

On Gender Statistics in the Art Field and Leading Positions in the International Sphere

Hassler, Katrin

Published in:
n.paradoxa

Publication date:
2017

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for pulished version (APA):
Hassler, K. (2017). On Gender Statistics in the Art Field and Leading Positions in the International Sphere. *n.paradoxa*, 39, 48-55. <https://www.ktpress.co.uk/nparadoxa-volume-details.asp?volumeid=39>


General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.


- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Whitechapel Gallery Guerrilla Girls Commission Is it even worse in Europe? (2016) Photos: Dan Weill. Courtesy of Whitechapel Gallery, London
Below: 'Little Chance to Advance?' (2016) published by the Katarzyna Kozyra Foundation <http://katarzynakozyrafoundation.pl/en/projects/research>. Front cover photo, courtesy of the National Digital Archives. Warsaw School of Fine Art 1919-1932, sculpture studio.
Elvis Richardson 'The Countess Report' (March 2016) Australia see <http://www.thecountessreport.com.au> – Drawing by Sadie Chandler.



On Gender Statistics in the Art Field and Leading Positions in the International Sphere

Katrin Hassler

Since the formation of the Guerrilla Girls, renowned for their posters and performances, which have pointed out gender inequality in the art world since 1985, there have been many different approaches to the issue of compiling statistics on gender and art. However, the challenges of counting gender in the arts, are not confined to posters and protest statements, like Micol Hebron's *A call for gender equity in the art*,¹ as there have been a number of partly scientific or semi-scientific studies conducted on these questions.² Maura Reilly's article 'Taking the Measure Of Sexism: Facts, Figures and Fixes' *ArtNews* (2015) for example, was based on statistics about representation of female artists at exhibitions and biennials. Despite mentioning positive signs of women's improved status and visibility in the art world, Maura Reilly reasons:

'The existence of a few superstars or token achievers – like Marina Abramovic, Tracey Emin, and Cindy Sherman – does not mean that women artists have achieved equality. The more closely one examines art-world statistics, the more glaringly obvious it becomes that, despite decades

of postcolonial, feminist, anti-racist, and queer activism and theorizing, the majority continues to be defined as white, Euro-American, heterosexual, privileged, and, above all, male. Sexism is still so insidiously woven into the institutional fabric, language, and logic of the mainstream art world that it often goes undetected.'³

The Guerrilla Girls exhibition reaches a similar conclusion, reflecting on whether **'It's even worse in Europe'** at the Whitechapel Art Gallery (2016-2017) in a new survey of 383 public museums and galleries where less than ¼ responded with information about any gender analysis of their collections.

The relationship between the situation of women artists' representation and those of women gallerists or museum directors requires closer consideration as there is a difference between art producers and art mediators. A recent US study 'The Gender Gap in Art Museum Directorships' (2014) conducted by the Association of Art Museum Directors (AAMD) not only indicates that female art museum directors earn substantially less than

their male counterparts, but also proves that top positions are most often filled by men. Women ran 32.0% of US museums in 2005 and by 2014 they occupied at least 42.6% of the leading positions as Directors, although they were clustered in institutions with the smallest operating budgets of the Associations' membership.⁴

Despite the existence of studies measuring gender positions in the art field, many different issues arise in the discussions around such statistics because few take place in a transdisciplinary setting insofar as academics as well as agents of the art field and not least politicians or policy advisers are involved.⁵ This discourse debating gender in the art sphere on a statistical level can be recognized as a rather marginal one, often shaped by a lack of acceptance of the findings. An example of reservations from the curators is presented by Katy Deepwell:

'When I and another speaker presented the levels of representation of women artists, this provoked a very negative response from the audience, but especially from several young curators present. The implication of their criticism was that figures about the proportion of male to female artists in exhibitions or in society are not relevant and to cite or use them, was not just inadequate, but even not permissible.'⁶

Beneath individual aversions, this quote bespeaks an attitude rooted in the (hyper-) idealistic, constructivist and individualistic traditions of the field, which is apparent on the practical as well as the academic side. Given the importance of differentiating between idiographic (particularity of a specific case) and nomothetic (general trends or "laws") approaches as a basis,⁷ the methodological foci of the academic disciplines predominantly concerned with the topic of gender in the arts – such as art history and partly gender studies – are principally associated with the former and this proves to be one reason why insufficient data about gender relations in the art field has been gathered or analysed, when compared to other economic or academic spheres and especially concerning the international level discussed below. In addition, art history continues to be based on case studies of artists, movements and periods as well as national frameworks or studies of theories of visual representation. Although more recent trends towards studies with quantitative designs in liaison with digital humanities can be discerned in art history, these again rarely concern gender in their analyses. Benjamin

