen become well-known artists endowed with exceptional talent – or, in some cases, with exceptionally talented apprentices. Artists such as Michelangelo and Raphael embody some of the first of such artists. The concept of the artist, and hence the concept of art, therefore, is understood here to emerge roughly during the transition from the Middle Ages to the Renaissance, when cultural objects were increasingly seen as expressions of independent personality (Hauser, 1968).

Yet, these first artists stood at least partly in service of societal and political elites. Church patrons commissioned artists to decorate church buildings, just like craftsmen had done for centuries during the Middle Ages within the capacity of a guild. Increasing trade, first primarily between Italian city-states such as Florence and Venice, soon resulted in an aristocratic class of wealthy merchants and, somewhat later, an absolute monarchy (Wolff, 1981). The Protestant Reformation and its iconoclasm, furthermore, ushered in a wave of arguably more secular artistic themes, particularly in Northern Europe in the sixteenth century. Hence, wealthy aristocrats and courts became, next to the Church, important patrons and commissioners of the arts, which served to represent their wealth and power. In response, the Catholic Church organized a Counter-Reformation by commissioning artworks in which religious values and themes were made more understandable for – and
relatable to the general public (Gombrich, 1950). Works of art, therefore, remained subjugated to aristocratic and religious values. Although artists had emerged and risen out of anonymity and freed themselves from the restrictive rules of communal guilds, they remained in service of and hence represented societal and political elites and the demands over content and form they dictated.

The period of Enlightenment brought about radical political changes as systems of government throughout the Western world transitioned from traditional and absolutist monarchies to republics increasingly legitimized by their citizens (De Tocqueville, 1955 [1856]). After the French Revolution, former kings and their courts were removed or saw their wealth and power significantly diminish. The Industrial Revolution, furthermore, radically changed the living and working conditions of many people in Europe, leading to drastic urbanization and the emergence of new social classes (Ashton, 1997). Although the French Royal Academy of Painting and Sculpture, already established in the seventeenth century, strongly promoted patriotic history paintings under Napoleon, the traditional system of patronage declined soon after. Instead of patrons and commissioners, artists now relied increasingly on impersonal markets (Bourdieu, 1993: 114), allowing them to experiment with new techniques, materials, styles and depictions. The paradigm of representation, with its aesthetic focus on beauty, harmony and craftsmanship, is followed by a modern paradigm, in which notions such as originality, individuality and authenticity become prevalent (Taylor, 1992).

Two art movements emerged in reaction to these societal developments and became indicative of the increased freedom from conventions that artists gained. Romantic artists, on the one hand, sought to escape from the oftentimes harsh conditions of everyday reality in Europe for most people, for example by turning to and romanticizing nature (e.g., Caspar David Friedrich). Realist artists, on the other hand, aimed to realistically depict reality without avoiding its harsh conditions (e.g., Francois Millet). The uncertainties brought about by the market,
however, required mediators who could help artists find the right audience (Wolff, 1981). Gradually, the traditional system of patronage was substituted, particularly for the visual arts, by a dealer-critic system (White & White, 1965). Some artists still produced artworks primarily as material commodities and remained dependent on market forces and economic success. Others relied less on external hierarchies and produced artworks for their symbolic and artistic rather than material value (Bourdieu, 1993: 114), giving way to a more autonomous art field that shied away not only from representation of traditional commissioners but now also from market demands.

At this point in time, the visual arts become increasingly autonomous. Artists had freed themselves from the demands of representation and were no longer primarily guided by external interests, such as those of religious and political elites. The focus of the visual arts, therefore, had shifted from representation to reflection: artists ideally should not worry about anything other than art itself. Immanuel Kant (1987 [1790]) had already alluded to this development with his notion of disinterestedness and the arts being purposive without a purpose. Berleant explains this attitude of disinterestedness by referring to “the perception of an object for its own sake without further purposes” (Berleant, 1991: 12) as an aesthetic marker. Autonomous art has its own value and should not be dependent on value unrelated to the arts, such as religious or political value (Wilcox, 1953): art for art’s sake. The modern visual arts, therefore, pursue autonomy and avoid any pollution with other social spheres.

Technological and institutional advances in the nineteenth century further catalyzed a break with existing conventions, perhaps even more radical than the decline of the system of patronage. The discovery and development of photography made the need for realistic depiction in the visual arts redundant and portable easels and paint in tubes allowed artists to work en plein air, out in the open instead of in their artificially illuminated studios (Gombrich, 1950: 388-396). The conservative academic approach to art, primarily focused on technique and a finished product, required what Bourdieu (1993: 244) called ‘learned reading’: the
art consumer was expected to have a certain level of knowledge and understanding of an artistic language, with which the viewer could academically and historically interpret works of art. By painting *en plein air* and leaving behind realism, however, Impressionists such as Manet deviated drastically from the conservative academic approach. Rather than providing representations of reality, they provided impressions of it according to their perceptions (Gombrich, 1950). Many artists followed this approach and soon the Royal Academy in Paris lost control over the flow of new art school recruits and the number of paintings being produced (White & White, 1965). In other countries in Europe, such as Germany (Lenman, 1989), the art market began to show similar signs of overcrowding.

The many Modernist avant-garde movements following Impressionism into the twentieth century illustrate this shift. Some of these movements went so far as to introduce manifestos to outline their distinctive approach to art. They advocated, implicitly or explicitly, artistic exploration of complex notions such as subjectivity (e.g. Post-Impressionism), the mental state of making art (e.g. Surrealism), expression (e.g. Expressionism), dimensionality (e.g. Cubism), and others (Gombrich, 1950). As such, the introduction of new approaches to art increasingly came with ideological and self-reflexive explanations as to why these should be considered art (Danto, 1997). These explanations were provided not only by artists but also by curators, critics and other artistic intermediaries, whose role became progressively pronounced. As a result, galleries and similar organizations replaced the former academic system of artist recruitment (White & White, 1965).

Much less idealistic than Kant, Bourdieu therefore defines artistic autonomy by taking into account how works of art are produced. He contrasts the fields of restricted and of large-scale cultural production in his analysis of the French literary field (Bourdieu, 1993). The former pertains to autonomous cultural production as it is aimed at a narrow audience primarily consisting of other cultural producers. The latter, in contrast, pertains to heteronomous cultural production as it is aimed at
larger audiences to accumulate economic capital. Here, artistic autonomy concerns art that seeks its own market and recognition among key actors within the field of art. When artists no longer have to represent societal elites and enjoy a high level of freedom of expression (that is, primarily freedom from conventions), we can argue that the visual arts in the nineteenth and twentieth century have become increasingly autonomous. The field of art became relatively independent from external values and was highly characterized by its own institutions, abstract rather than representational depiction and the preference of form over function or purpose (Bourdieu, 1993). Sociologically, of course, there is much more to be said at this point: who decides the artistic criteria upon which an artist enjoys artistic status and how is art distinguished from non-art? This is the main topic of discussion in the next section.

1.2.3 But what is art

Ultimately, after several avant-garde manifestos it appeared that no single Modernist approach to art (or any other approach for that matter) ultimately holds up to critical reflection without being normative. Baudrillard (1993: 14) argues accordingly that there ‘are no more fundamental rules, no more criteria of judgement or of pleasure’ with which one can judge or value artworks. Art critics such as Danto (1997), similarly, would argue that there are no longer any ideological narratives from which art movements emerge and hence no constraints to what art could be – anything goes. The result of this development was not that after Modernism art was no longer made or that good art was no longer distinguishable from bad art. There still were and still are, evidently, numerous artists, art schools, galleries and art museums. But then, what is art? Or rather, when is something considered art and how is artistic status achieved?

We have already seen how Bourdieu’s (1993) field theory approach allows us to view the arts as a relatively autonomous field in which artistic production is never the product of an isolated individual. Instead, actors within the art field struggle over the symbolic capital to enforce
artistic hierarchies and norms of artistic production. As cultural producers, artists rely on gatekeeping actors within the art field who select and evaluate artists and their works of art (Janssen & Verboord, 2015). In more general terms, these cultural intermediaries – or sometimes referred to as cultural mediators – stand in-between the producer and the consumer of cultural goods. They are curators, critics, gallery- and museum directors and others who distinguish between artworks and artists that are considered good (i.e. original, authentic, legitimate, pioneering or insert any other evaluative term) and those that aren’t. Hence, they are perceived to be the experts who are aware of the cultural codes through which artists and artworks achieve artistic value (Bourdieu, 1993) and therefore are in the position to attribute artistic value to cultural goods and producers (Bourdieu, 1984; DiMaggio, 1987). In this role, they provide artists with (their expectations of) artistic standards and conventions and pick out artists and artworks they consider to be worthy of promotion and endorsement through practices of selecting, supporting and evaluating (Janssen & Verboord, 2015).

Within the sociology of culture, the literature on boundary work provides insight into how objects, people and practices are classified (Lamont & Fournier, 1992) and hence also how artworks are differentiated. At the core of their practices, cultural intermediaries draw boundaries to distinguish between good and bad art. These boundaries are of a symbolic nature as they are primarily conceptual and intersubjective distinctions by cultural intermediaries to categorize artistic products, producers and practices (Lamont & Molnár, 2002: 168). The practice of boundary drawing is visible in the cultural intermediary’s main gatekeeping practices as professionals. By organizing art events, such as exhibitions, curators in the arts select artworks and artists to be put on display (Balzer, 2014; O’Neill, 2007). Art dealers, in turn, seek artistic talent that corresponds to the aesthetic preferences of collectors and buyers (Velthuis, 2005). In the sphere of art journalism, reviewers and critics attribute artistic qualities to works of art. Since they lack an objective procedure on which to base their evaluations (Van Rees, 1989),
they are often seen to develop legitimating ideologies that substantiate their claims that certain artists and works of art have artistic value and others do not (Bourdieu, 1984). Throughout these practices, therefore, cultural intermediaries constantly draw symbolic boundaries through which artistic value is attributed to some and denied to others.

In practice, this is visible in the way the field of visual art developed towards an increasingly autonomous field. Bourdieu (1993) distinguishes between those who derive their status from field-specific criteria (i.e. an autonomous hierarchy) and those who are responsive to criteria external to the arts such as commercial success and market demand (i.e. a heteronomous hierarchy). The differentiation between highbrow and lowbrow or fine and popular art throughout the nineteenth and twentieth century follows this distinction. Both highbrow and lowbrow art cannot be defined by qualities or characteristics that are inherent to them (DiMaggio, 1992a). Instead, they are differentiated on the basis of externally attributed criteria in line with the boundary work by cultural intermediaries. DiMaggio (1992b) showed how in the US the fine arts came to be defined as separated from and in opposition to popular, commercial culture or that which the populace consumed. Levine (1990) highlighted how this development went hand in hand with the use of an increasingly sacralized language to oppose the sacred highbrow from the profane lowbrow. The fine or highbrow arts, hence, came to be seen as affording an aesthetic experience that requires an understanding of their complexity and depth (Alexander & Bowler, 2014). In practice, these characteristics are primarily attributed.

Because of these externally attributed criteria, cultural intermediaries have a strong say in what type of art is accepted and what is not. Artistic status, therefore, is never fixed. Some cultural genres within the art field can be elevated from lowbrow to highbrow. Baumann (2007a) details how the reception of Hollywood films shifted from mere entertainment to legitimate art through an intellectual discourse in film reviews. In music, similarly, Lopes (2002) demonstrates how the meaning of jazz as a musical genre is transformed over time into high art. Within the visual
arts, more central to this dissertation, Impressionist art was initially met with great resistance, while its acceptance was in part dependent on sympathetic art critics (White & White, 1965). Similarly, the more contemporary genre of street art originates from the cultural practice of graffiti and achieved acknowledgement as an art form when art galleries and art dealers in urban areas became interested (Wells, 2016).

1.2.4 Towards social engagement in the contemporary art field.
An autonomous rather than heteronomous hierarchy in the art field (Bourdieu, 1993), however, isolates the arts from other societal fields. In an art field that is relatively autonomous, a democratic majority or majority of consumers have little say in deciding what is good or bad art. By the same logic, why would anyone outside of the art field listen to artists or other artistic actors with regards to matters of a non-artistic nature? Indeed, save from artists who produced politically conscious artworks (Roussel, 2007) and after the postmodern advances of feminist art and more culturally diverse or post-colonial art (Carter, 2009), few well-recognized artists, at least within Western art-history, become public or political spokespersons and receive attention beyond that of peers and intermediaries within art fields.

Yet, it can be argued that modes of social engagement have become increasingly visible in the more contemporary visual arts. Heinich (2014) points to extra-aesthetic elements becoming increasingly pervasive in contemporary art along with the blurred boundaries between art and everyday life. Indicatively, art movements such as conceptual and performance art emerged in the second half of the twentieth century, for which ideas and pressing social topics take preference over aesthetics (Carter, 2009). More recently, scholars have pointed to a variety of artistic practices that incorporate social engagement in more explicit ways. Felshin (2006) referred to activist art to denote process-oriented rather than object-oriented artistic practices in the shape of interventions in public sites rather than in an art world context of galleries and museums. Other scholars draw on the concept of artivism, as a
portmanteau of art and activism, to further build on the concept of activist art and to emphasize both the artistic and political dimension to activist art practices (Danko, 2018). Bishop (2012) refers to participatory art as art in the form of collaborative practices rather than commodities. Such socially engaged art forms employ the symbolic capital of the arts to achieve social change, but as such originate and are disseminated primarily within the art field.

More empirically, renowned arts events, such as Documenta (e.g. Documenta 14 in 2017) and the Venice Biennale (e.g. the Venice Biennale in 2019), eagerly center around a variety of social and political issues (Kompatsiaris, 2014). Artistic practices, furthermore, have been used effectively in visualizing climate change and sustainability issues (Cozen, 2013). They are furthermore often adopted to promote engagement with human rights issues (McPherson & Mazza, 2014). Through artistic practices, people are found to actively challenge issues in relation to gender inequality (Rhoades, 2012). With regards to solving migration issues, artistic practices have been found effective in achieving urban transformation (Mekdjian, 2018). These studies, in other words, indicate more concretely that artistic practices afford engagement with – and are helpful in – solving urgent societal issues.

In the field of cultural policy, similarly, many contemporary Western democracies have increasingly emphasized the instrumental role of arts and culture in tackling pressing societal issues (Belfiore & Bennett, 2008). From a neoliberal point of view, in which the minimalization of state intervention and preservation of free markets are strongly promoted (Harvey, 2005), spending public money on the arts is not easily justified when the arts remain primarily valuable in and of themselves. Instead, by instrumentalizing artistic practices in favor of social ends such as their contribution to society, politicians have been able to legitimate public spending on the arts (Bishop, 2012). Indeed, apart from their increasing focus on creative industries and economic value (Throsby, 2010), instrumentalist notions commonly appear in cultural policies in recent
decades (Belfiore & Bennett, 2008), such as social cohesion (Delhaye, 2018) or urban regeneration (Belfiore, 2012).

