



HAL
open science

WHEN CELEBRITY DESTROYS ARTISTIC REPUTATION: THE CASE OF FRENCH ARCHITECTS

Amélie Boutinot, Vincent Mangematin, Iragaël Joly

► **To cite this version:**

Amélie Boutinot, Vincent Mangematin, Iragaël Joly. WHEN CELEBRITY DESTROYS ARTISTIC REPUTATION: THE CASE OF FRENCH ARCHITECTS. EGOS - 2010 Colloquium, 2010, Lisbonne, Portugal. hal-00526511

HAL Id: hal-00526511

<http://hal.grenoble-em.com/hal-00526511>

Submitted on 14 Oct 2010

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

WHEN CELEBRITY DESTROYS ARTISTIC REPUTATION: THE CASE OF FRENCH ARCHITECTS

Amélie BOUTINOT^{1*}

Vincent MANGEMATIN²

Iragael JOLY³

ABSTRACT

This paper suggests understanding better the debate between reputation and celebrity, by analyzing how various types of reputations can combine (or not) to achieve celebrity. Based on a quantitative analysis of the most reputed French architects, we contribute to the reputation and celebrity literatures.

Keywords: Reputation; Celebrity; Stakeholders; Creative sector; Architecture

¹ * Corresponding author. PhD candidate at GAEL, 1221 rue des Résidences, 38400 Saint Martin d'Hères, France, ameliéboutinot@gmail.com

² Grenoble Ecole de Management, 12 rue Pierre Sémard, 38000 Grenoble, France, vincent.mangematin@grenoble-em.com

³ GAEL, 1221 rue des Résidences, 38400 Saint Martin d'Hères, France, ijoly.research@gmail.com

INTRODUCTION

"Al" Capone was an American gangster who led a Prohibition-era crime syndicate, dedicated to smuggling and bootlegging liquor and other illegal activities, in Chicago, from the early 1920s to 1931. His bad reputation of cruelty made him famous. At the opposite, Elliot Ness was an American Prohibition agent, famous for his efforts to enforce Prohibition in Chicago, famous for leading the legendary team of The Untouchables. His positive reputation became celebrity when he put Al Capone in jail.

Celebrity and reputation are not synonymous. Reputation is a general impression which represents how an organization or individual is perceived by a collective (Fombrun, 1996; Fombrun and Shanley, 1990). Al Capone started as street racketeer in New York and his reputation of "professionalism" grew amongst the gangsters. To help his mentor, he killed five persons. This action established his reputation in the Chicago crime scene. When he took the lead of the crime syndicate, his reputation spread out in different audiences, including the police and the media, and he became famous. Celebrity here refers to an individual whose name "*has attention-getting and interest-riveting*" (Rein, Kottler and Stoller, 1987:15). In this Al Capone case, reputation led to celebrity that even survived Al Capone's and all of the protagonists' death.

But do reputation and celebrity always go hand with hand? To what extent does reputation nurture celebrity? Which are the strategies to transform reputation among peers into celebrity?

Such questions have been explored by management scholars. Reputation, as a general perception by a collective (Fombrun, 1996; Fombrun and Shanley, 1990), is established thanks to signals and symbols (Rao, 1994) that will be distinct for each collective (Fombrun, Gardberg and Sever, 2000; Fombrun and Shanley, 1990; Deephouse, 2000). Applied to creative sectors, the artists' reputation refers to the esteem of others in the same "art world", who base their opinion on artistic signals (Becker, 1988). There is more debate about celebrity and its construction. Rindova et al. (2006) refer to it as a high level of large scale public attention and positive emotional responses established by mass media. In celebrity lies two contrasting perspectives (Gamson, 1994): it can be considered as deserved (determined by proofs of talent) or unearned (without sufficient evidence to suggest quality of outcomes); connecting reputation and celebrity thus appears as a challenge.