Zweig has pointed to the delayed integration of digital instruments into this discipline compared to archaeology or literary studies in his text 'Forgotten Genealogies: Brief Reflections on the History of Digital Art History'.⁸ At the same time, he conceives quantitative designs as offering a challenge as well as an addendum to the art historical set of methods: **'As the foundation for methods such as topic modelling and data mining, the quantitative analysis of art historical data can be both a challenge and a complement to the case-study model of practice.'**⁹

Additionally, the limited amount of data and the relatively small field concerning the art sphere and particularly its subfield of visual arts (in a way that lends itself to secondary analysis) can be regarded as a result of its intrinsic opacity alongside its frequently informal occupational profiles and training pathways. Elisabeth Mayerhöfer points out the deficiencies of periodic evaluations such as the micro-census or national statistics, which gather an aggregated field because they find it impossible to distinguish the art/cultural labour market in a strict sense from labour markets in a broader sense, let alone pinpoint the distinct economics of the field of visual arts.¹⁰ Furthermore, a politically mandated **"gender-blindness"** in the official statistics about the arts as an employment field can be ascertained, at least in Germany and Switzerland (while in Austria and the UK it applies to some extent) – in which, astonishingly, recently issued creative economy reports on the art market in Germany do not take gender aspects into consideration at all.¹¹ This is in spite of the fact that the European Union has since the late 1990s argued for gender-mainstreaming and monitoring attention to be given to women in leadership and management as its official policy.¹² Jim McGuigan argues this accentuates consolidations on the part of cultural (and not only social) politics concerning questions of gender equity made during the 1940s in the realm of the Marshall Plan.¹³

Existing studies usually conduct their surveys on a local or national state level and here another issue arises because of the lack of statistical insights at an international level.¹⁴ Again, how vertical, as opposed to horizontal, discrimination through various segments of the arts operate is rarely considered. This data gap might be met by the recently intensified debates around **"creative industries"**, **"creative class"** and **"creative economy"** at

a global level – but only if gender aspects are taken into consideration as part of the model of analysing how these labour markets operate.¹⁵ Astonishingly, the numerous art sociological analyses concerning the centre of the art field in its global positioning since 2000 – not least from Diana Crane (2002)¹⁶, Alain Quemin (2002),¹⁷ Heike Munder/Ulf Wuggenig (2012)¹⁹ and Larissa Buchholz (2013)¹⁸ – hardly consider gender in their discourse. Among the few exceptions, two studies stand out: a currently unpublished [2000] survey by Gudrun Quenzel, submitting substantial results on the rankings of top 100 artists²⁰ and a 2013 study conducted by Alain Quemin, analysing the stars of contemporary art by use of diverse rankings. In one chapter of his book, he considered the influence of gender on renown in the international sphere.²¹

The following will provide an example of a “*gender-mapping*” on an international top level – an excerpt from my PhD research – using samples of different agent groups, such as artists (n=2612), directors (n=186) and gallerists (n=251). These numbers and the hierarchy explored were based on analysing the rankings given in Artfacts.Net, the *Kunstkompass* and the ranking of art galleries published by the art magazine *Artinvestor* – but not without critically discussing how such ranking instruments operate and why these are presumed to be the leading segment.²² Thus, the data presented here is part of a broader project evaluating gender gaps in different research areas, and this includes diachronic developments, patterns in accordance with geographical provenance of the agents, as well as issues of economic capital. In addition to frequency analyses, other instruments of data-mapping such as scatter diagrams and regression analyses have been used.²³ The compilation of this kind of analysis I argue enables us not only to visualize effectively the share of female agents in this specific field or effects of gender on gaining symbolic or economic capital and to disclose how gender is related to the measurement of vertical and horizontal discrimination in this labour market; but also allows to compare tendencies between different spheres in terms of the gender gap, such as those in the general economy and how these are evaluated and assessed in academic studies. By these means, recurring assertions that the art field is one which now favours women and where equality has been reached²⁴ can be confronted with data that are factually capable of accenting the paradox