Bishop (2012) refers to this development as a social turn in the arts, in which artistic practices are increasingly evaluated and legitimized through ethical and social rather than artistic criteria. Indeed, the surge of various forms of socially engaged art as well as the policy changes that perhaps catalyzed them, imply at least some level of institutionalization of social engagement in the contemporary arts field. Tunali (2017), focusing on the artists and their artworks, however, contends that socially engaged artworks compromise aesthetic value for the sake of social change and only gain artistic status that is removed from its political intent. Mullin (2009) similarly, maintains that some art critics either concede that art should not be produced for political change or they largely ignore the artistic value of political artworks by mainly focusing on their political or activist intent. In the humanities, furthermore, scholars have critically reflected on the political potential of the arts through discussions of notions such as political art (Yarto, 2017) and politics of aesthetics (Rancière, 2004). While the former pertains to artistic practices that highlight societal issues of inequality and social exclusion, such as artistic expressions used during protests (Tunali, 2017), the latter avoids instrumentalization of art and points to how the arts in their very distance from society are able to change our understanding of society.

Socially engaged artistic expressions, therefore, beg the question how social criteria have become relevant in evaluating contemporary art. But then, what do I mean exactly with social engagement? Understood broadly, social engagement encompasses involvement and participation in a wide variety of social activities and associations, indicators of what Putnam (2000) would refer to as social capital. Within an art context, such practices relate closely to Bourriaud’s (2002) concept of relational art, which includes artistic practices that derive their meaning from the collective and interactive encounters with and between art consumers. In this dissertation, however, I am interested primarily in those artistic
practices that are somehow intended to achieve change within society rather than those that merely take place within an art field context. Here, therefore, social engagement is understood more narrowly to include politically oriented modes of engagement that are geared towards bringing attention to societal issues (Tunali, 2017) and hence engaging in public debates.

The specific type of social engagement central in this dissertation, therefore, is artivism, as it includes political activism if we understand this to be the practice of dissent to bring excluded views and voices into public debates (Dahlberg, 2007). Artivists, in other words, seek societal change by bringing attention to societal issues through their artistic practices (Danko, 2018). Hence the artivist constitutes somewhat of a hybrid: an artist engaged in political activism. Although oftentimes primarily an artist, as an activist artist the artivist stands with one leg in the political field (Felshin, 2006). In this dissertation, therefore, the concept of artivism functions as a hypernym to encompass similar more concrete modes of politically oriented social engagement within the arts, such as activist art (Felshin, 2006), participatory art (Bishop, 2012), political art (Yarto, 2017) and others.

1.2.5 The question of societal impact

This approach to social engagement in general and artivism in particular takes as its point of departure the intention of the artist as the producer of a mode of expression that is both a form of art and political activism. Whether artivists are heard for their political activism, however, does not simply follow from their activist intentions. After all, anyone can refer to themselves as a political activist, but only some are listened to. We know, at this point, how artistic status is attributed, but to what extent is political activism that originates in the art field heard and accepted within society? The societal impact of artivism, then, is understood here not in terms of concrete societal changes. These remain difficult to measure and the causality between the aim to achieve change and realized change remains problematic (Tunali, 2017). Instead, I approach the societal
impact of artivism along the lines of attention in order to study the extent
in which the political activism of artivism is accepted.

Similar to the attribution of artistic status through cultural
intermediaries, the mechanism through which the political activism of
artivists is acknowledged involves some level of external acceptance
rather than internal conviction. Political science literature outlines how
acceptance to engage in politics revolves closely around the concept of
political legitimacy. Legitimacy in general is often understood in terms of
how the unaccepted becomes accepted and is to be achieved through
some degree of consensus among a constituency (Zeldtich, 2001). In
politics, then, political legitimacy pertains to acceptance of political
institutions and actors. Although electoral systems to create governmental
representation are of course essential in legally legitimizing governments,
Rothstein (2009) considers political legitimacy within the governmental
sphere to be dependent more on people’s perception of how governments
perform (output side) than on the process through which a government is
formed (input side). Hence, political legitimacy is not necessarily derived
from democratic votes, but rather from the extent to which people
perceive of governmental institutions and actors as deserving of support
(Gurr, 1971: 185).

The same can be argued for political legitimacy in the sphere of
political activism. It is important to note that the field of politics
encompasses practices and processes that affect or influence government
actions or public policy and therefore include participating in
governmental politics as well as acts of political protest and activism
(Ekman & Amnå, 2012). Activists help bridge the disconnections
between the broader public and the policy makers in government (Cottle,
2008). In order to exert influence over governmental processes, therefore,
they too require acceptance from – and representation among –
constituencies. This is visible, for example, when looking at how popular
culture celebrities who are engaged in activism struggle to claim the
representation of others in order to attain political legitimacy (Watts,
2019). In other words, political legitimacy is sought after by political
parties and politicians within the sphere of governmental politics and by activists, protesters and social movements within the sphere of political activism. It is therefore a helpful concept to understand how activism comes to be accepted. The question remains by whom they are accepted.

The journalism or media field is particularly important here as political science and cultural sociology literature on political legitimacy increasingly emphasize the role of media. Bourdieu (2005: 41) has argued that the field of journalism exerts an increasingly powerful hold over the political field (and the field of cultural production) due to its symbolic production: media have the power to determine who and what is considered important in society and therefore have crucial influence on public opinion (Champagne, 2005). Indeed, while in the past achieving and maintaining acceptance in the sphere of governmental politics often took place largely within the terrain of political elites and intellectuals, today legitimation in politics is strongly oriented towards media (Simons, 2003). Politicians increasingly rely on access to mass news media and news media audiences (Loader, Vromen & Xenos, 2016; Kriesi, Lavenex, Esser, Matthes, Bühlmann & Bochsler 2013), while social movements (Gamson & Wolfsfeld, 1993), political activists (Cottle, 2008) and popular culture celebrity activists (Watts, 2019) rely on news media coverage to mobilize wider support. As a result, media have come to play an important role in both the sphere of governmental politics (Buchanan, 2002) and the sphere of political activism (Cottle, 2008) to the extent that acceptance of and attention to political activism is increasingly dependent on how it is presented within the realm of media.

If we understand societal impact of artivism along the lines of acceptance beyond the confines of the art field within the broader society, we can empirically study how and to what extent this acceptance is attributed by analyzing media and media audience attention to artivism. I focus on two types of media specifically. News media, first, constitute a principal platform through which information about society is communicated and consumed, to the extent that they determine what is considered societally relevant (Esser & Strömbäck, 2014). Newspapers,
for example, have been seen for a long time to take an intermediary role in the field of politics (Cook, 1998). The way in which newspapers frame events that relate to politics and activism plays an important role in how these are represented in public debates. Furthermore, newspapers have been found to influence the representation of election campaigns (Miller, Peake & Boulton, 2010) and political scandals (Puglisi & Snyder, 2011), political protests (Oliver & Maney, 2000) and pressing societal debates such as climate change (Schmidt, Ivanova & Schäfer, 2013). As such, news media do not simply communicate news, they produce news through the decisions that editors and journalists make over content and framing. As such, they play a key role in attributing societal impact.

Social media, second and similarly, have come to play an important role in politics more recently. Platforms such as Twitter afford everyday political discussions among media audiences, often strongly in relation to news media content (Wilkinson & Thelwall, 2012). They maintain an infrastructure that allows their users to openly exchange ideas and views that are relevant to politics in an everyday fashion (Vromen, Xenos & Loader, 2015). Such everyday communicative processes through which the broader public discuss topics pertaining to politics can be considered a form of latent political participation (Ekman & Amnå, 2012). Indicatively, social media platforms today are actively used during election campaigns (Larsson & Moe, 2011) to the extent that politicians consider social media platforms to be important campaigning tools (Enli & Skogerbø, 2013). Beyond the sphere of governmental politics, social media are commonly used for digital protests through hashtag activism (Bonilla & Rosa, 2015), which in turn gets picked up by news media. Through social media audiences, in other words, political activism gains momentum and recognition, to the extent that these too play a key role in attributing impact.

Just like one achieves artistic status through acceptance among cultural intermediaries, we can understand societal impact to be achieved through acceptance among news media and media audiences. As artists with one foot in political activism, artivists therefore travel through
several spheres, which is visualized more schematically in Figure 1.1. As societal fields are never fully autonomous, they display overlap. Artivists originate from the field of art, engage in political activism as a mode of social engagement and require attention within the media field through news media and social media attention in order to be heard in the broader society. The question then is how the different criteria with which artivists are evaluated within these layers in terms of their artistic status and societal impact overlap and strengthen or contrast each other. In this way, we understand more broadly how artivism is received within society and how the arts can function as an arena for social engagement.

Figure 1.1: Schematic model depicting how artivism relates to several domains.

1.3 Data and methods
Similar to the overarching theoretical framework that has been outlined above, the research in this dissertation is grounded in an overarching methodological framework. I conduct four empirical studies to address the reception of artivism. Throughout each of these interrelated studies, I
focus, in varying degrees, on the reception of six artivist cases in three countries. Before outlining the concrete methodologies behind the empirical studies, therefore, I will first elaborate on the national contexts and artivist cases central in this dissertation.

1.3.1 Artivist cases

Even though we live in an increasingly globalized world, which is particularly true for the field of arts and culture (Quemin, 2006), the art-historical sociological grounding of my theoretical framework is inherently Western. The concept of art and the development of the art field strongly originate from – and relate to Western Europe and North America. Similarly, the role of news media and social media in politics, as outlined earlier, is particularly applicable to contemporary democratic societies. It is important to emphasize this, as the relative autonomy of the art fields in Western societies is not given for artists operating in non-Western societies. Furthermore, Western media audiences have been found to be particularly interested in the cosmopolitan, repressed other (Chouliaraki, 2013).

I have selected, therefore, three Western artivist cases from the three respective countries central in this dissertation and three non-Western artivist cases from non-democratic societies. Even though artistic autonomy is difficult to measure, I have consulted the annual Freedom of the World Report (Freedom House, 2016) to indicate the limited levels of political rights and civil liberties, as a proxy for artistic freedom, that non-Western artivists face in contrast to Western artivists. Furthermore, each case has raised particular societal issues throughout their artistic careers and each has received attention within and beyond the art field sufficient enough to collect data. Finally, to emphasize their political activism, each selected artivist has been met with some degree of (legal) controversy. The six selected cases are provided in Table 1.1 and further introduced below.
Banksy, first, is a street artist from the UK who remains anonymous to this day. Presumably originating from Bristol and an exceptionally influential artist in the street art movement, the artist is well-known for using graffiti to provide social commentary on current global human rights issues (Brassett, 2009). For example, the artist has produced art to highlight the Syrian refugee crisis (Ellis-Petersen, 2015), the Palestine conflict (Fisher, 2017) and climate change (Siddique, 2009). Banksy remains controversial, however, as many authorities consider the artist’s works to be vandalism, despite some of those works selling for huge sums of money at auction houses (Dalley, 2018).

Hans Haacke, second, is an established German artist living and working most of his life as a professional artist in New York. His polemic work often revolves around the relationship between museums and their corporate sponsors and the social, economic and political aspects to this relationship. He draws on Bourdieu (Bourdieu and Haacke, 1995) to bring to light how these parties exchange capital while his artworks and art installations target how corporations influence the arts. Occasionally, his focus on the role of art institutions in socio-economic injustice led him to address politicians as well (Farago, 2019), such as former New York governor Nelson Rockefeller and current US president Donald Trump.

Table 1.1: Artivist cases in context.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Artivist</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Freedom score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banksy</td>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hans Haacke</td>
<td>United States</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jonas Staal</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ai Weiwei</td>
<td>China</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jafar Panahi</td>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pussy Riot</td>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Banksy, first, is a street artist from the UK who remains anonymous to this day. Presumably originating from Bristol and an exceptionally influential artist in the street art movement, the artist is well-known for using graffiti to provide social commentary on current global human rights issues (Brassett, 2009). For example, the artist has produced art to highlight the Syrian refugee crisis (Ellis-Petersen, 2015), the Palestine conflict (Fisher, 2017) and climate change (Siddique, 2009). Banksy remains controversial, however, as many authorities consider the artist’s works to be vandalism, despite some of those works selling for huge sums of money at auction houses (Dalley, 2018).

Hans Haacke, second, is an established German artist living and working most of his life as a professional artist in New York. His polemic work often revolves around the relationship between museums and their corporate sponsors and the social, economic and political aspects to this relationship. He draws on Bourdieu (Bourdieu and Haacke, 1995) to bring to light how these parties exchange capital while his artworks and art installations target how corporations influence the arts. Occasionally, his focus on the role of art institutions in socio-economic injustice led him to address politicians as well (Farago, 2019), such as former New York governor Nelson Rockefeller and current US president Donald Trump.
Jonas Staal, third, is a Dutch visual artist whose work focuses on the role of art in political processes, particularly in relation to democracy and propaganda. In 2005, for example, he produced a series of works in which the death of (still living) Dutch right-wing politician Geert Wilders was mourned (Kranenberg, 2007). As these works were perceived as death threats, Jonas Staal was arrested and brought to trial, only to be acquitted later. His political intentions, furthermore, are visible in his ongoing New World Summit project, in which he brings together political actors and communities excluded from democratic participation (Van Heuven, 2013).

Ai Weiwei, fourth, is a Chinese artist who experiments with different art forms and who actively uses social media to present himself. His artworks often explicitly address human rights issues and are widely acknowledged by renowned arts institutions (Hancox, 2014). For example, he has criticized the Chinese government with his Sunflower Seeds installation at the Tate Museum in London in 2010 (Cumming, 2010) and brought attention to the Syrian refugee crisis through installations with discarded life jackets worn by refugees (Berdan, 2020). Furthermore, he was detained in 2010 by Chinese authorities and what followed was a long dispute over alleged tax evasion (Judkis, 2011).

Jafar Panahi, fifth, is an Iranian film director whose films have been banned in Iran due to their critical depiction of life and women’s rights in Iran (Donadio, 2015). He was arrested and sentenced to jail in 2010, and subsequently banned from producing movies. This has sparked attention from various famous artists within the world of cinema, who pleaded for his release (Brooks, 2012). While under house arrest later, he still directed films, some of which were smuggled out of the country to film festivals in Europe where they received several prizes (Brody, 2015).

Pussy Riot, finally is a Russian punk activist group, known for hit-and-run art performances in which they protested against the Russian government and institutions of power. In 2012, some members faced legal prosecution after they staged a performance in a Moscow church (Smyth & Soboleva, 2013) and spent two years in jail. Ever since, the
group has made various appearances on TV, in concerts and in exhibitions throughout the world. They made the cover of Time magazine in their characteristic and colorful ski masks in a series of 100 Women of the Year (Time, 2020).

1.3.2 Four studies, four methods

In this dissertation, I conduct four empirical studies to trace the evaluation of artivism within different domains (see Figure 1.2). These studies are interrelated in the sense that they each cover a distinct context in which artivism is evaluated, together covering the reception of artivism more generally. To provide such a comprehensive understanding, however, requires a combination of research methods that take into account both the qualitative and quantitative dimensions to the reception of artivism within the art field, among news media and among social media audiences. Below, therefore, I briefly elaborate on the methodological underpinnings of the interrelated empirical studies in this dissertation.