With the growing knowledge economy, when the quality of services is difficult to assess, reputation and celebrity appear as two ways to identify the relevant providers, collaborators or partners. To analyze the mechanisms to build respectively reputation and celebrity, we conducted a quantitative analysis of the most reputed French architects. We suggest complementing research about reputation and celebrity by determining how reputations are built within different stakeholders and exploring how reputations are combined to enhance (or not) celebrity.

We highlight two results we found especially interesting. First, we learn that each type of reputation is not determined by one distinct type of signals. Especially for artistic reputation, that is supposed to be based on artistic outcomes, our results show that it is formed thanks to a variety of signals such as trust and visibility signals. This research can help us question the uniqueness of signals related to the construction of each reputation, and breaking the idea that only artistic outcome will lead to an artistic reputation. Second, our analysis indicates that reputation and celebrity are connected. But to achieve celebrity, the several reputations can't be combined, because they conflict with each other. Our analysis highlights the positive impact of society at large but also the negative impact of artistic reputation on celebrity.

The paper begins with a review about reputation and celebrity. Then, we present our methodology and cases to answer our research question. We highlight two results about how the several kinds of reputations within a creative sector are created and combined, and the way they impact celebrity. We finally suggest how this paper contributes to the literature about reputation and celebrity.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The literature review presents the complex links between reputation and celebrity in creative sectors (Caves, 2000; Hartley, 2005). It is divided in three parts: we will first present the differences between reputation and celebrity; next, we will explain the way several reputations can be established among several distinct stakeholders; and finally, we will suggest how the several reputations and celebrity can be combined.

Perspectives on reputation and celebrity

Reputation

Reputation is understood as a general impression, which represents how a collective – here called an audience – perceives an organization or individual (Fombrun, 1996; Fombrun and Shanley, 1990; Rao, 1994). This impression is the result of a legitimation process (Rao, 1994) that runs over time, and will thus here be considered as positive; in this paper, we will not deal with bad or negative reputations. Moreover, reputation is established in the long term: it is based on several years of past actions (Weigelt and Camerer, 1988), and extracts those who stand out through time (Fombrun and Shanley, 1990; Roberts and Dowling, 2002). This long-term characteristic leads to considering reputation as not static and not established once and for all. Its stages of evolution have been studied in previous research: several scholars showed the complexity of its creation, building, maintenance and repair (Fombrun 1996; Fombrun, Gardberg and Sever, 2000; Fombrun and Shanley, 1990; Rhee and Valdez, 2009; Rindova et al, 2005).

Another core characteristic of reputation is that to one audience corresponds one reputation (Fombrun, 1996). We define here an audience thanks to two elements: similar values and common media to exchange information. Indeed, an audience is considered as a group of organizations or individuals with the same roles, values and characteristics, which can be denominated with a common name; for instance, in a creative sector like art or entertainment (Caves, 2000; Hartley, 2005), artists are an audience, like the clients or the legal authorities of the sector. The members of an audience share common values and expectations: they apply distinct criteria in assessing organizations/ individuals (Freeman, 1984), because they are sensitive to specific signals and symbols (Rao, 1994) derived from an organization's past actions (Weigelt and Camerer, 1988). These signals thus serve as stable basis to form a rational common opinion about the organization. In this sense, the audience appears as a community that can only exist thanks to dedicated ways of exchanging information and of reducing uncertainty (Fombrun and Shanley, 1990). Media are especially important in this matter; they are specialized information intermediaries that vehicle organizations' actions and influence the collective mind and closeness of the members of an audience (Deepphouse, 2000).