Rank	Women artists % of total
1-100	12.6
101-500	20.4
501-2500	27.0

Table 1: Three levels of exclusion at the symbolic pole of the international top region of the art field by gender.
(Source: ArtFacts.Net, April 2010)

Rank	Artists nos. in rank	Women artists %
Top 10	10	10
Top 50	52	7.7
Top 100	103	12.6
Top 500	514	18.9
Top 1000	1037	22.9
Top 1500	1552	24.4
Top 2000	2079	24.9
Top 2500	2612	25.4

Table 2: Leading female artists at the international top level by rank (as symbolic capital) (Source: ArtFacts.Net April 2010)
In case of multiple positionings of ranks (because of artist couples or groups/collectives) each artist is included in the valuation.

of this particular gender gap. Likewise, the study as well as the data collection presented below constitute a plea for stronger reflection and integration of quantitative designs in the current gender and art research landscape, to question methodological prejudices and to open up to mixed-methods research.

As the analysis of the data shows, the level of the top 100 artists, data also questioned by Alain Quemin and Gudrun Quenzel, appears to be characterised by a far stronger gender inequality (with regard to appointment to top positions) than is the case for a more exhaustive analysis of the leading 2500 positions. This is of particular interest, as data extending beyond the top 100 level was not taken into account until now. My research suggests to divide the examined field into the three levels given in table 1. The data show a relatively strong gender gap in the top 100 artists; where about 12.6 % of the artists listed here are female. In the second level, including the positions 101 to 500 of Artfacts.Net there is an increase

	Artists (all) no.	Women Artists %	Museum Directors (all) no.	Women Directors %	Gallerists (all) no.	Women Gallerists %
Top 10	10	10.0	10	10.0	11	27.3
Top 50	52	7.7	-	-	62	32.3
Top 100	103	12.6	-	-	129	37.2
Top 200	206	18.0	186	32.4	251	39.8

Table 3: Share of women in different professional groups of the international top field.
The data are based on different sources: Artists according to ArtFacts.Net (April, 2010), museum directors according to Kunstkompass (2009), gallerists according to Artinvestor Galerien Ranking (2008). The directors are categorized into two groups by the editors of the Ranking: Rank 1: ten leading museums, Rank 2: all other museums listed. No values exist for the Top 50 and Top 100 positions. The gallerists and artists show multiple positionings of ranks (e.g. artist duos/groups) and values vary for the different agent categories.

in the number of women to 20.4%, and in the third level, the proportion women artists comprise around 27.0%. A more detailed division given in table 2 reveals the share of women artists at 7.7% for the top 50 and 12.6% overall for the top 100 positions. The proportion of women artists rises as a percentage of the top 500 ranks and the top 1000, ending at 25.4% for the top 2500. The gender gap shows women “*clustering at the bottom*”, which is a well-known trait for women within male-dominated professions. However, it has to be taken into account that the “*bottom*” in question still concerns an international top level and the share of female professionals appears from this perspective comparatively high, as shown below. Nevertheless it becomes clear that women are lagging behind, even in the top positions. The argument brought forward by the art critic Brian Boucher that ‘*girls run the world. That’s arguably especially true in the art world*’.²⁵ does not appear to have any basis in fact in terms of their role as artists in international rankings. In contrast, a more appropriate and differentiated position held by the sociologist Pierre Bourdieu within his gender analysis *Masculine Domination* declares that the cultural sector is one of the few professional areas where women can occupy leading positions. Bourdieu describes women as responsible agents for the conversion of economic capital into symbolic capital within the domestic unit, leading to the conclusion that the professional emancipation of women, among others in the cultural field, can be seen as a simple extension of the traditional female role – even securing the submission of women to this domination.²⁶ This perspective becomes evident