The surge of – and attention to social engagement in the arts as well as the policy changes that perhaps catalyzed it, imply at least some level of institutionalization of social engagement in the contemporary arts field. In the first study (Chapter 2), therefore, I analyzed the evaluation of social engagement in general and artivism in particular within the art field. More concretely, I conducted fifteen in-depth qualitative interviews with curators in the Netherlands, UK and US. The interviews are semi-structured and analyzed through a grounded theory approach to tap into the gatekeeping and evaluative practices and decisions of curators. As most practices of cultural intermediaries are perceived to be based on particular motives and explanations (Baumann, 2007b; Janssen & Verboord, 2015), grounded theory helps to shed light on curators’ professional views on – and experiences with different forms and modes of social engagement within the arts. If indeed social engagement has come to permeate the art field, it can be expected that curators include
matters of a social rather than strictly artistic nature in their evaluation of socially engaged art.

Figure 1.2: Schematic model depicting the three interrelated studies.

In the second study (Chapter 3), I looked at the newspaper coverage of artivists in terms of both content and magnitude. On the one hand, newspaper coverage plays an important role within the arts as art journalists and art critics, like curators, function as cultural intermediaries who select, evaluate and hence shape the perception of art (Janssen, Kuipers & Verboord, 2008). On the other hand, newspaper coverage plays an important role in politics as newspapers constitute a principal platform through which information about society is communicated and consumed (Esser & Strömbäck, 2014). As such, newspapers play a key role in the legitimation of art and in shaping public opinion (Purhonen, Heikkilä & Hazir, 2017), both of which are relevant for research into social engagement in the arts. Newspaper coverage therefore constitutes a good measure of societal relevance in the broader society. More concretely, in this study I conducted a computerized content analysis of over 2,000 newspaper articles from both quality and popular newspapers
from the Netherlands, the UK and the US. The analysis focuses specifically on the newspaper sections in which newspaper coverage on artivists is published and the context in which they are presented content-wise. The computerized content analysis therefore borders between a qualitative and quantitative approach and sheds light on how both the art and activism of artivism are received within and beyond the art field.

Beyond the confines of the art field, in the third study (Chapter 4), I analyzed the reception of artivists among the broader public. For the last few years, social media platforms have come to constitute empirical windows to study audience reception on a relatively large scale. These platforms constitute communicative spaces that afford ordinary people in society to engage in politics through everyday political talk (Vromen, Xenos & Loader, 2015). The content on social media platforms, therefore, provides insight into how people talk about social issues, such as politics and activism. This is particularly true for Twitter, which people in mainstream society have come to use for sharing their views and opinions (Hogan, 2010). Furthermore, even though connective social media platforms such as Twitter are highly characterized by their users reproducing and repurposing meaning (Mortensen, 2017), the Twittersphere constitutes a communicative space where a fairly large proportion of ordinary people in society openly exchange ideas that are relevant to politics in an everyday fashion (Larsson & Moe, 2011). In this study, therefore, I collected over two million tweets in order to analyze the media audience reception of the artivist cases on a relatively large scale. I employed the method of topic modelling to uncover the most dominant meaningful latent themes (DiMaggio, Nag & Blei, 2013) within this large dataset of short texts. Furthermore, I combined this topic modelling analysis with semantic network analysis to help visualize and interpret the results. While topic modelling bridges the quantitative and the qualitative – preserving hermeneutic meaning, the interpretation of the results remains challenging. By combining topic modelling with semantic network analysis, I aim to “provide a systematic method of
focusing qualitative microscopes within the increasingly overwhelming world of big data” (Bail, 2014: 474).

Finally, in the fourth study of this dissertation (Chapter 5), I further zoom in on a subset of the Twitter data that was collected in the previous, third study. Many of the tweets that were collected (but omitted) as part of the third study originate from popular culture celebrities. This is not surprising as social engagement has found its way to popular culture as well and as some of the artist cases in this dissertation receive elaborate news and social media attention. Indeed, popular culture celebrities easily pick up those issues that guarantee further media attention to the extent that celebrity advocacy has come to play an important role in politics (Thrall et al., 2008). It is interesting, therefore, to further investigate the extent in which popular culture celebrities engaged with the artist cases that are central to this dissertation, including their causes. The fourth study, therefore, consists of a computerized content analysis of close to a thousand tweets by over three hundred popular culture celebrities. Similar to the second study, I conducted a computerized content analysis to analyze how celebrities talk about artist cases, while differentiating between different types and degrees of celebrity.

1.4 Academic and societal contribution

With this dissertation, I provide several contributions, both academically and societally. As I already alluded to above, first, research into the increasing prevalence of social engagement in the arts remains largely anecdotal, primarily conceptual and oftentimes monodisciplinary. Systematic and comparative studies into the reception of artist cases, then, remain rare, even though this is a prerequisite for understanding how social engagement has come to permeate the art field. Many scholars engage in conceptual discussions to explain how art and social engagement are combined, whether the latter pertains to community work or activism, and illustrate their arguments on the basis of anecdotal examples. Although this is valuable in and of itself, most work overlooks
how those who produce works of art become accepted artists and how those who engage in political activism become accepted political actors. In this dissertation, therefore, I take a more interdisciplinary approach in order to provide a more comprehensive and systematic analysis of the extent to which social engagement in general and artivism in particular travel from the art sphere to the broader society. Theoretically, therefore, I draw on literature from the humanities, sociology of culture, political science and media studies. In this way, I attempt to provide a model that takes into account the art field and the political field, as well as the role of media. This model thereby explains how an artist who engages in political activism becomes an artivist through the attribution of artistic status and societal impact rather than through merely their artivism itself.

Empirically, third, this dissertation provides important contributions to the study of arts and culture, particularly in the field of sociology of culture. As Roose, Roose and Daenekindt (2018) noted, more attention is needed for the everyday cultural practices of meaning-making by artistic actors. By interviewing curators and analyzing newspaper coverage of artivism, meaning-making processes in the arts are central in this dissertation. In addition, cultural sociology research into newspaper coverage of the arts often focuses primarily on quality newspapers (e.g. Berkers, Verboord & Weij, 2014; Janssen, Kuipers & Verboord, 2008; Purhonen, Heikkilä & Hazir, 2017). In this dissertation, however, I contrast quality newspapers to popular newspapers. Even though the former are still often understood to play an important role in shaping public opinion (Champagne, 2005), the latter often enjoy a much higher circulation and therefore reach much more people in society.

Methodologically, fourth, this dissertation employs computational methods to further develop the formal study of culture “to capture, analyze, and understand cultural patterns” (Edelman & Mohr, 2018: 1). With the emergence of the digital humanities, it became evident that innovative computational methods have much to offer. Yet, these methods have only recently found their way into the sociology of culture, which remains “theory-rich and methods poor” (DiMaggio, Nag & Blei,
2013: 571). They offer new ways to analyze data that is commonly collected by sociologists, such as how symbolic boundaries can be studied through automated text-classification methods (Bail, 2014) or, more empirically, the analysis of literary fiction into the relationship between author gender and literary themes (Jockers & Mimno, 2013). In this light, this dissertation aims to contribute to demonstrating the value of computational methods in the study of arts and culture by showing how these can be employed on what kind of data and, epistemologically, by demonstrating the type of knowledge that they can tap into.

In relation to this, fifth, I aim to contribute to bridging the traditional divide between qualitative and quantitative approaches within sociology of culture, through my choice of both methods and data. I combine both qualitative and quantitative methods and employ computational methods that go beyond the mere surface level analysis of traditional quantitative methods. Topic modelling, for example, allows for the analysis of the relationality of meaning by analyzing latent themes within large bodies of textual data (DiMaggio, Nag & Blei, 2013). The collected textual data, furthermore, except from the interview data, constitute a population rather than a sample: all tweets and newspaper articles in which the artivist cases are mentioned were collected. In such datasets, the researcher can easily navigate, in a meaningful way, back and forth between the individual and the collective – the individual data points and their aggregate (Latour, 2010). Converging quality and quantity in this way, allows the researcher to retrieve meaningful findings from distant reading (Burdick et al., 2012). In other words, throughout this dissertation I contribute to demonstrating how large textual corpora are available to and useful for social scientists.

In terms of societal relevance, sixth, public opinion towards the arts too often seems to be strongly rooted in the idea that the arts, and hence everyone involved in the arts, serve no other purpose than themselves. Political science studies, indicatively, have extensively analyzed the role of news media in activism (e.g. Cottle, 2008) but often overlook the political value of arts and culture. More anecdotally, this disregard for the
arts became visible recently during the global crisis following the COVID-19 outbreak. Many governments were quick to respond by reserving considerable budgets with the sole purpose to ameliorate the economic damage that lockdown policies caused. In the Netherlands, the arts and culture sector was one of the first to be severely damaged, which caused a strong increase in unemployment. Yet, when the Dutch government announced financial support to the arts and culture sector, public debate quickly revolved around whether this sector was valuable enough to receive such support vis-à-vis other economic sectors (Burghoorn, 2020). In other countries in Europe, where the art field relies relatively strongly on governmental funding, similar discussions emerged (Dickson, 2020). By conducting research into how political engagement from the art field travels to the broader society, I contribute to demonstrating that this view of the art field as primarily preoccupied with itself and lacking value outside of this alleged confinement is outdated and harmful.
CHAPTER 6
CONCLUSION

6.1 Introduction
Recently, UK artist Banksy has moved from depicting the current global migrant crisis through his well-known street art to acting on it by funding a migrant rescue boat in the Mediterranean Sea. The artist claimed to have used money that was made from his earlier artworks about the migrant crisis to finance the purchase of the ship out of moral conviction (Tondo & Stierl, 2020). The vessel itself is run by an all-female activist group experienced in rescue missions and features Banksy’s trademark street art in purple and black graffiti paint. To date, it has rescued over 200 migrants and is still sailing the Mediterranean Sea in search for more to rescue. As such, this new Banksy project is both an art and humanitarian project at the same time. It is not just an artwork that can be observed in a museum – at least not yet. Nor is it merely a humanitarian project when Banksy’s signature art is all over it so plainly. At the same time, however, while some of his previous artworks primarily raised attention to the current migrant crisis, this one is used to the advantage of migrants more directly. Whereas his artworks can easily be ignored by the larger public, this one will keep saving migrants even if no one is paying attention. Of course, the artist could have simply financed a rescue boat without associating his name with it. Then again, it might
have received less media coverage and hence the global migrant crisis might have received less attention. It seems as though the boat needed to be an artwork for it to achieve more impact.

This recent art project of Banksy, therefore, is a perfect illustration of the complex position in which artivists find themselves. They aim to achieve societal change, but often attempt to do so through a mode of artistic expression. To study this phenomenon of artivism, I have analyzed the reception of artivism within the fields of art, news media and social media. I have attempted to answer the main research question through four empirical studies in which I compare three domains of artivist reception: within the art field, within the media realm and among media audiences.

Internal to the field of art, I have demonstrated how for some curators artistic criteria do not appear to play an important role in attributing artistic status to artivists. For them, art and social engagement are inseparable and they believe that societal change can be achieved through socially engaged art (chapter 2). Within newspaper coverage (chapter 3), however, quality newspapers appear to differentiate between the art and activism of artivism by covering artivists in cultural sections when they are primarily artistically evaluated and in non-cultural sections when they are discussed in a political context. This differentiation is much less visible within popular newspapers, while the latter furthermore appear less artistically and politically oriented in their coverage of artivism overall. Among media audiences (chapter 4), artivists appear to enjoy attention that predominantly involves a focus on the consequences that artivists have faced for their activism rather than their activist cause. The analysis of popular culture celebrity engagement with artivism (chapter 5), finally, shows that celebrities are primarily interested in the activism of artivists and that more political content in celebrity tweets on artivist cases results in more engagement by media audiences. While in the previous chapters I have already attempted to reflect on my findings, these studies offer several theoretical insights, along with possible
avenues for future research, when considered together. I will further elaborate on these below.

6.2 Return to representation

Although historically it can be argued that the field of visual arts came to define itself as relatively autonomous with its own status markers, today there appears to be a strong voice within the arts that perceives of the field of visual arts as an important avenue for social engagement. If a social turn in the arts is characterized by the arts being increasingly evaluated on the basis of social and ethical criteria (Bishop, 2012), then it could be argued that there is indeed some empirical support for this hypothesis. Where others have spoken of eroding boundaries between art and everyday life when extra-aesthetic elements become increasingly pronounced in the arts (e.g. Bishop, 2012; 2014), however, I would additionally argue that the boundaries between the field of visual art and the broader society in particular become blurred. Quite a few curators interviewed for chapter 2 appeared reluctant to follow dominant aesthetic considerations and instead give precedence to social criteria in their evaluation of art. According to De Duve (2019), this constitutes a counter-ideological approach: exclusively aesthetic considerations are explicitly rejected in favor of criteria of social engagement. This approach suggests that the arts become heteronomous in the Bourdieusian sense that criteria external to the arts become more important (Bourdieu, 1993) and that the field of art is not a strictly autonomous or societally isolated sphere but one that bears the same inequalities that can be seen in society in general. In contrast to Bourdieu’s findings, however, heteronomy here is found in the role of social engagement in the arts, rather than of economic factors. In other words, by countering inequalities in the arts inequalities in the broader society are expected to be tackled too.

The evaluative practices of curators with regards to social engagement in general and artivism in particular, furthermore, concern social and
ethical criteria that especially seem to pertain to representation. While representation in previous centuries was visible through artists who came to view themselves as the ‘cultural deputies’ of the court (De Duve, 2019: 69), representation among the visual arts today is visible through its fragmentation into art movements that represent particular and often underrepresented or even oppressed social groups, such as feminist art, black art, community art and similar movements. This representation of the underrepresented can therefore be seen as primarily a social rather than artistic discourse in line with Bishop’s (2012) distinction and perhaps constitutes the contours of a new artistic paradigm or schism in which artistic expression becomes a means to a more socially oriented goal. Within such a paradigm, artistic status depends in part on criteria in social, ethical and political activist terms. Throughout their practices of categorizing artistic products, producers and practices (Lamont & Molnár, 2002), however, not all curators draw similar boundaries with regards to whether and what type of social engagement is accepted in the arts. While some curators strongly maintain an artistic discourse and consider social engagement to be reserved for non-artistic practices, others consider it a requirement for contemporary artists to be socially engaged.

In the introduction I emphasized how socially engaged artistic practices, such as artivism, present a puzzle: they appear to follow their own logic, yet seek to achieve societal change through their focus on social engagement. This puzzle, then, can be explained by pointing to a strong voice within the arts for social engagement, in particular in relation to representation. From the perspective of the art field, those curators who applaud social engagement contend that by maintaining strictly artistic evaluative criteria social inequalities are reproduced. For them it is up to artists and themselves as cultural intermediaries to achieve societal change through art. Through representative art, underrepresented social groups gain a voice within the arts and this in turn is seen to give those groups a voice in society in general.
Ultimately, however, there is also a strong national element to representation as an artistic paradigm. In the end, representation comes down to the social groups who socially engaged artists in general and artivists in particular aim and claim to represent. Particularly in the West, what constitutes a minority group differs from country to country (e.g. Berkers, Janssen & Verboord, 2011). Indicatively, for example, US curators strongly displayed a curatorial attitude that is accepting of social engagement especially when it involves African-American minorities. Representation, therefore, further emphasizes the heteronomy of contemporary art within a national context particularly: it is never solely dependent on the evaluation practices of cultural intermediaries but ultimately depends on whether and how the claim of representation finds resonance within the broader society. As such, representation requires from the artist not a strictly aesthetic mode of artistic expression or exclusively artistic discourse. Rather, it requires from the artist a certain practice to speak for particular social groups and thereby to be heard by them and accepted in the broader society to speak on their behalf.