Finally, previous studies showed that reputation can expand through various audiences (Fombrun 1996; Fombrun, Gardberg and Sever, 2000; Rindova, Williamson, Petkova and

Sever, 2005). Each sector or domain of activity can be seen as a composition of several audiences that have their own characteristics and distinct ways of assessing the others members of the sector. Boutinot's study (2010) about reputation-building in creative sectors suggests three important audiences in architecture: peers, clients and society at large. For each profile, a specific reputation will be associated: artistic reputation will expend among peers, operational reputation will expend among clients, and public reputation will expend within society. Moreover, an artistic reputation is more elaborated on artistic outcomes, based on talent and capacity of differentiation and innovation (Becker, 1988; Delmestri et al, 2005; Lang and Lang, 1988). As for operational and public reputations, trustworthiness (ability for project management) and exposure respectively play a role.

As such, each audience and each kind of reputation seems disconnected from the other ones.

How celebrity differs from reputation

Celebrity is understood as the ability to attract large scale public attention and to generate positive emotional responses (Rein, Kottler and Stoller, 1987). Past research often considered reputation and celebrity as opposed (Rindova, Hayward and Pollock, 2006; Sanders and Hambrick, 2007) or completely disconnected for several reasons. First, contrary to reputation, celebrity is not necessarily built on the long term (Rindova et al., 2005); it can be established thanks to few and artificial traces. These traces are managed by individuals or organizations themselves, or by mass media that create celebrities (McCracken, 1989) and dramatize reality (Rindova, Pollock and Hayward, 2006). Second, contrary to reputed organizations, which proved their superior talent and competences through a legitimation process, celebrity does not necessarily deal with reliability. Indeed, celebrities may not be the most relevant organizations of a given sector, as "*the publicity machine focuses attention on the worthy and unworthy alike*" (Gamson, 1994). They even seem less likely to perform as reliably as high reputation organizations, because they are more associated with a character representing lifestyle expectations than with merit and relevant outcomes (McCracken, 1989; Sanders and Hambrick, 2007). Third, if reputation expends differently within several audiences, celebrity attracts large scale public's attention. Thanks to mass media, heterogeneous profiles can be influenced alike.

But the debate about the links between reputation and celebrity needs to be developed; if previous studies opposed them or focused on one but not on the other, this paper suggests trying to link these two notions. Indeed, famous artists like Van Gogh or Picasso, who

attracted a large scale public attention and generated positive emotional responses, were also reputed among their peers and clients. We suggest that celebrity can be understood as the agreement of all the audiences of a given activity, thus a combination of several types of reputation. This leads to our research question: How can reputation and celebrity be combined? More specifically, if achieving celebrity corresponds to combining several types of reputation, how can the latter, which seem to be separated and quite disjointed, can be combined? To which degree are the several kinds of reputation resilient for celebrity?

Before suggesting some links between reputation and celebrity in creative sectors, the following section proposes to understand better the distinctiveness of reputation-building in several audiences.

Homogenous and distinct signals for each kind of reputation

Each audience assesses the other members of the activity in a specific way, and as a consequence confers a specific type of reputation (Delmestri et al., 2005; Fombrun and Shanley, 1990). As previously mentioned, each audience theoretically appears as clear-cut from the others. We here suggest a first general hypothesis that we will decline in the following lines:

H1: Each kind of reputation expends within one specific audience; as each audience is independent from the others, each kind of reputation is considered independent

We address the three main kinds of reputation within creative sectors (artistic, operational and public ones) to understand better how they are constituted.

Artistic reputation is elaborated on integrity, creativity, differentiation and merit (Becker, 1988; Delmestri et al, 2005; Jones, Narasimhan and Alvarez, 2005; Florida, 2002). Given by peers, artistic reputation is established by people who value merit, individuality and differentiation, here understood as innovation ability. Such a reputation is thus mostly based on artistic outputs (Lang and Lang, 1988), thanks to four signals mentioned in previous studies (Becker, 1988; Caves, 2003; Delmestri et al, 2005; Lang and Lang, 1988): *election to artistic societies* refers to the honor of being named in a relevant artistic authority; *acceptance of works in juried competitions*; *artistic awards won*; and *collaborative network*, to see if the artists are well introduced in their profession and work with other

reputed architects. Artistic reputation can be seen as potentially quickly obsolete, as it is based on innovation ability; if one is not innovative enough on the long term, (s)he may lose rapidly this kind of reputation.