when contrasting the aforementioned results based on the Artfacts.Net ranking with data concerning the economic field, based on Catalyst.org.²⁷ Due to the difference between their chosen indicators, no direct comparison of the data can be made; nevertheless the results point out a tendency according to which gender inequality in the art sphere is relatively moderate in relation to the economic field – at least at an international level at executive or senior management roles. To name just two examples: in 2014, women held 5% of the Fortune 500 and 5.3% of the Fortune 1000 positions as chief executive officers.²⁸ Table 3 shows that this situation of discrimination does not only apply to artists but also to other agents of the art sphere, such as directors of leading museums and galleries. According to this, female gallerists display a share of approximately 40.0% women in the top 200 positions; the directors show 32.4% whereas female artists occupy 18%. In addition the data reveal a differentiation between the professions of art production and art mediation with the former showing a much stronger asymmetrical distribution of gender than the latter. This comparison also indicates an exceptionally high visibility of female gallerists, also apparent when measured by assessments of the top 10 in which women form slightly more than a quarter (27.3%) of those listed. For both groups, artists as well as museum directors, only 1 in 10 of the listed agents are female at this absolute peak. Looking at the Top 50 and Top 100 rankings, artists and gallerists clearly differ in the percentages of women when compared to men (no specifications can be made for the museum directors): only 7.7% of the top

50 positions are occupied by female artists while female gallerists make up 32.3% of their top 50 rankings. While the proportion of women at the top 100 level show 12.6% for artists and 37.2% for gallerists. A change is becoming apparent for both artists and museum directors leading to a stronger inclusion of women in the younger age cohorts. For gallerists, an analogous transformation cannot be discerned: rather, the professional group shows a largely balanced gender representation even for the older cohorts, whereas for galleries founded in the 1980s and later the figures indicate a considerable asymmetry in favour of the male agents. In galleries founded between the years 1990 and 1999, 12.4% of the leading positions were occupied by women.²⁹

An explanation for the differentiation between productive and mediating positions can be found in the conceptualization of artistry and its persistent, mythical and naturalized topoi of the male genius.³⁰ Interestingly, despite the claims about the **‘disappearance of the author’**, the **‘blurring of the boundaries between art and life’** and the **‘reformulation of the concept of artistic work’** that have been taking place for forty years,³¹ the consistency of mythical characterisations in which creative excellence is based in individual, male genius remain visible in the data presented. The issue raised here of why more women enter and sustain careers in the mediation side of the field – especially as professional gallerists – can be further elucidated by taking a closer look at some historical and even literary figures, also observed by Pierre Bourdieu in *The Rules of Art*. However, the sociologist didn’t explicitly determine aspects of gender in his field analyses. Princess Mathilde Bonaparte (1820-1904) is an example from nineteenth century Paris who acted as a prominent mediator in artistic fields – a protector as well as patron of the arts – and invested her fairly high social and economic capital for these purposes. She endeavoured to acquire benefits and protection for her friends, such as the Légion d’honneur for Flaubert or the prize of the Académie Française for George Sand.³² Her inherited capital allowed her to adopt a (powerful) position of public influence (particularly on cultural issues), which remained barred to other women, including those of the bourgeoisie, at the time, who also held salons. While Bourdieu describes their activities and influence as genuine articulations between the fields of art,³³ he points to how only very few women had limited and relative influence on symbolic production,

through their salons. Referring to Flaubert’s *Sentimental Education* he singled out those run by Madame Arnoux and Madame Dambreuse.³⁴ Jens Kastner depicts these bourgeois institutions furthermore as providing a singular opportunity to take up a (semi-)public function for women by presenting artists and *litterati* (almost always male) as well as introducing them to each other.³⁵ The salons can be declared spaces of opportunity for these women, giving them the ability to receive (semi-)official recognition in the nineteenth century; albeit the space remains restricted to the cultural field. These models are an example of how women experienced relative inclusion in the cultural and social field (in relation to their social status), accompanied by an exclusion from political and economic power positions, as Bourdieu consistently shows in his descriptions of the field of power.³⁶ This structure of dominance continues to exist today albeit in a more moderate form and its influence becomes partly visible in the data given above. Even if women still occupy less frequently powerful positions in the art field than their male counterparts – looking at artists, museum directors and gallerists in equal measure – they acquire a relative inclusion in this sphere in comparison to the economic field. The particularly high share of female gallerists can be explained insofar as it concerns an occupation, known for its relative opacity and informality, neither requiring a set career track nor a specific academic education;³⁷ instead, becoming a gallerist demands a high level of capital (e.g. economic and social) and therefore seems in particular to be a continuation and professionalisation of the practice formerly performed by the salonnières.³⁸ The evident disposition of women in the art field – or even the concessions made to female agents with regard to professionalisation as well as the opening up of leading positions in this social sphere – can also be seen as a matter of dominance on the macro-level of the **‘social room’** (Bourdieu). For, this inclusion coexists with an exclusion from the centres of power (at the economic pole) and the women agents are thereby positioned as dominated dominants. This is why the dominance of women in the art field is both relative and ultimately paradoxical; and the gender representation within the field for mediating gallerists and directors needs to be contrasted with the idea of genius artistic creators.