Along the same line, there is a strong geopolitical element to representation. Particularly beyond the art field, representation could explain why so much news media and media audience attention go out to prosecuted artivists and the prosecution of artivists. Ai Weiwei, Pussy Riot and Jafar Panahi each represent the oppressed through the very state prosecution they have faced. For others, a ‘symbolic coup’ (Roussel & Lechaux, 2010: 22) might be needed to achieve representation: just like popular culture celebrities who equate their audience to a constituency they claim to represent (Watts, 2019), artivists address a pressing societal issue and seek representation among those they believe to have been wronged. Indicatively, Banksy has used the earnings he made for artworks that addressed to global migrant crisis to finance a rescue boat. Other artivists, in contrast, might have exposed wrongdoing but lack the representation when they, for example, quickly move from one societal issue to another throughout their artistic careers.
6.3 Media and media audience attention

This search for representation, however, is less visible within the newspaper coverage of artivism. In part, of course, this is the result of the way newspaper articles were coded. Instead, however, newspapers can be seen to somewhat reproduce the view of art as primarily preoccupied with itself, by separating their attention to the art and activism of artivism. In cultural newspaper sections, artivists are discussed primarily in an artistic context, while in non-cultural sections artivists are discussed primarily in a political context. Even more so, this contrast between the art and activism of artivism is most clearly visible in quality newspapers, while the latter also cover artivists much more often in cultural sections than popular newspapers do. This is particularly interesting when we consider art journalists who write for the cultural sections of newspapers to be cultural intermediaries (Kuipers, Janssen & Verboord, 2008). To that extent, the field of visual arts is treated as a separate sphere that follows its own autonomous logic and therefore deserves separated attention. Since news media such as newspapers are powerful in determining what is societally relevant (Champagne, 2005; Esser & Strömbäck, 2014), they appear to play an important role in reproducing the view of the arts as a separate, relatively autonomous sphere.

Taking news media attention and media audience attention as a measure for societal impact, then, requires some nuance. From analyzing the media audience attention to artivism on a large scale, it has become clear that some artivists enjoy much more attention than others and that the political activism of artivists finds little resonance. In case of the latter observation, media audiences appeared much more interested in the prosecution of some of the artist cases in comparison to their respective activist causes. This is in part the result of news media practice as news media strongly determine what is considered societally relevant (Esser & Strömbäck, 2014) and thereby strongly influence social media attention (Wilkinson & Thelwall, 2012). Indeed, it is unsurprising that those artivists who received much newspaper coverage also appeared to enjoy
a lot of attention from Twitter users. At minimum, then, news media can be seen to work as a filter in that audience attention is primarily limited to certain activists and to certain aspects of those activists.

It is important to emphasize that news media in general and the journalists who produce news in particular operate as gatekeepers (Vos, 2009) in that they reject some bits of information, while selecting others to become news. Not only do they selectively cover information about activists, they selectively cover some and ignore others. As such, news media attention brings massive exposure among the broader audience to some activists and much less to others. This selective news consumption is further catalyzed because news media are sensitive to content that attracts most readers as their business model depends strongly on engagement with audiences (Batsell, 2015). Perhaps, then, a social turn in the arts through a return to representation is visible within news media primarily in the extent of coverage in quantitative rather than qualitative terms. The number of articles devoted to particularly Ai Weiwei and Pussy Riot, in comparison to the other activists, suggests that those who represent the oppressed indeed enjoy much more audience engagement.

This parallel that can be drawn between newspaper coverage and Twitter attention is furthermore interesting in light of what others have referred to as a news gap (Boczkowski & Mitchelstein, 2013). The gap between what journalists consider important (i.e. hard news) and what media audiences desire (i.e. soft news) appears to lead to a watered-down coverage of activists. Covering an activist practice by for example Ai Weiwei on the global refugee crisis demands much more reflection from the audience than covering the aesthetics of it or covering his prosecution in China. News production that is focused on soft news or easy-to-read controversy tends to lead to the most audience engagement, while increased audience engagement in turn tends to push news producers to produce even more soft news.

Perhaps this has been particularly visible among popular culture celebrities, who give virtually no attention to Hans Haacke, Jonas Staal and Jafar Panahi and by far appear to have been mostly interested in
Banksy. As such, celebrities too function as gatekeepers for artivism. In contrast to news media, however, celebrities appear much less interested in the art of artivism. Perhaps the attention to artivists by celebrities is primarily informed by the latter performing their celebrity status and the practice of maintaining their star power. As gatekeepers, then, celebrities can be seen to give attention to those artivists and those artivist causes that ultimately are instrumental in their celebrity performance, for example by sticking close to their respective professional fields.

The attribution of societal impact to artivism, then, seems to depend on the type of news that can be produced about particular artivists. Indeed, news media attention can be seen to provide artivists with a way to engage the broader society and to be heard for their activism. At the same time, news media engage in gatekeeping practices and impose a filter: when artivists enjoy news coverage, their respective activist causes are at minimum communicated in a very limited way and at worst neglected entirely in favor of soft news. For artivists, this means that societal impact through media (including celebrities) and media audience attention comes at the cost of their activist cause.

Here too, however, there is a strong geopolitical dimension visible within newspaper coverage. In comparison to Dutch and UK newspapers, US newspapers appeared to be particularly interested in Chinese visual artist Ai Weiwei, Iranian filmmaker Jafar Panahi and Russian punk protest group Pussy Riot, each of which concerns an artivist from a non-democratic country with which the US maintains challenging international relations. The international interest of US newspapers, therefore, is not only more politically oriented in its content but also appears to be more geopolitically oriented in its focus on artivist cases than could be said for Dutch and UK newspapers. In part, this can be explained by how social engagement through representation similarly appeared to be more prevalent among US curators. At the same time, however, societal impact for artivism beyond the confines of (national) art fields seems to be sensitive to geopolitical relationships: while curators strongly refer to representation within a national context, news
media coverage and media audience attention are much more internationally oriented.

6.4 Critical reflection and future research

Some critical reflections about this study seem appropriate. Furthermore, there is much room for future research beyond the scope of this study. First, studying the role of social engagement in the arts requires a better understanding of the types of political activism that are more accepted than others in terms of both form and content. In an era of global protest movements and increased polarization, the selective news media and media audience attention to artivism might do little more than reproduce, in line with Rancière’s (2009) argument, existing problematic societal values, tensions between social groups and geopolitical relationships. In that sense, there is much to gain for political scientists, media scholars and cultural sociologists from engaging with research from each other’s respective disciplines. With this dissertation I have shown that the topic of artivism touches upon each of these disciplines and that its role in society as an artistic and socially engaged practice can only be understood through interdisciplinary research. Further systematic and interdisciplinary case-based research, therefore, could provide further valuable insight into our understanding of how activism is viewed in relation to the arts and therefore into how the arts as a field is representative of the broader society in general.

Second, newspapers in general are often seen to play an important role in the legitimation of art and in shaping public opinion (Champagne, 2005; Purhonen, Heikkilä & Hazir, 2017). Such generalizing theories, however, fail to take into account the differentiated approach to the arts within newspapers. From a cultural sociology perspective, therefore, it is important to consider the extent to which the art journalists who work for newspapers reproduce the image of the arts as an autonomous field that requires coverage in separate sections primarily devoted to coverage of art in its own artistic context. Their role as cultural intermediary and
journalist places them in two different fields and considering the extent to which news media shape public opinion (Champagne, 2005), this double position of art journalists requires a systematic understanding of the role and effect of news consumption and news production in relation to the arts. Particularly in relation to artivism, news media coverage and audience attention are required to be studied in tandem to fully understand how artivists reach the broader society through the field of media. For example, such a study would need to take into account how the selective news production and consumption of artivism results in filter bubbles (Pariser, 2011) in which the ideological positions of consumers remain unchallenged when only certain types of artivism enjoy media coverage in terms of both form and content.

Third, this research topic furthermore has a lot to gain from a more longitudinal approach. If it can indeed be said that the arts increasingly returns to representation, albeit this time particularly of those who face inequality rather than of societal elites (e.g. De Duve, 2019), then a strong empirical basis is required on which this development can be grounded and one that is contrasted more clearly with the previously dominant paradigm of abstract art. This avenue of research requires a more longitudinal empirical analysis of the art field in the broader sense: changes in artistic practices, changes in intermediary practices, changes in museum practices, changes in cultural policies and so on. Existing research into this topic is still strongly theoretical and conceptual of nature. More in-depth longitudinal studies into how social engagement came to permeate the art field provides further insight into how practices of artistic production, distribution, reception and consumption have changed over recent years. This will additionally benefit policy makers in gaining knowledge of how current practices within the arts relate to existing cultural policies. This dissertation offers a point of departure for future research into this direction, by demonstrating the role of social engagement in the arts and the constraints that artists might face in receiving attention in the broader society.
Fourth, an important shortcoming of the research into the media audience reception of artivism through a large-scale analysis of Twitter has been the lack of systematic geographical metadata for each collected tweet. It would be very interesting to further analyze differences in audience reception in relation to geographical location. Given the cross-national differences in the newspaper coverage of artivism, it is likely that the reception of artivism among media audiences differs strongly on a cross-national level. This is especially valuable when we consider that even though the art field is affected by globalization (Quemin, 2006), strong national differences are visible with regards to contemporary practices of socially engaged art. Further research into this aspect, however, requires a different approach to data collection that overcomes at least one of two important hurdles. Collecting demographic information on Twitter users requires either an advanced technological understanding of Twitter’s API infrastructure that is generally reserved for those in the field of computer science or those with the financial means to buy the required data through a data broker that is more common in a commercial environment.

In relation to this, finally, there is much to gain for sociologists of culture to utilize computational methods and the vast quantities of available online data to study the arts in more general terms. Although there surely are limitations to this, as I have addressed in the previous chapters, the combination of computational methods and large datasets offers several methodological and epistemological advantages. The availability of large amounts of quantitative and qualitative data enables researchers to bridge the traditional divide between quantitative and qualitative research. Particularly promising for sociologists of culture, for example, large-scale analysis of textual documents such as the analysis of newspaper coverage and social media messages in this dissertation enables research into many evaluative and boundary-drawing processes while maintaining qualitative depth and generalizability (e.g. Roose et al., 2018). The “theory-rich and methods poor” (DiMaggio, Nag & Blei, 2013: 571) sociology of culture risks losing its grip on the ever-changing
social reality empirically if it fails to jump on the bandwagon of computational research. The same applies to the research topic central in this dissertation: artivism emerged in an increasingly globalized and digitalized society and can only be understood when different data points are brought together. Because there is so much to gain on this level for sociologists of culture, I hope that this dissertation provides at least a small contribution in that direction and demonstrates that computational methods are readily accessible for social scientists if they want to.
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Appendices

Appendix A

Standard EUR informed Consent Form

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Title and version</th>
<th>Geopolitics of artivism: Comparing the attribution of societal impact and artistic qualities in the Western reception of art activists from democratic and authoritarian regimes.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of Principal Investigator</td>
<td>Frank Weij</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Organisation</td>
<td>Erasmus University Rotterdam: Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name of Sponsor</td>
<td>NWO (De Nederlandse Organisatie voor Wetenschappelijk Onderzoek)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the Study</td>
<td>This research is being conducted by Frank Weij. I am inviting you to participate in this research project about the way in which cultural intermediaries attribute artistic legitimacy to artists who combine political concerns or activist action with artistic production. The purpose of this research project is to further investigate the relationship between art and politics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures</td>
<td>You will participate in an interview lasting approximately one to two hours. The interview will be recorded using a sound recording device or software. You will be asked questions about your role as a cultural intermediary and your views on politically and societally engaged or activist artists. Sample questions include: “How would you describe your role at your organization?” and “How do you feel about artists who incorporate political protests or activism into their artworks?”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Potential and anticipated Risks and Discomforts

There are no obvious physical, legal or economic risks associated with participating in this study. You do not have to answer any questions you do not wish to answer. Your participation is voluntary and you are free to discontinue your participation at any time.

### Potential Benefits

Participation in this study does not guarantee any beneficial results to you. The broader goal of this research is to further develop the research area that deals with the relationship between art and politics. This can potentially be of interest for policy makers and various actors working in the cultural sector both internationally and in the Netherlands.

### Sharing the results

After transcribing the interviews, a transcript will be send to you for approval. This provides you with the opportunity to correct factual errors and to withdraw or rephrase particular statements. After approval, the interview transcripts will be used for further analysis and development of research output. The research findings will be shared more broadly through publications and conferences.

### Confidentiality

Your privacy will be protected to the maximum extent allowable by law. No personally identifiable information will be reported in any research product. Moreover, only trained research staff will have access to your responses. Within these restrictions, results of this study will be made available to you upon request.

As indicated above, this research project involves making audio recordings of interviews with you. Transcribed segments from the audio recordings may be used in published forms (e.g., journal articles and book chapters). In the case of publication, pseudonyms will be used. The audio recordings, forms, and other documents created or collected as part of this study will be stored in a secure location in the researchers’ offices or on the researchers password-protected computers and will be destroyed within ten years of the initiation of the study.
Right to Withdraw and Questions

Your participation in this research is completely voluntary. You may choose not to take part at all. If you decide to participate in this research, you may stop participating at any time. If you decide not to participate in this study or if you stop participating at any time, you will not be penalised or lose any benefits to which you otherwise qualify. If you decide to stop taking part in the study, if you have questions, concerns, or complaints, or if you need to report an injury related to the research, please contact the primary investigator:

Frank Weij, MSc
weij@eshcc.eur.nl
Erasmus University Rotterdam
Erasmus School of History, Culture and Communication
Department of Arts and Culture Studies

Statement of Consent

Your signature indicates that you are at least 18 years of age; you have read this consent form or have had it read to you; your questions have been answered to your satisfaction and you voluntarily agree that you will participate in this research study. You will receive a copy of this signed consent form.

You have been given the guarantee that this research project has been reviewed and approved by the ESHCC Ethics Review Committee. For research problems or any other question regarding the research project, you can contact the Data Protection Officer of Erasmus University, Marlon Domingus, MA (fg@eur.nl).
If you agree to participate, please sign your name below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Audio recording (if applicable)</th>
<th>I consent to have my interview audio recorded</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Secondary use (if applicable)</th>
<th>I consent to have anonymised data be used for secondary analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature and Date</th>
<th>NAME PARTICIPANT:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAME PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGNATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGNATURE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DATE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Python code

```python
import tkinter as tk
import sys
import os
import re
from collections import Counter

########## to consider before running ##########

""
For cleaner check:
- block 4: JOURNAL-CODE is not always given.
- block 6: change artist
""

class ExampleApp(tk.Tk):

    def __init__(self):
        tk.Tk.__init__(self)
        toolbar = tk.Frame(self)
        toolbar.pack(side="top", fill="x")
        b1 = tk.Button(self, text="cleaner", command=self.cleaner)
        b2 = tk.Button(self, text="print text", command=self.print_text)
        b3 = tk.Button(self, text="appearances", command=self.appearances)
        b4 = tk.Button(self, text="content analysis", command=self.content_analysis)
        b5 = tk.Button(self, text="artist presence", command=self.presence)
        b6 = tk.Button(self, text="import ready", command=self.import_ready)
        b1.pack(in_=toolbar, side="top", fill="both")
        b2.pack(in_=toolbar, side="top", fill="both")
```
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b3.pack(in_=toolbar, side="top", fill="both")
b4.pack(in_=toolbar, side="top", fill="both")
b5.pack(in_=toolbar, side="top", fill="both")
b6.pack(in_=toolbar, side="top", fill="both")
self.text = tk.Text(self, wrap="word")
self.text.pack(side="top", fill="both", expand=True)
self.text.tag_configure("stderr", foreground="#b22222")

sys.stdout = TextRedirector(self.text, "stdout")
sys.stderr = TextRedirector(self.text, "stderr")

def cleaner(self):
    #block1: join the lines
    one = open("…/start.txt", "r")
    two = open("…/1.txt", "w")
    with open("…/start.txt") as one:
        print(" 
.join(line.strip() for line in one), sep = ", file=two)
one.close()
two.close()

    #block 2: add <start>
    one = open("…/1.txt", "r")
    two = open("…/2.txt", "w")
    for line in one:
        line0 = line.replace("DOCUMENTAIRE", "documentaire")
        line1 = line0.replace("DOCUMENTS", 
\n\n.<start><1>"
        line2 = line1.replace("DOCUMENT", 
\n\n.<start><1>"
        print(line2, file=two)
one.close()
two.close()
#block 3: remove redundant lines
one = open(".../2.txt", "r")
two = open(".../3.txt", "w")
for line in one:
    if line.startswith("<start>")::
        print(line, end="", file=two)
    else:
        continue
one.close()
two.close()

#block 4: remove redundant articles
one = open(".../3.txt", "r")
two = open(".../4.txt", "w")
for line in one:
    if "LENGTH: " in line:
        print(line, file=two)
    else:
        continue
one.close()
two.close()

#block 5: remove non-paged articles
one = open(".../4.txt", "r")
two = open(".../5.txt", "w")
for line in one:
    text = line[line.find("SECTION: ") + 9:line.find("LENGTH: ")] if "Blz." in text:
        print(line, end="", file=two)
elif "Pg." in text:
        print(line, end="", file=two)
    else:
        continue
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one.close()
two.close()

#block 5: add page numbers
one = open("../5.txt", "r")
two = open("../6.txt", "w")
for line in one:
    text = line[line.find("SECTION: ") : line.find("LENGTH: ")] 
    text2 = text[text.find(";") : ]
    text3 = text2.replace("Pg.", "Blz.")
    text4 = text3[text3.find("Blz."):]
    text5 = text4.replace("", ", ")
    text6 = text5.replace("Blz. ", ", ")
    text7 = text6.replace("A", ", ")
    text8 = text7.replace("C", ", ")
    text9 = text8.replace("B", ", ")
    text10 = text9.replace("D", ", ")
    text11 = text10.replace("E", ", ")
    text12 = text11.replace("T", ", ")
    text13 = text12.replace("Q", ", ")
    text14 = text13.replace("F", ", ")
    text15 = text14.replace("G", ", ")
    text16 = text15.replace("W", ", ")
    if len(text16.split()) == 1:
        print("<page>", text16, line, end="", file=two)
    elif len(text6.split()) == 0:
        print("<page>0", line, end="", file=two)
one.close()
two.close()

#block 6: newspaper names
one = open("../6.txt", "r")
two = open("…7.txt", "w")
for line in one:
    newspaper = line[line.find("<1>")+3:line.find("20")]
    if "Algemeen Dagblad" in newspaper:
        newspaper2 = "algemeen dagblad"
        line1 = line.replace("Algemeen Dagblad", " ")
    elif "Daily Mirror" in newspaper:
        newspaper2 = "daily mirror"
        line1 = line.replace("Daily Mirror", " ")
    elif "Daily Star" in newspaper:
        newspaper2 = "daily star"
        line1 = line.replace("Daily Star", " ")
    elif "Daily Telegraph" in newspaper:
        newspaper2 = "daily telegraph"
        line1 = line.replace("Daily Telegraph", " ")
    elif "Evening Standard" in newspaper:
        newspaper2 = "evening standard"
        line1 = line.replace("Evening Standard", " ")
    elif "NRC" in newspaper:
        newspaper2 = "NRC"
        line1 = line.replace("NRC", " ")
    elif "Daily News" in newspaper:
        newspaper2 = "daily news"
        line1 = line.replace("Daily News", " ")
    elif "New York Times" in newspaper:
        newspaper2 = "new york times"
        line1 = line.replace("New York Times", " ")
    elif "Telegraaf" in newspaper:
        newspaper2 = "telegraaf"
        line1 = line.replace("Telegraaf", " ")
    elif "USA TODAY" in newspaper:
        newspaper2 = "usa today"
        line1 = line.replace("USA TODAY", " ")
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elif "Volkskrant" in newspaper:
    newspaper2 = "volkskrant"
    line1 = line.replace("Volkskrant", " ")
elif "Washington Post" in newspaper:
    newspaper2 = "washington post"
    line1 = line.replace("Washington Post", " ")
print("<newspaper>", newspaper2, line1, end="", file=two)

one.close()
two.close()

#block 7: isolate headline

one = open("../7.txt", "r")
two = open("../8.txt", "w")

for line in one:
    newspaper = line[line.find("<newspaper>"):line.find("<start>")+7]
    text = line[line.find("<1>"):line.find("SECTION:")] + ""
    text2 = text.lower()
    text3 = text2.replace("maandag", "<dag>"
    text4 = text3.replace("monday", "<dag>"
    text5 = text4.replace("dinsdag", "<dag>"
    text6 = text5.replace("tuesday", "<dag>"
    text7 = text6.replace("woensdag", "<dag>"
    text8 = text7.replace("wednesday", "<dag>"
    text9 = text8.replace("donderdag", "<dag>"
    text10 = text9.replace("thursday", "<dag>"
    text11 = text10.replace("vrijdag", "<dag>"
    text12 = text11.replace("friday", "<dag>"
    text13 = text12.replace("zaterdag", "<dag>"
    text14 = text13.replace("saturday", "<dag>"
    text15 = text14.replace("zondag", "<dag>"
    text16 = text15.replace("sunday", "<dag>"
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text17 = text16[text16.find("<dag>")+5:]
rest = line[line.find("SECTION:"):] 
print(newspaper, text17, rest, end="", file=two)
one.close()
two.close()

#block 9: break into sections
one = open("../8.txt", "r")
two = open("../9.txt", "w")
for line in one:
if "LENGTH:"

newspaper = line[line.find("<newspaper> ")+12:line.find(" <start>")] 
headline = line[line.find("<start> ")+8:line.find(" SECTION:")] 
if "national edition" in headline:
if "byline:" in headline:
headline1 = headline[line.find("national edition")
+16:headline.find("byline:")] 
else:
headline1 = headline[line.find("national edition")
+16:headline.find("SECTION:")] 
elif "byline:" in headline:
headline1 = headline[:headline.find("byline:")] 
else:
headline1 = headline 
headline2 = headline1.replace(" ", " ") 
headline3 = headline2.replace(";", "") 
headline4 = headline3.replace("edition 1", "") 
headline5 = headline4.replace("sports final edition", "") 
headline6 = headline5.replace("sports final replate edition", "") 
headline7 = headline6.replace("late edition - final", "") 
headline8 = headline7.replace("final edition", "") 
headline9 = headline8.replace("every edition", "")

191
elif "February" in year:
    month = "februari"
elif "Maart" in year:
    month = "march"
elif "March" in year:
    month = "march"
elif "April" in year:
    month = "april"
elif "Mei" in year:
    month = "may"
elif "May" in year:
    month = "may"
elif "Juni" in year:
    month = "june"
elif "June" in year:
    month = "june"
elif "Juli" in year:
    month = "july"
elif "july" in year:
    month = "july"
elif "Augustus" in year:
    month = "august"
elif "August" in year:
    month = "august"
elif "Sepember" in year:
    month = "september"
elif "Oktober" in year:
    month = "october"
elif "October" in year:
    month = "october"
elif "November" in year:
    month = "november"
elif "December" in year:
month = "december"
pubtype = line[line.find("PUBLICATION-TYPE: "):line.find("JOURNAL-CODE:")]]
pubtype2 = pubtype[pubtype.find("PUBLICATION-TYPE: ")+18:pubtype.find(" Copyright")]
pubtype3 = pubtype2.lower()
print("<newspaper>", newspaper, "<head>", headline11, "<section>",
     section5, "<length>", length,"<date>", year2, " ", month, "<type>",
     pubtype3, "<text>", text16, sep="", end="\n", file=two)
one.close()
two.close()

#Block 8: remove duplicate headlines
one = open(".../9.txt", "r")
two = open(".../10.txt", "w")
headlines = set()
for line in one:
    text = line[line.find("<head> ")+7:line.find("<section>")]  
    if text in headlines:
        continue
    else:
        print(line, end="", file=two)
        headlines.add(text)
one.close()
two.close()

#block 9: remove duplicate texts
one = open(".../Desktop/10.txt", "r")
two = open(".../clean.txt", "w")
texts = set()
for line in one:
    text = line[line.find("<text>")+6:]
if text in texts:
    continue
else:
    print(line, end="", file=two)
    texts.add(text)
one.close()
two.close()

#block10: line count
one = open(".../clean.txt", "r")
lines = one.readlines()
count = len(lines)
one.close()
print(count)
os.remove(".../1.txt")
os.remove(".../2.txt")
os.remove(".../3.txt")
os.remove(".../4.txt")
os.remove(".../5.txt")
os.remove(".../6.txt")
os.remove(".../7.txt")
os.remove(".../8.txt")
os.remove(".../9.txt")
os.remove(".../10.txt")
print("done cleaning")

def print_text(self):
    # prints the text to compile the dictionaries
    one = open(".../clean.txt", "r")
two = open(".../text.txt", "w")
for line in one:
    line1 = line[line.find("<text>"):]  
    print(line1, end="\n", file=two)
one.close()  
two.close()  
print("printed")


def appearances(self):
    #add artist name and number it appears in the text
    one = open(".../clean.txt", "r")
    two = open(".../cleanv1.txt", "w")
    for line in one:
        text = line[line.find("<text>"):]  
        countweiwei = text.count("weiwei")
        countbanksy = text.count("banksy")
        counthaacke = text.count("haacke")
        countpanahi = text.count("panahi")
        countjonas = text.count("jonas")
        countpr = text.count("pussy riot")
        headline = line[line.find("<head>")+6:line.find("<section>")]
        countpr = text.count("pussy riot")
        print("
    one.close()  
two.close()  
    os.remove(".../clean.txt")  
    print("appearances done")

def content_analysis(self):
    # uses two dictionaries to count how often artistic and political words
    # appear in text
    one = open(".../cleanv1.txt", "r")
    art = open(".../art.txt", "r")
    pol = open(".../pol.txt", "r")
    two = open(".../cleanv2.txt", "w")
    artwords = art.read().lower()  # Read file and convert content to lowercase
    artwords1 = artwords.split("n")
    polwords = pol.read().lower()  # Read file and convert content to lowercase
    polwords1 = polwords.split("n")
    for line in one:
        count1 = 0  # Initialize counts
        count2 = 0  # Initialize counts
        line1 = line[line.find("<text>"):]  # Extract content between <text> tags
        for word in line1.split(" "):
            if word in artwords1:
                count1 += 1
            elif word in polwords1:
                count2 += 1
        print("<art>", count1, "<pol>", count2, line, sep="", end="", file=two)  # Output content to new file
    one.close()
    art.close()
    pol.close()
    two.close()
    os.remove(".../cleanv1.txt")
    print("analysis in cleanv2.txt")

def presence(self):
    # uses dictionaries to count how often the artist is present
    one = open(".../cleanv2.txt", "r")
    weiwei = open(".../weiwei.txt", "r")
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banksy = open("../banksy.txt", "r")
haacke = open("../haacke.txt", "r")
panahi = open("../panahi.txt", "r")
jonas = open("../jonas.txt", "r")
pr = open("../pr.txt", "r")
two = open("../cleanv3.txt", "w")
weiweiwords = weiwei.read().lower()
weiweiwords1 = weiweiwords.split("\n")
banksywords = banksy.read().lower()
banksywords1 = banksywords.split("\n")
haackewords = haacke.read().lower()
haackewords1 = haackewords.split("\n")
panahiwords = panahi.read().lower()
panahiwords1 = panahiwords.split("\n")
jonaswords = jonas.read().lower()
jonaswords1 = jonaswords.split("\n")
prwords = pr.read().lower()
prwords1 = prwords.split("\n")
for line in one:
    count1 = 0
    count2 = 0
    count3 = 0
    count4 = 0
    count5 = 0
    count6 = 0
    line1 = line[line.find("<text>"):]
    for word in line1.split(" "):
        if word in weiweiwords1:
            count1 += 1
        elif word in banksywords1:
            count2 += 1
        elif word in haackewords1:
            count3 += 1
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elif word in panahiwords1:
    count4 += 1
elif word in jonaswords1:
    count5 += 1
elif word in prwords1:
    count6 += 1
print("<weiweipresence>", count1, "<banksypresence>", count2,
     "<haackepresence>", count3, "<panahipresence>", count4,
     "<jonaspresence>", count5, "<prpresence>", count6, line, sep="",
     end="", file=two)
one.close()
weiwei.close()
banksy.close()
haacke.close()
panahi.close()
jonas.close()
pr.close()
two.close()
o.remove("…/cleanv2.txt")
print("analysis in clean3.txt")

def import_ready(self):
    #make ready for import for excel or rstudio with ; as delimiter
    #uses two dictionaries to count how often artistic and political words
    #appear in text
    one = open("…/cleanv5.txt", "r")
two = open("…/clean_sep.txt", "w")
print("sectionsrecode", "weiweipres", "banksypres", "haackepres",
     "panahipres", "jonaspres", "prpres", "art", "pol", "weiwei", "banksy",
     "haacke", "panahi", "jonas", "pr", "newspaper", "page", "headline",
     "section", "length", "date", "type", "text",sep=";", end="\n", file=two)
for line in one:
    line1 = line.replace("<art>", ";")
    199
line2 = line1.replace("<pol>", ",;")
line3 = line2.replace("<countweiwei>", ",;")
line4 = line3.replace("<countbanksy>", ",;")
line5 = line4.replace("<counthaacke>", ",;")
line6 = line5.replace("<countpanahi>", ",;")
line7 = line6.replace("<countjonas>", ",;")
line8 = line7.replace("<countpr>", ",;")
line9 = line8.replace("<newspaper>", ",;")
line10 = line9.replace("<head>", ",;")
line11 = line10.replace("<section>", ",;")
line12 = line11.replace("<length>", ",;")
line13 = line12.replace("<date>", ",;")
line14 = line13.replace("<type>", ",;")
line15 = line14.replace("<text>", ",;")
line16 = line15.replace("<start>", ",;")
line17 = line16.replace("<page>", ",;")
line18 = line17.replace("<weiweipresence>", ",;")
line19 = line18.replace("<banksypresence>", ",;")
line20 = line19.replace("<haackepresence>", ",;")
line21 = line20.replace("<panahipresence>", ",;")
line22 = line21.replace("<jonaspresence>", ",;")
line23 = line22.replace("<prpresence>", ",;")
line24 = line23.replace("<sectionrecoded>", ",")
print(line24, end="", file=two)
one.close()
two.close()
print("import file done")

class TextRedirector(object):
    def __init__(self, widget, tag="stdout"):  
        self.widget = widget
        self.tag = tag
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def write(self, str):
    self.widget.configure(state="normal")
    self.widget.insert("end", str, (self.tag,))
    self.widget.configure(state="disabled")

app = ExampleApp()
app.geometry("630x750")
app.title("data processor")
app.mainloop()
Appendix C