In conclusion, these examples also show how the use of quantitatively oriented designs combined with theoretical

considerations contributes to clarifying assumptions and “pretty speeches” about gender effects in the art field. These methods enable the presentation of concrete facts and figures to provide new inputs and impulses for the gender-art discourse – an approach, which calls for not only further and even interdisciplinary intensifications (by integrating art-historical and sociological approaches as well as aspects of gender studies even-handedly) but also for a stronger organisation and recognition of the patterns and shifts within the gender and art research landscape.

Notes

1. See <http://gallerytally.tumblr.com> [October 6th, 2016]. Hebron began her ‘(en)Gendered (in)Equity: Gallery Tally Project’ in 2013, putting out a call for contributions via social media. Artists conceived new posters representing the gender ratio on a certain gallery’s roster.
2. See the studies alisted on n.paradoxa: <http://www.ktpress.co.uk/feminist-art-statistics.asp> [10 October 2016]. For further reading see also the compendium in Katrin Hassler ‘Das Paradox der Geschlechterdichotomie. Eine empirische Studie zur Bedeutung von Geschlecht für die Einnahme von Spitzenpositionen im Kunstfeld’ (PhD diss., Luneburg, Leuphana University, 2016) pp. 26-88
3. Maura Reilly ‘Taking the Measure Of Sexism: Facts, Figures and Fixes’ in *ArtNews* (25 May 2015)
4. Anne Marie Gan, Zannie Giraud Voss et al. ‘The Gender Gap in Art Museum Directorships’ (New York, 7 March 2014) <https://aamd.org/standards-and-practices> [Last Accessed, 6 November 2016]
5. Studies of the different agent groups can be distinguished according to their objectives. Whilst surveys of a political origin most frequently issue recommendations for actions (e.g. Danielle Cliche, Ritva Mitchell, Andreas Joh. Weisand *Pyramid or Pillars: Unveiling the Status of Women in Arts and Media Professions in Europe* (Bonn, 2001); Jens Leberl, Gabriele Schulz *Frauen in Kunst und Kultur II, 1995-2000, Partizipation von Frauen an den Kulturinstitutionen und an der Künstlerinnen- und Künstlerförderung der Bundesländer* (Berlin, 2003)); academic approaches often focus on revealing (general) structures and are more frequently based on a theoretical foundation such as distinct statistical models (e.g. Marita Flisbäck ‘Creating a Life: The Role of Symbolic and Economic Structures in the Gender Dynamics of Swedish Artists’ *International Journal of Cultural Policy*, Vol. 19, no. 4 (2012) pp. 462-480 or Jukka Savolainen ‘Style Matters: Explaining the gender gap in the Price of paintings’ *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Geschichtswissenschaften*, 17 Jg. Heft 2&3 (2006) pp. 83-97). Artistic approaches (e.g. The Guerrilla Girls, Micol Hebron)

often concentrate on a protest level, although continuous transitions can be recognized between the three groups.