Art dictionary

['abbemuseum'][ 'abramovic'] ['abramovich'] ['abromovitsj'] ['absurdistische']
['acclaim'] ['accordeon'] ['achtergrondmuziek'] ['acrylverf'] ['acteerprestaties']
['acterende'] ['acteur'] ['acteurs'] ['acteurscollectief'] ['acting'] ['actor'] ['actresses']
['actrice'] ['actrices'] ['aerosmith'] ['aesthetic'] ['aesthetically'] ['aesthetician']
['aestheticization'] ['aesthetics'] ['affichemuseum'] ['affleck'] ['aficionados']
['agitprop'] ['aguilera'] ['airbrush'] ['akoestiek'] ['akoestische'] ['albumhoes']
['albums'] ['altaarstukken'] ['amateuracteurs'] ['amateurfilmer'] ['amateurkunst']
['amateurkunstenaar'] ['amateurmuzikanten'] ['amateurschilderder'] ['ambacht']
['ambachtelijk'] ['amsterdammuseum'] ['amusementspraatprogramma']
['animatiefenomeen'] ['animatiefilm'] ['animatiestudio'] ['annehathaway'] ['ansari']
['anthem'] ['anthology'] ['anthologyfilmarchives'] ['antiekzaak'] ['antikunst']
['antiquair'] ['architect'] ['architecten'] ['architectenbureau'] ['architectenbureaus']
['architectenduo'] ['architectkunstenaar'] ['architectonische'] ['architects']
['architectural'] ['architecturale'] ['architecturally'] ['architecture'] ['architecturen']
['architectuur'] ['architectuurinstituut'] ['architectuurschepping'] ['architectuurstijl']
['architekten'] ['architektur'] ['aronofsky'] ['art'] ['artbasel'] ['artbeijing'] ['artclown']
['artdirector'] ['artefacts'] ['artfinder'] ['artforms'] ['artgoing'] ['arthouse']
['arthousebioscopen'] ['arthousegedraza'] ['arthousefilm'] ['arthousepubliek']
['artiest'] ['artiesten'] ['artiestenmuseum'] ['artisanal'] ['artisanship'] ['artist'] ['artiste']
['artistic'] ['artistically'] ['artisticjunk'] ['artisticjunks'] ['artistickeel'] ['artistickeelen']
['artistics'] ['artistry'] ['artists'] ['artistswanted'] ['artivist'] ['artkunstenaar']
['artless'] ['artlessness'] ['artlondon'] ['artmasters'] ['artnet'] ['artpotential']
['artprize'] ['artreview'] ['artrotterdam'] ['arts'] ['artscene'] ['artschool']
['artsiness'] ['artsnight'] ['artvermomming'] ['artwalking'] ['artwork'] ['artworks']
['arty'] ['asgardian'] ['ateliers'] ['ateliercomplex']
['atelierdubbelooy'] ['atelierfotografie'] ['ateliergezelschap'] ['atelierruimtes']
['ateliers'] ['atlasarts'] ['attractievriend'] ['auction'] ['auctionable'] ['auctioned']
['auctioneers'] ['auctioning'] ['auctions'] ['audio'] ['audiofielen'] ['audiosculpturen']
['audiovisual'] ['audiovisuele'] ['auditioning'] ['auditions'] ['auteurs']
['auteursdaag'] ['auteursgezelschap'] ['auteurs']
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[‘potscherf’][‘powermetalband’][‘prachtcollectie’][‘prachtliedjes’][‘premieres’][‘premiering’][‘premodern’][‘prentenboekillustraties’][‘presentatieduo’][‘pretpark’][‘previewdag’][‘prijzenseizoen’][‘print’][‘printing’][‘printmakers’][‘produceur’][‘producer’][‘productiehuis’][‘productiekant’][‘productontwerpers’][‘programmeur’][‘promenadeconcert’][‘pronkstukken’][‘protestkunst’][‘protestlied’][‘protestliederen’][‘protestliedjes’][‘premieres’][‘premiering’][‘premodern’][‘prentenboekillustraties’][‘presentatieduo’][‘pretpark’][‘previewdag’][‘prijzenseizoen’][‘print’][‘printing’][‘printmakers’][‘produceur’][‘producer’][‘productiehuis’][‘productiekant’][‘productontwerpers’][‘programmeur’][‘promenadeconcert’][‘pronkstukken’][‘protestkunst’][‘protestlied’][‘protestliederen’][‘protestliedjes’][‘premieres’][‘premiering’][‘premodern’][‘prentenboekillustraties’][‘presentatieduo’][‘pretpark’][‘previewdag’][‘prijzenseizoen’][‘print’][‘printing’][‘printmakers’][‘produceur’][‘producer’][‘productiehuis’][‘productiekant’][‘productontwerpers’][‘programmeur’][‘promenadeconcert’][‘pronkstukken’][‘protestkunst’][‘protestlied’][‘protestliederen’][‘protestliedjes’][‘premieres’][‘premiering’][‘premodern’][‘prentenboekillustraties’][‘presentatieduo’][‘pretpark’][‘previewdag’][‘prijzenseizoen’][‘print’][‘printing’][‘printmakers’][‘produceur’][‘producer’][‘productiehuis’][‘productiekant’][‘productontwerpers’][‘programmeur’][‘promenadeconcert’][‘pronkstukken’][‘protestkunst’][‘protestlied’][‘protestliederen’][‘protestliedjes’][‘premieres’][‘premiering’][‘premodern’][‘prentenboekillustraties’][‘presentatieduo’][‘pretpark’][‘previewdag’][‘prijzenseizoen’][‘print’][‘printing’][‘printmakers’][‘produceur’][‘producer’][‘productiehuis’][‘productiekant’][‘productontwerpers’][‘programmeur’][‘promenadeconcert’][‘pronkstukken’][‘protestkunst’][‘protestlied’][‘protestliederen’][‘protestliedjes’][‘premieres’][‘premiering’][‘premodern’][‘prentenboekillustraties’][‘presentatieduo’][‘pretpark’][‘previewdag’][‘prijzenseizoen’][‘print’][‘printing’][‘printmakers’][‘produceur’][‘producer’][‘productiehuis’][‘productiekant’][‘productontwerpers’][‘programmeur’][‘promenadeconcert’][‘pronkstukken’][‘protestkunst’][‘protestlied’][‘protestliederen’][‘protestliedjes’][‘premieres’][‘premiering’][‘premodern’][‘prentenboekillustraties’][‘presentatieduo’][‘pretpark’][‘previewdag’][‘prijzenseizoen’][‘print’][‘printing’][‘printmakers’][‘produceur’][‘producer’][‘productiehuis’][‘productiekant’][‘productontwerpers’][‘programmeur’][‘promenadeconcert’][‘pronkstukken’][‘protestkunst’][‘protestlied’][‘protestliederen’][‘protestliedjes’][‘premieres’][‘premiering’][‘premodern’][‘prentenboekillustraties’][‘presentatieduo’][‘pretpark’][‘previewdag’][‘prijzenseizoen’][‘print’][‘printing’][‘printmakers’][‘produceur’][‘producer’][‘productiehuis’][‘productiekant’][‘productontwerpers’][‘programmeur’][‘promenadeconcert’][‘pronkstukken’]
Political dictionary

['aangeklaagden'] ['aangevochten'] ['aangifte'] ['aanrangend'] ['aanslag'] ['aanspannen'] ['aantijgingen'] ['aanwakkert'] ['aartsvijand'] ['abolishing'] ['abolition'] ['abolitionists'] ['abortion'] ['abortions'] ['abuse'] ['abusers'] ['abusive'] ['accusation'] ['accusations'] ['accuse'] ['accused'] ['actiegroep'] ['actievoerder'] ['actievoerders'] ['actievoeren'] ['actievoerende'] ['actievoersters'] ['activism'] ['activisme'] ['activist'] ['activiste'] ['activisten'] ['activistendrone'] ['activistisch'] ['activistische'] ['activists'] ['admiraal'] ['advocaat'] ['advocaten'] ['advocatenvergunning'] ['advocates'] ['afgevaardigde'] ['afluisterapparatuur'] ['afluisterpraktijken'] ['afluisterschandaal'] ['agent'] ['agenten'] ['agentenuniformen'] ['agents'] ['agentschappen'] ['aggression'] ['aggressiveness'] ['aggressors'] ['aggressor'] ['alcatraz'] ['allegations'] ['alliantie'] ['allies'] ['allochtonen'] ['ambachtsman'] ['ambassade'] ['ambassademedewerkers'] ['ambassaderaad'] ['ambassades'] ['ambassadeur'] ['ambassadeurs'] ['ambassador'] ['ambassadrice'] ['ambtelijke'] ['ambtenaar'] ['ambtenaren'] ['ambtenarenapparaat'] ['ambtenarenexamen'] ['ambtenarij'] ['ambtsgenoot'] ['ambtsperiode'] ['ambtstermijn'] ['ambtstermijnen'] ['amendement'] ['amnestie'] ['amnestie'] ['amnestieregeling'] ['amnestiewet'] ['amnesty'] ['amoral'] ['anarchistische'] ['anarchism'] ['anarchisme'] ['anarchistisch'] ['anarchistische'] ['anarchists'] ['anarcho'] ['anarchy'] ['annexatie'] ['annexing'] ['anonymousmasker'] ['anticapitalist'] ['antichrist'] ['anticorruptie'] ['anticorruptrieaktivist'] ['anticorruptiebestrijder'] ['anticorruptieblogger'] ['anticorruption'] ['antigovernment'] ['antihomoseksualiteitswetgeving'] ['antihomo'] ['antihomowet'] ['antihomowetgeving'] ['antihomowetten'] ['antikapitalisme'] ['antikapitalistisch'] ['antimarket'] ['antipatriotisch'] ['antipropaganda'] ['antiregeringsprotesten'] ['antireligieuze'] ['antisemitische'] ['antisemitism'] ['antiterreurwetgeving'] ['antiterrorism'] ['antiterrorisme'] ['antitoneelstuk'] ['antivormgever'] ['antiwesterse'] ['apartheid'] ['apartheidsregime'] ['apolitical'] ['apolitiek'] ['arbeit'] ['arbeitersdemonstraties'] ['arbitragezaak'] ['arbitration'] ['archbishop'] ['arrestatie'] ['arrestatiebevel'] ['arrestatiebus'] ['arrestatiebusjes'] ['arrestatiegolf'] ['arrestaties'] ['arrestatieteam'] ['arrested'] ['arresteerde'] ['arresteerden'] ['arresting'] ['arrests'] ['asiel'] ['asielzoekers'] ['asie'] ['asielzoekers'] ['assad'] ['assange'] ['assassinate'] ['assassination'] ['assassinations'] ['assault'] ['associatieverdrag'] ['asylum'] ['atoombommen'] ['atrocities'] ['attacked'] ['attorney'] ['auschwitz'] ['auteursrechten'] ['authoritarian'] ['authoritarianism'] ['authoritarians']
[‘departement’][‘department’][‘destabiliseren’][‘destroyed’][‘detained’][‘detsains’]
[‘detective’][‘detectives’][‘detentie’][‘detentiecensura’][‘detentiekampen’]
[‘detention’][‘dictatoriaal’][‘dictatorial’][‘dictorial’][‘dictators’][‘dictatorship’]
[‘dictatorships’][‘dictatuur’][‘dierenbeschermers’][‘dierenmishandeling’]
[‘dijsselbloem’][‘diplomaat’][‘diplomacy’][‘diplomat’][‘diplomaten’]
[‘diplomatic’][‘diplomatically’][‘diplomatie’][‘diplomatiek’][‘diplomatieke’]
[‘diplomats’][‘disarmament’][‘discriminated’][‘discriminatie’][‘discrimination’]
[‘discrimineert’][‘discrimineringen’][‘dissensing’][‘dissenters’][‘dissidence’][‘dissidenten’][‘dissidentenbestand’][‘dissidentenbeweging’]
[‘dissidentie’][‘dissidents’][‘dissidentschap’][‘doctrinal’][‘dodencellen’]
[‘doemaverkiezingen’][‘doodgehongerd’][‘doodgemoedereerd’][‘doodgeschoten’]
‘doodschoot’][‘doodsdozaak’][‘doodsstrijd’][‘doodstraf’][‘doodvonnis’]
[‘dorpsbevolking’][‘dorpsgemeenschap’][‘dranghekken’][‘drugshandel’]
[‘dystopian’][‘ecologist’][‘ecomonomical’][‘ecomonomies’][‘ecoterroristen’][‘education’]
[‘eenmansprotesten’][‘eenpartijstaat’][‘egalitaire’][‘egalitarian’][‘egalitarianism’]
[‘elected’][‘election’][‘elections’][‘electorate’][‘electorates’][‘emancipate’]
[‘emancipaties’][‘emancipating’][‘embassies’][‘embassy’][‘emigranten’]
[‘emigrantenkringen’][‘emigre’][‘emigrated’][‘emigration’][‘emissions’]
[‘energiepolitiek’][‘energiesector’][‘energietsaar’][‘environment’]
[‘environmentalism’][‘environmentalist’][‘environmentalists’][‘epidemic’]
[‘equality’][‘erdogan’][‘escape’][‘escaped’][‘espionage’][‘eurobashers’]
[‘eurolanden’][‘europa’][‘European’][‘Europeesgezinde’][‘eurozone’][‘evacuated’]
[‘evasion’][‘evictions’][‘evidence’][‘excommunicate’][‘execution’][‘extrajudicial’]
[‘extremelinkse’][‘extremisme’][‘extremisten’][‘extremistische’][‘extremists’]
[‘eyewitness’][‘eyewitnesses’][‘factieleiders’][‘famine’][‘famines’][‘fascism’]
[‘fascisme’][‘fascist’][‘fascisten’][‘fascistische’][‘fascists’][‘fatsoensnorm’]
[‘fatsoensnormen’][‘fawkesmaskers’][‘federal’][‘federally’][‘federatieraad’]
[‘federations’][‘femen’][‘feminine’][‘femininity’][‘feminism’][‘feminisme’]
[‘feminist’][‘feministe’][‘feministen’][‘feministes’][‘feministing’][‘feministisch’]
[‘feministische’][‘feminists’][‘femalisme’][‘ferguson’][‘fighting’][‘filmverbod’]
[‘firearms’][‘fiscal’][‘fiscals’][‘fitma’][‘flutaanklacht’][‘forbidding’]
[‘fotoprotestactie’][‘fracties’][‘freeaiweiwei’][‘freed’][‘freedom’][‘freedoms’]
[‘freepussyriot’][‘frontlines’][‘fugitive’][‘fundamentalism’][‘fundamentalist’]
[‘fundamentalistische’][‘fundamentalists’][‘fundamentals’][‘funerals’][‘g20’]
[‘gaddafi’][‘gadafi’][‘gangster’][‘gangstes’][‘gardisten’][‘gardistengroep’]
[‘gasprijzen’][‘gastarbeidermonument’][‘gastarbeidersmonument’][‘gay’]
['revolutionaries'] ['right'] ['rights'] ['riksdag'] ['riot'] ['romney'] ['roofcapitalisme'] ['roofmoord'] ['roofovervallen'] ['rushdie'] ['rusland'] ['ruslandkenner'] ['ruslandpartij'] ['ruslandveteraan'] ['rusia'] ['russian'] ['russiannes'] ['russias'] ['russification'] ['sabotaging'] ['salafis'] ['salafism'] ['salafisten'] ['samenlevingsmodel'] ['samenzwering'] ['samenzweringen'] ['samoetsevitsj'] ['samoetsjevitsj'] ['sanctie'] ['sanction'] ['santorum'] ['sarkozy'] ['satanisten'] ['satanists'] ['scandalized'] ['scapegoats'] ['schaduwparlement'] ['scheidingsmuur'] ['schendingen'] ['schieterij'] ['schuldbekentenis'] ['schulderverklaring'] ['secretary'] ['seculiere'] ['security'] ['sekse'] ['seksegelijkheid'] ['sekseongelijkheid'] ['seksistisch'] ['seksistische'] ['semitism'] ['semitisme'] ['senaat'] ['senate'] ['senator'] ['senators'] ['sentences'] ['separation'] ['separatisme'] ['separatist'] ['separatisten'] ['separatistische'] ['separatists'] ['sex'] ['sexism'] ['sexist'] ['sexistische'] ['sexuality'] ['sharia'] ['sharia4belgium'] ['show'] ['showprocessen'] ['showrechtbank'] ['siberian'] ['sjiiten'] ['skinheads'] ['slaat'] ['slacktivism'] ['slagwerkmuziek'] ['slave'] ['slavenarbeid'] ['slavernij'] ['slavery'] ['slechten'] ['sloppenwijken'] ['slotpleidooi'] ['smokkelroutes'] ['sniper'] ['snowden'] ['snowdens'] ['sochi'] ['socialise'] ['socialisme'] ['socialist'] ['socialistisch'] ['socialistische'] ['socialists'] ['socialization'] ['socialize'] ['societal'] ['society'] ['socioeconomic'] ['sociological'] ['sociopolitical'] ['soennieten'] ['soldaat'] ['soldier'] ['soldierds'] ['soldiered'] ['solidariteit'] ['sovereignty'] ['soviet'] ['sovjets'] ['sovjet'] ['sovjetachtig'] ['sovjetdictator'] ['sovjetgehalte'] ['sovjethouding'] ['sovjetkampen'] ['sovjetleider'] ['sovjetmodel'] ['sovjetperiode'] ['sovjetregime'] ['sovjetrepublieken'] ['sovjetterreur'] ['sovjetunie'] ['sovjetische'] ['spion'] ['spionage'] ['spionageactiviteiten'] ['spionageapparatuur'] ['spionnen'] ['spionnenfilm'] ['staats'] ['staatsacties'] ['staatsbedrijf'] ['staatsbedrijven'] ['staatsbestuur'] ['staatsburger'] ['staatscamera'] ['staatscensuur'] ['staatscommissie'] ['staatsdiensten'] ['staatsgevaarlijk'] ['staatsgevaarlijke'] ['staatsgrip'] ['staatshoofd'] ['staatsinstelling'] ['staatsjargon'] ['staatsjournaliste'] ['staatskrant'] ['staatsleiders'] ['staatsmacht'] ['staatsman'] ['staatsmonopolies'] ['staatsoliebedrijf'] ['staatsonderkomen'] ['staatsondermijrende'] ['staatsondermijning'] ['staatsondernemingen'] ['staatsorgaan'] ['staatspersbureau'] ['staatspropaganda'] ['staatssecretaris'] ['staatsstructuur'] ['staatsveiligheid'] ['staatsveiligheidsapparaat'] ['staatsveiligheidsdienst'] ['staatsvijand'] ['stafrecht'] ['stalin'] ['stalingra'] ['stalinist'] ['stalinistische'] ['stalinization'] ['stalins'] ['stance'] ['state'] ['stateloze'] ['statelozen'] ['statenloze'] ['staten'] ['states'] ['statesman'] ['stateswoman'] ['steekpartij'] ['steekpenningen'] ['stembusstraat'] ['stemgedrag'] ['stemberechtigde']
['stolen'][straatactivist][straatarme][straatartiest][straatdemonstraties]
['straatgevecht'][straatgevechten][straatprotest][straatprotesten][straatsburg'
'strafbare'][strafris][straftactie][straftactieorganisaties]
'straftak'][straftacties][straftploeg]
'strafarts'][straftakt][straftaktigheid'][straftaktoestand][straftakt[straftakvervolging][straftakwet][straftakzaken][straftakvrachtwagen][straftaken]
'subsidieslurper'][subsidies][subsidie]
'subsidies'][subsidiestelsel][subsidies][subsidies'][subsidies]
'sustainability'][sustained'][stwastika][sympolityk][syria'][syrian][syrisch][syrische][taakstraftak'][tahirplein][taliban][taxpayer][tegenbetogers][tegencultuur][teheran][teherans][tehran][terechtstaat]
'terreuraanslag'][terreuraanslagen][terreurcampagne][terreurdadend][terreurdeiging][terreurlijst][territory][terrorise]
'terroriseren'][terrorism][terrorisme][terrorist][terroriste][terroristisch]
'terroristische'][terrorists][testify'][thatcherian'][thatcherism][theft]
'theresa'][theif][thievry][threatening][tiananmenplein][tirannie]
'toeristenvism'][toeslagen][toga][topambtenaar][topambtenaren][torpedo]
'tory'][totalitaire'][totalitarianism][totalitarisme][traangas]
'trainingskamp'][traitor][tralies][transgendered][transgenderisme][transgressive][transmigration][transparency][transsексueel][transsексuellen][transsexual][treason][treaters][treaties][treinkaping]
'trespassers'][trespassing][trial][trials][tribunal][troeteldissident]
'troonopvolger][tsjernobyl][tsjetsjenieoe][tsunami][tunesiv'][tunesische][turkey'][turgije][tyranny][uitkeringen][uitleveringsverdrag]
'uitleveringsverzoek'][uitzetting][ukip][ukraine][ukraines][ukrainian]
'ukrainians'][ultraconservatifoe][ultraconservative][ultranationalist][ultranationalists][ultraorthodoxe][ultrarchtse][ultrasecularist]
'unconscious'][undersecretary][underwood][undiplomatic][uniform]
'uniformmen'][unilaterale][unparliamentary][vaderland][vaderlandsheide]
'vaderlandslevende'][vandalising][vandalism][vandalisme][vandals][vandalizing]
'veiligheids'][veiligheidsadviseur][veiligheidsagent][veiligheidsagenten]
Appendix D