6. Katy Deepwell ‘Equal but different: questions about rights, statistics and feminist strategies for change’ in *FKW/Zeitschrift für Geschlechterforschung und Visuelle Kultur* Vol. 47 (2009) p.10
7. Regarding the distinction between nomothetic and idiographic approaches see e.g. Earl Babbie ‘The Practice of Social Research’ (Boston, 2014) pp. 23 and pp. 93
8. See Benjamin Zweig ‘Forgotten Genealogies: Brief Reflections on the History of Digital Art History’ *DAH-Journal* Issue 1 (2015) p. 40
9. Ibid p. 46
10. Elisabeth Mayerhöfer ‘Ungenützte Chancen: Gender Mainstreaming im Kunstbereich’ *Österreichische Zeitschrift für Politikwissenschaft (ÖZP)* 35 Jg. Heft.3 (2006) p. 276
11. See Irene Bertschek, Jörg Ohnemus et al. (ed.) ‘Monitoring zu ausgewählten wirtschaftlichen Eckdaten der Kultur- und Kreativwirtschaft 2013’ (Berlin: Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, 2014) and id. et al. (ed.) ‘Monitoring zu ausgewählten wirtschaftlichen Eckdaten der Kultur- und Kreativwirtschaft 2014. Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie’ (Berlin: Bundesministerium für Wirtschaft und Energie, 2015) omit gender unlike other relatively strong political interest concerning this matter in economics and science (see e.g. Statistisches Bundesamt ‘Auf dem Weg zur Gleichstellung? Bildung, Arbeit und Soziales – Unterschiede zwischen Frauen und Männern’ (Wiesbaden, 2014) and Johanna Mischke, Christian Wingerter ‘Frauen und Männer Auf dem Arbeitsmarkt. Deutschland und Europa’ (Wiesbaden, 2012). This gap urgently requires closure.
12. See Cliche/Mitchell/Weisand *Pyramid or Pillars* (2001)
13. See Jim McGuigan *Rethinking cultural policy* (Maidenhead, 2004) p. 33
14. See for example the Katarzyna Kozyra Foundation report ‘Little Chance to Advance? An Enquiry into the Presence of Women at Art Academies in Poland’ (2016) <http://katarzynakozyrafoundation.pl/en/projects/research> [November 10th, 2016] Elvis Richardson ‘The Countess Report’ (2016) <http://www.thecountessreport.com.au/The%20Countess%20Report.FINAL.pdf> [15 November 2016] as well as Susanne Schelepa, Peter Wetzel et al. (ed.) ‘Zur sozialen Lage der Künstler und Künstlerinnen in Österreich. Endbericht’ (2008), http://www.bmukk.gv.at/medienpool/17401/studie_soz_lage_kuenstler_en.pdf [8 March 2010]; Annette Brinkmann, Andreas Joh. Weisand ‘Frauen im Kultur- und Medienbetrieb III. Fakten zu Berufssituation und Qualifizierung, 2. Report für das Bundesministerium für Bildung, Wissenschaft, Forschung und Technologie’ (Bonn, 2001) or Bonnie Nichols ‘Women Artists: 1990-2005’ NEA Research Note #96 (Dec. 2008)
15. See for instance the following reports: UNESCO ‘Re|Shaping Cultural Policies’ (Paris, 2015); United Nations, UNDP, UNESCO ‘Creative Economy Report 2013’ (New York, 2013)