Art dictionary

['academy'] ['actor'] ['album'] ['amusement'] ['anish'] ['antics'] ['art'] ['artfail'] ['artist'] ['artists'] ['artknowledge'] ['artkrushbanksy'] ['artmiami'] ['artpr'] ['arts'] ['artwork'] ['auction'] ['auctioning'] ['avatar'] ['awards'] ['baldwin'] ['band'] ['bands'] ['banksyart'] ['banksyfilm'] ['banksyism'] ['basquiat'] ['beastie'] ['beautifully'] ['bicycles'] ['bikes'] ['brainwash'] ['brand'] ['bristol'] ['buy'] ['canvas'] ['celebrity'] ['cinema'] ['cinemaesque'] ['cinemas'] ['classic'] ['collective'] ['colouring'] ['commission'] ['concert'] ['creation'] ['creativity'] ['culture'] ['culturebox'] ['dali'] ['damienhirst'] ['dannydevito'] ['designboom'] ['dicaprio'] ['diddy'] ['dismaland'] ['disney'] ['elephant'] ['emmys'] ['ending'] ['entertaining'] ['entertainment'] ['exhibit'] ['exhibition'] ['featuring'] ['festival'] ['feud'] ['film'] ['filmmaker'] ['films'] ['gaga'] ['gallery'] ['gangnam'] ['giftshop'] ['gorillaz'] ['graffiti'] ['graffitti'] ['guetta'] ['gwyneth'] ['hirshhon'] ['hollywood'] ['horses'] ['houseofcardssseason3'] ['iconic'] ['industrial'] ['installation'] ['installs'] ['jamesfrancotv'] ['kapoor'] ['katemoss'] ['ladygaga'] ['lennon'] ['logo'] ['lucienfreud'] ['madonna'] ['masterpiece'] ['matisse'] ['miami'] ['movie'] ['mrbrainwash'] ['mural'] ['museum'] ['museums'] ['music'] ['musicians'] ['netflix'] ['nominated'] ['nomination'] ['novel'] ['obeygiant'] ['original'] ['oscar'] ['oscars'] ['paint'] ['parody'] ['paulmccartney'] ['photographers'] ['portrait'] ['premiere'] ['punk'] ['realtalibkweli'] ['review'] ['rickygervais'] ['rock'] ['rocker'] ['rollingstone'] ['royalacademy'] ['russellcrowe'] ['salon'] ['salvador'] ['satire'] ['screening'] ['seeds'] ['sell'] ['selling'] ['sells'] ['serpente'] ['sheperd'] ['shephard'] ['simpsons'] ['singing'] ['sketchil'] ['slashfilm'] ['sold'] ['song'] ['spray'] ['stencil'] ['stenciling'] ['steveart'] ['streetart'] ['style'] ['sundance'] ['sundanceawards'] ['sunflower'] ['talented'] ['talibkweli'] ['tate'] ['theater'] ['therеalswizzz'] ['tupac'] ['tyrabanks'] ['ukulele'] ['unveiled'] ['unveils'] ['urbanart'] ['vase'] ['velvet'] ['visitbristol'] ['visual'] ['warhol'] ['warhol'] ['williamshatner']
Political dictionary

['abuse']['abused']['activism']['activist']['activists']['advocacy']['alcatrazisland']['alcatrazpenitentiary']['ambassador']['amnesty']['amnestyusa']['arrest']['arrested']['assange']['assembly']['attack']['authorities']['bail']['balaclava']['banishing']['berlusconi']['bloody']['bomber']['borders']['caged']['capitalism']['capitalist']['chamberlain']['charged']['charges']['church']['commercialism']['condemned']['condemns']['confession']['confined']['consulate']['controversies']['convicted']['conviction']['court']['criminal']['crisis']['customs']['death']['defense']['demonstrating']['demonstration']['denied']['deputy']['detained']['detention']['dissident']['district']['edward']['edwardsnowden']['election']['embassy']['environmental']['evidence']['fascist']['feds']['feminist']['fines']['forgiveness']['free']['freedom']['freeing']['freepussyriot']['gas']['gays']['gaza']['government']['greenpeace']['grounded']['guerilla']['guerrilla']['hacked']['heist']['hitchens']['homophobic']['hootiganism']['hospital']['hospitalized']['humanity']['identity']['imperial']['imprisoned']['injured']['internationalist']['jail']['jailed']['jailing']['judicials']['judge']['judges']['killing']['kingdom']['lawsuit']['lawyer']['liability']['marine']['masked']['mayor']['migrant']['minister']['mosque']['nation']['notantisemitic']['nypd']['onegreenplanet']['orthodox']['outrage']['outraged']['parliament']['parole']['passport']['peace']['persecution']['petition']['police']['political']['prayer']['prison']['prisoner']['propaganda']['protected']['protest']['protesting']['protests']['prove']['punished']['putin']['radical']['rape']['refugee']['refugees']['released']['renegade']['revolution']['rural']['scandal']['sentence']['sentences']['siberia']['siberian']['snowden']['society']['soros']['spies']['spying']['steal']['strike']['subversive']['support']['supporters']['supporting']['surveilling']['suspects']['syria']['syrian']['tax']['taxes']['templars']['theresa']['torture']['trail']['trial']['undercover']['vandal']['vandalism']['vandalized']['vandalizing']['verdict']['victim']['visa']['visas']['vladimir']['walmart']['washington']['west']['wikileaks']['withsyria']
SUMMARY IN ENGLISH

Throughout (Western) art history, the visual arts have developed into a distinctive and relatively autonomous societal sphere. As such, the visual arts are primarily governed by a hierarchy of artistic criteria and largely insensitive to criteria unrelated to the arts. More concretely, this means that recognized artists enjoy status on the basis of the artistic (rather than for example economic) value of their work, that is for a large part determined by intermediary art institutions and actors such as art museums, curators, galleries, dealers and critics. More recently, however, several scholars have pointed to social matters increasingly permeating the sphere of visual arts. This is even referred to as a social turn in the arts, in which social and ethical criteria are thought to play an increasingly important role in the evaluation of art. Socially engaged forms of art, such as art activism or artivism, are particularly indicative of this development.

If, however, artistic status today is still strongly rooted in autonomous artistic evaluation, then socially engaged artistic practices such as artivism present an interesting puzzle: they appear to follow their own logic, yet seek to achieve societal change through their focus on social engagement. This begs the question how practices such as artivism are evaluated and to what extent they have an impact and enjoy some degree of attention beyond the confines of the relatively autonomous sphere of visual art. The growing body of literature that has come to take shape around social engagement in the visual arts, however, remains incapable of fully explaining these questions for two reasons. First, social engagement in general, and notions such as artivism in particular, often remain problematically broad, ranging from artistic practices that are embedded in – and engage local communities to those that raise and fight against pressing global societal inequalities and human rights issues. Beyond conceptual considerations and anecdotal indications that social engagement is progressively pronounced in the arts, however, it remains unclear under which conditions artistic-activist expressions are accepted.
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Second, current empirical studies are primarily preoccupied with the role of social engagement within the arts and often overlook how and to what extent social engagement from visual artists travels beyond the confines of the art sphere. In the end, any form of social engagement requires two parties: one engaging and one being engaged. Few scholars systematically and empirically address the questions as to which types of socially engaged artistic practices achieve acceptance not just in the art sphere but in the broader society.