16. Diana Crane 'Culture and Globalization. Theoretical Models and Emerging Trends' in D. Crane (ed.) *Global Culture. Media, Arts, Policy, and Globalization* (New York/London, 2002) pp. 1-28
17. Alain Quemin *L'art contemporain international: entre les institutions et le marché (Le rapport disparu)* (Nîmes, 2002)
18. Larissa Buchholz 'The Global Rules of Art' (PhD diss., New York: Columbia University, 2013)
19. Heike Munder/Ulf Wuggenig (ed.) *Das Kunstfeld: Eine Studie über Akteure und Institutionen der zeitgenössischen Kunst* [The art field: A study of actors and institutions in contemporary art] (Zurich, 2012)
20. Gudrun Quenzel 'Inklusion und Exklusion im Kunstfeld. Prozesse geschlechtsspezifischer sozialer Schliessung' (Magisterarbeit, Luneburg: Luneburg University, 2000, unpublished).
21. See Alain Quemin *Les stars de l'art contemporain. Notoriété et consécration artistiques dans les arts visuels* (Paris, 2013)
22. See Hassler (2016), pp. 196-203 and 220-223. The database Artfacts. Net [<http://www.artfacts.net>] is one of the largest of its kind; it contains no fewer than 100,000 ranked artists. Using econometrical methods, the ranking system aims to arrange artists by their exhibition success. The tool evaluates exhibitions held on an international level since 1996 and pays homage to the so-called economy of attention. The Kunstkompass has computed the '100 most famous living artists in the world' since 1970. These were published in business magazines for forty-five years until it migrated to a focused art magazine *Weltkunst* in 2015. According to Linde Rohr-Bongard (who has been involved in its production since 1971), the ranking does not aim at measuring the quality of art or an individual artist, only "fame" measured through presence in exhibitions, prizes and media/publications (See Paul Buckermann 'Back from Business. On Commensuration, Construction, and Communication of a Global Art World in the Ranking Kunstkompass' *KAPSULA* 1: 2016 (Toronto, 2016) pp. 12-18). The ranking of art galleries was published by the art magazine *Artinvestor* in the year 2008. Galleries are ranked according to their participation at important international art fairs, in particular Fiac, Frieze, Art Basel, Art Basel Miami Beach, Art Forum Berlin and Art Cologne from the year 2002 to 2007. The magazine ceased publication in 2014 and was replaced by *Artcollector* in 2015. Rankings such as the three stated here are regarded differently and critically by social scientists: Kunstkompass is said to attach a national bias to Germany, which demands special attention in secondary analyses (see Ulf Wuggenig 'Kunstzentren und Kunstmarktzentren: Paris, Wien, Zürich und Hamburg' in Wuggenig/Munder (2012) pp. 63-86 or Alain Quemin 'Globalization and Mixing in the Visual Arts: An Empirical Survey of "High Culture" and Globalization' *International Sociology* 2006: 21 pp. 522 – 550).
23. See Hassler (2016)
24. 'The common refrain that "women are treated equally in the art world now" needs to be challenged.' Reilly (2015)
25. Brian Boucher '25 Women Curators Shaking Things Up' *ArtnetNews* (17 March 2015). Also the reference to "girls" suggests a rather limited ability of gender-theoretical reflection.
26. See Pierre Bourdieu *Masculine Domination* (Stanford, 2001) p. 101
27. Catalyst is a leading non-profit organization with a mission to accelerate progress for women through workplace inclusion. In 1984 Catalyst initiated their annual census of women on boards of Fortune 500 companies; in 1993 they began publishing their annual study and have done so every year since (see Mary Elizabeth Gross 'Experiences of Women Directors of U.S. Corporations. An Exploratory Study of the Experiences of Women Directors of U.S. Public Corporation Boards of Directors' (PhD diss., Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, 2015), pp. 1. Further figures and discussion in Hassler (2016)
28. The analysis is based on the leading stock market oriented businesses (<http://www.catalyst.org/knowledge/women-ceos-fortune-1000> [October 10th, 2016]. See also, Hassler (2016).
29. Detailed tables concerning this matter are shown in Hassler (2016).
30. e.g. Beatrice von Bismarck *Auftritt als Künstler – Funktionen eines Mythos* (Köln, 2010) p. 8 or Linda Nochlin 'Why Have There Been No Great Women Artists?' in *ArtNews* 69 (1971) pp. 22-39 and 67-71.
31. See for example von Bismarck (2010) p. 8.
32. Pierre Bourdieu *The rules of art* (Stanford, 1996), pp. 51
33. Ibid p. 51
34. Ibid, for further explanations concerning the role of these salons from a gender perspective see Hassler, 2016, pp. 174 -192
35. Jens Kastner *Die ästhetische Disposition. Eine Einführung in die Kunsttheorie Pierre Bourdieus* (Vienna, 2009) p. 60
36. See Bourdieu (1996). For an analysis of these power structures and a discussion of the gender dimension see Hassler (2016) pp. 174-192
37. An analysis of the educational training of the listed gallerists, directors and artists shows that the latter two groups of agents pursued a rather appropriate educational and career trajectory. Directors in particular are distinguished by a high and specific educational capital: 30.1 % hold a doctorate in art history, another 29.6% earned a university degree in this discipline; 26.4% have a tertiary education in humanities or architecture (of these 7% with a PhD). Only 2.7% do not have an academic qualification (see Hassler (2016) pp. 312)
38. Examples include Peggy Guggenheim (1889-1979) or Ileana Sonnabend (1914-2007). Bourdieu states: 'The history which I have tried to reconstruct in its most decisive phases by using a series of synchronic slices leads to the establishment of this world apart – the artistic field or the literary field we know today.' (Bourdieu, 1996) p. 141. See also, Beate Söntgen 'Den Rahmen wechseln. Von der Kunstgeschichte zur feministischen Kulturwissenschaft' in her (ed) *Rahmenwechsel. Kunstgeschichte als feministische Kulturwissenschaft* (Berlin, 1996) p. 9