I have addressed both problems by conducting research into the reception of artivism within and beyond the arts through the following overarching research question:

*How are artivists evaluated within the fields of art, news media and social media in a cross-national context?*

In order to answer this research question, I have brought together literature from various disciplines. In the first chapter, therefore, I draw on art-historical literature to place social engagement in the arts more elaborately and concretely within an art-historical context. Combining this with sociology of culture literature, second, provides insight into how works of art are produced, consumed and distributed. I have approached the sphere of art as a historically developed field with its own logic and status markers and addressed the practices of classifying objects and actors within this field. This provided theoretical ground on which to study how artistic status is attributed and how distinctions within the arts are made in relation to artivism. Through literature from political sciences, third, I outlined how modes of artistic expression can function as avenues for social and political engagement. In combination with insights from media studies, finally, I theorized more concretely how news media and social media afford different ways of social and political engagement and how news and social media attention have become important for the question of societal impact with regards to the arts.
Empirically, I have conducted four interrelated studies which in the end will be integrated on the level of outcomes. In the first study (chapter 2), I analyzed the evaluation of social engagement in general and artivism in particular within the art field. More concretely, I conducted fifteen in-depth qualitative interviews with curators in the Netherlands, UK and US. The interviews are semi-structured and analyzed through a grounded theory approach to tap into the curators’ professional views on – and experiences with different forms and modes of social engagement within the arts. The analysis has shown that three different curatorial attitudes can be discerned with regards to social engagement in the arts. Aesthetics-first curators, first, do not necessarily verbalize a clear and explicit preference or rejection with regards to social engagement in any form, but give preference to aesthetic over social and ethical considerations in their own evaluation of art. Political curators, second, are much more vocal and pronounced in that they would maintain that art and social engagement are inseparable from each other and that art can bring change to society. Acquiescent curators, finally, express an optimistic attitude and willingness towards social engagement in the arts, while remaining reserved in their curatorial practices. It could be argued, therefore, that socially engaged art constitutes a distinct art movement or perhaps genre, roughly defined along the symbolic boundaries that especially the aesthetic and political curators draw.

In the second study (chapter 3), I looked at the newspaper coverage of artivists in terms of both content and magnitude. On the one hand, newspaper coverage plays an important role within the arts as art journalists and art critics, like curators, function as cultural intermediaries who select, evaluate and hence shape the perception of art. On the other hand, newspaper coverage plays an important role in politics as newspapers constitute a principle platform through which information about society is communicated and consumed. Newspaper coverage therefore constitutes a good measure of societal relevance in society when it comes to artivism. More concretely, in this study I conducted a computerized content analysis of over 2,000 newspaper articles from
both quality and popular newspapers from the Netherlands, the UK and the US. The analysis reveals that overall newspapers treat the art and activism of artivism quite separately, by focusing primarily on art in cultural newspaper sections and on politics in non-cultural newspaper sections. Furthermore, there are interesting national differences in that US newspapers are particularly politically oriented in their coverage of artivism. These findings are particularly indicative of how current research into social engagement in the arts take as their point of departure the art field and often overlook how the arts are perceived in the broader society.

In the third study (chapter 4), I analyzed the reception of artivists among the broader public by focusing on media audiences. For the last few years, social media platforms have come to constitute empirical windows to study audience reception on a relatively large scale. The content on social media platforms, therefore, provides insight into how people talk about social issues, such as politics and activism. In this study, therefore, I collected over two million tweets in order to analyze the media audience reception of the artivist cases on a relatively large scale. I employed the method of topic modelling to uncover the most dominant meaningful latent themes within this large dataset of short texts. Furthermore, I combined this topic modelling analysis with semantic network analysis to help visualize and interpret the results. The analysis indicates that media audiences are primarily interested in controversy surrounding artivism, for example in the case of artivist prosecution. The political causes of artivists therefore appear to enjoy little attention, limiting the societal impact of artivists.

In the fourth study (chapter 5), I investigated the extent in which popular culture celebrities engaged with the artivist cases that are central to this dissertation, including their causes. This is interesting because celebrities and their political engagement constitute an important avenue through which people in the broader society engage with pressing societal issues. This fourth study consists of a computerized content analysis of close to a thousand tweets by over three hundred popular
culture celebrities. I have found that the way celebrities talk about artivists differs per type of celebrity. In addition, the more political content celebrities cover in their tweets, the more audience engagement is visible through likes, retweets and replies. As such, celebrities indeed constitute an important avenue through which people in society engage in political discussions in general and with artivism in particular.

Finally, I have aimed to bring these four empirical studies together in chapter 6, by providing a general conclusion and by discussing possibilities for future research. The study of the reception of artivism particularly within the field of art, first, appears to point to the contours of a new artistic paradigm of representation in which artistic expression becomes a means to a more socially oriented goal. While art-historically, representation in the arts often pertained to the representation of societal elites, today representation is primarily visible in relation to underrepresented social groups. By giving a voice to the latter, inequalities in the broader society are expected to be tackled. Second, the selective news production and consumption in relation to artivism constitutes a filter and highlights how news media function as gatekeepers. While news media give considerable attention to some artivists in contrast to others, media audiences appear to largely ignore the activist causes of artivists. The puzzle of artivism, as an artistic practice that appears to follow a strictly artistic logic while seeking societal change, then, can be explained by pointing to how representation of the underrepresented constitutes an important social rather than artistic discourse within the arts. News media and media audience attention provide artivists with societal impact through a gatekeeping and filtering process whereby those who receive media coverage and audience attention see their activist causes largely ignored.
SUMMARY IN DUTCH


Wanneer, echter, artistieke status vandaag de dag nog sterk geworteld is in autonome artistieke evaluatie, dan vormen sociaal betrokken kunstvormen, zoals artivism, in interessante puzzel: ze lijken een eigen logica te volgen, maar zoeken tegelijkertijd maatschappelijke verandering door hun nadruk op sociale betrokkenheid. Dit roept de vraag op hoe dergelijke kunstvormen worden geëvalueerd en in hoeverre zij een impact hebben en aandacht genieten buiten de relatief autonome kunstwereld. Huidig onderzoek dat zich bezighoudt met de toenemende mate van sociale betrokkenheid in de kunst is echter niet goed in staat in dergelijke vragen te beantwoorden. Ten eerste blijven concepten zoals sociaal betrokken kunst in het algemeen en artivism meer specifiek vaak problematisch breed. Voorbij conceptuele overwegingen en anekdotische indicaties voor sociale betrokkenheid in de kunst, blijft het onduidelijk onder welke voorwaarden kunst-activistische expressies zoals artivism zijn geaccepteerd. Huidige empirische studies, ten tweede, houden zich vooral bezig met de rol van sociale betrokkenheid in de kunst en negeren vaak hoe en in hoeverre sociale betrokkenheid in de kunst buiten de kunstwereld wordt gezien. Uiteindelijk vereist sociale betrokkenheid altijd twee partijen: een partij die betrokken wil zijn en een partij die dient te worden betrokken. Weinig onderzoekers hebben zich
systematisch en empirisch gericht op de vraag welke vorm van sociaal betrokken kunst wordt geaccepteerd en gehoord buiten de kunstwereld in de bredere samenleving.

In dit proefschrift heb ik mij op de twee bovenstaande problemen gericht door onderzoek te doen naar de receptie van artivism binnen en buiten de kunstwereld middels de volgende onderzoeksvraag:

_Hoe wordt artivisme geëvalueerd in het veld van de kunst, van nieuwsmedia en van sociale media in een cross-nationale context?_

Om deze onderzoeksvraag te kunnen beantwoorden heb ik literatuur van verschillende disciplines samengebracht. In het eerste hoofdstuk pas ik daarom kunsthistorische literatuur toe om sociale betrokkenheid binnen de kunst meer concreet in een kunsthistorische context te plaatsen. Ten tweede heb ik gebruik gemaakt van cultuursociologische literatuur om inzichtelijk te maken hoe kunstwerken worden geproduceerd, geconsumeerd en gedistribueerd. Ik benader de kunstwereld als een historisch ontwikkeld veld met een eigen logica en eigen wijze waarop objecten en actoren worden geclassificeerd en geëvalueerd. Dit biedt een theoretische grondslag om te bestuderen hoe artistieke status wordt toegekend en hoe onderscheid wordt aangebracht binnen het kunstveld met betrekking tot artivism. Hierbij pas ik literatuur uit de politieke wetenschappen toe om uiteen te zetten hoe vormen van artistieke expressie en manier tot sociale en politieke betrokkenheid kunnen zijn. In combinatie met inzichten uit mediastudies, tot slot, heb ik uitgelegd hoe media en sociale media sociale betrokkenheid mogelijk maken en hoe nieuwsberichtgeving en sociale media-aandacht van belang zijn binnen het kunstveld om maatschappelijke impact te bereiken.

Op empirisch vlak heb ik vier studies uitgevoerd. In de eerste studie (hoofdstuk 2) heb ik de evaluatie van sociale betrokkenheid in het algemeen en artivism meer specifiek binnen het kunstveld geanalyseerd. Meer concreet heb ik in deze studie vijftien diepte-interviews afgenomen onder curatoren in Nederland, Engeland en de Verenigde Staten. Deze
interviews zijn geanalyseerd middels een grounded theory benadering om inzicht te verkrijgen in de professionele visie van curatoren op en hun ervaring met verschillende vormen van sociale betrokkenheid binnen de kunsten. De analyse toont aan dat er drie verschillende houdingen zijn te onderscheiden onder curatoren met betrekking tot sociale betrokkenheid. Esthetische curators, ten eerste, vertonen niet noodzakelijk een duidelijke en expliciete voorkeur of afkeur van sociale betrokkenheid in de kunst, maar geven wel voorkeur aan esthetische boven sociale en ethische criteria in hun beoordeling van kunst. Politieke curators, ten tweede, blijken meer uitgesproken in dat ze kunst en sociale betrokkenheid onafscheidelijk van elkaar zijn en dat kunst verandering in de bredere samenleving teweeg kan brengen. De welwillende curators, tot slot, vertonen een optimistische houding en bereidheid tot acceptatie jegens sociale betrokkenheid in de kunst, maar blijven enigszins terughoudend in hun eigen werkzaamheden als curator. Sociaal betrokken kunst lijkt daarom mogelijk een nieuwe kunstbeweging te vormen, grofweg gedefinieerd langs de symbolische grenzen die vooral esthetische en politieke curators trekken.

In de tweede studie (hoofdstuk 3) heb ik gekeken naar dagbladberichtgeving van activistische kunstenaars in termen van inhoud en mate. Aan de ene kant speelt dagbladberichtgeving een belangrijke rol binnen de kunst omdat kunstjournalisten en kunstcritici, net zoals curatoren, kunst selecteren en evalueren en daarom de perceptie van kunst mede vormgeven. Aan de andere kant speelt dagbladberichtgeving een belangrijke rol in politiek omdat kranten een belangrijk platform vormen waarmee informatie over de samenleving wordt gecommuniceerd en geconsumeerd. Via dagbladberichtgeving kan daarom de maatschappelijke relevantie in de bredere samenleving gemeten worden voor wat betreft artivism. Meer concreet houdt dat in dat ik in deze studie een geautomatiseerde inhoudsanalyse heb toegepast op meer dan 2,000 krantenartikelen van zowel kwaliteitskranten als populaire kranten uit Nederland, Engeland en de Verenigde Staten. De analyse heeft laten zien dat dagbladberichtgeving in het algemeen de
kunst en het activisme van artivism als gescheiden behandelt, door vooral in de culturele secties aandacht aan de kunst te geven en vooral in niet-culturele secties aandacht aan het activisme te geven. Daarnaast blijken er nationale verschillen zichtbaar daar waar vooral Amerikaanse kranten politiek georiënteerd blijken in hun berichtgeving over artivism. Deze bevindingen wijzen erop dat huidig onderzoek naar sociale betrokkenheid in de kunst de kunstwereld als vertrekpunt nemen en daarmee vaak de receptie binnen de bredere samenleving over het hoofd zien.

In de derde studie (hoofdstuk 4) heb ik de receptie van artivism geanalyseerd onder het bredere publiek in de samenleving. In de laatste jaren vormen sociale media een belangrijke bron van data om publieksreceptie op grote schaal te analyseren. De inhoud op sociale media geeft daarom inzicht in hoe mensen over bepaalde zaken praten, zoals politiek en activisme. In deze studie heb ik om die reden twee miljoen tweets verzameld om de publieksreceptie van artivism op grote schaal te analyseren. Hierbij heb ik de innovatie methode van topic modeling gebruikt om binnen de tekstuele data de meest dominante en betekenisvolle thema’s inzichtelijk te maken. Vervolgens heb ik deze methode gecombineerd met semantische netwerkanalyse om de resultaten beter te visualiseren en zodoende te kunnen interpreteren. Uit de analyse blijkt dat het bredere publiek vooral geïnteresseerd is in controverse rondom artivism, bijvoorbeeld in het geval van vervolging. De politieke doelen van activisten krijgen daarmee weinig aandacht, wat de maatschappelijke impact van activisten sterk beperkt.

In de vierde studie (hoofdstuk 5) heb ik onderzoek gedaan naar de mate waarin beroemdheden binnen de populaire cultuur aandacht hebben gegeven aan artivism. Dit is interessant omdat beroemdheden en hun politieke betrokkenheid een manier vormen waarmee het publiek in de bredere samenleving betrokken kan zijn bij urgente maatschappelijke problemen. Deze vierde studie bestaat uit een geautomatiseerde inhoudsanalyse van circa duizend tweets door ongeveer 300 beroemdheden. De analyse geeft aan dat de manier waarop
beroemdheden over artivists praten erg kan verschillen per type beroemheid. Daarnaast blijkt een sterkere nadruk op politieke inhoud binnen de tweets van beroemdheden leidt tot meer betrokkenheid onder het bredere publiek middels zogenaamde likes, retweets en replies. Zodoende vormen beroemdheden inderdaad een manier waarop het bredere publiek in het algemeen zich in politieke discussies kan mengen en meer specifiek betrokken kan zijn bij artivism.

Tot slot heb ik de bevindingen van de vier empirische studies bij elkaar gebracht (hoofdstuk 6), waarin ik een algemene conclusie geef en mogelijk toekomstig onderzoek bespreek. De studie naar de receptie van artivism in het kunstveld, ten eerste, lijkt te wijzen naar de contouren van een nieuw kunstparadigma van representatie waarbij artistieke expressie een belangrijk middel tot een meer sociaal georiënteerd doel lijkt te worden beschouwd. Waar vanuit kunsthistorisch perspectief heeft representatie vooral betrekking op maatschappelijke elites, is representatie vandaag vooral zichtbaar met betrekking op onderrgerepresenteerde sociale groepen. Door aan de laatste een stem te geven, wordt gepoogd om ongelijkheden binnen de bredere samenleving aan te pakken. De selectieve nieuwsproductie en -consumptie in relatie tot artivism, ten tweede, vormt een filter en toont hoe nieuwsmedia als poortwachters fungeren. De puzzel van artivism, als een artistieke praktijk dat grotendeels een eigen artistieke logica lijkt te volgen en tegelijkertijd maatschappelijke impact nastreeft, kan zodoende worden verklaard door te wijzen op hoe representatie een belangrijk sociaal in plaats van artistiek discours vormt binnen de kunst. Aandacht van nieuwsmedia en mediapubliek geven weliswaar maatschappelijke impact, maar deze wordt zodanig gefilterd dat de artivists die aandacht ontvangen hun activistische zaak grotendeels genegeerd zien worden.
ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Frank Weij (Rotterdam, 1987) holds a bachelor degree in arts and culture and in philosophy of science and finished his research master degree in sociology of culture, media and the arts at the Erasmus University Rotterdam, including an exchange for six months at Northwestern University in Chicago, US. He conducted his PhD research within the Department of Arts and Culture at the Erasmus University Rotterdam, while his research project was funded by the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO). During this period, he has furthermore taught several courses within the field of cultural sociology and published his research in several journals. Currently, Frank Weij is pursuing a career outside of academia as a data analyst.