H1a = Artistic reputation is only based on artistic outcomes

Operational reputation refers to a more commercial side of reputation. This kind of reputation, given by clients who buy the artworks, is elaborated on the artists' ability "to make a dream come true". It refers to the artist's ability to respect the feasibility of his/ her ideas, budgets, dead-lines, while maintaining quality and innovation. Previous studies (Becker, 1988; Delmestri et al, 2005; Galenson, 2005; Lang and Lang, 1988) mentioned three signals that can help clients elaborate an operational reputation: *educational background*, in that the prestige of education confirms the potential talent; *public honors*, reflecting the artist's capacity to be recognized for his/ her societal works; *commercial network*, which refers to working with the same clients on a regular basis. Operational reputation appears to be less obsolete than the artistic one, because it seems more established thanks to signals for trustworthiness through time.

H1b = Operational reputation is only based on trust between parties

Finally, public reputation refers to a broader type of reputation, established within society at large. It is more difficult to trace, due to the heterogeneity of society compared to the other stakeholders (Becker, 1988; Lang and Lang, 1988). Close to Lang and Lang's concept of "renown", public reputation deals with a broader recognition than peers and clients, and depends on the visibility given to the artist. Previous studies mention signals that help the construction of public reputation: *books about the artist*, written by critics, promoters, and the architects themselves; *exhibitions*, organized by public authorities not necessarily related to the artistic domain.

H1c = Public reputation is only based on visibility or exposure from the artists

Celebrity as the combination of artistic, operational and public reputations

Scholars often oppose reputation and celebrity: their mechanisms of construction seem different, especially on the time length necessary to be established, the reliability and the spread of diffusion. In this section, we explore some ways to connect the two notions and build some hypotheses that suggest their combination.

First, both notions explain the prominence of individuals/ organizations within a given sector. While reputation theory explains how several kinds of reputation diffuse among various stakeholders, up to society at large (Fombrun and Shanley, 1990; Lang and Lang, 1988), celebrity theory explains people's broadcasting in a large scale public (Rindova et al., 2006). Second, celebrity may not always be seen negatively; instead of considering celebrity only as unworthy and artificially constructed, it can also be seen as "*deserved and earned, related to achievement and quality*" (Gamson, 1994:15). Indeed, celebrities are not necessarily people who were made visible without being relevant. Celebrities can also be "*people of enormous talent, energy and drive*" (Frank and Cook, 1995:8). As such, celebrity and reputation both validate individuals and organizations who passed some trials and are thus both merited: reputation is the result of a legitimation process (Rao, 1994) while celebrity represents people who have also overcome competitions, and showed their talent. The most relevant individuals/ organizations become reputed and famous because they access the top-positions by being certified by specific stakeholders, or by a broader public. Third, like reputation, celebrity construction can be viewed as a long term process: celebrity is not only based on artificial outputs that will not be conducted to posterity. In creative sectors, people who are recognized outside of the small circle of peers and clients, and who persist over time, are those who produce regular traces such as buildings, books, or other artworks (Lang and Lang, 1988).

These connections go against the disjunction between celebrity and reputation. We thus suggest that if an individual manages to combine artistic, operational and public reputations, which are the three important kinds of reputation in creative sectors, (s)he may become a celebrity, a star (Dyer, 1979; Gamson, 1994). Celebrity would thus be based on a beam of signals, enabling an organization/ individual to attract large scale and varied stakeholders (peers, clients and society), and generate positive responses from all of them. In this regard,

the most famous ones are those who are accepted by the three audiences. This leads to our next hypothesis:

H2 = Celebrity consists in adding artistic, operational and public reputations

On this basis, artistic, operational and public reputations are all integrated into celebrity. Even if these three reputations may impact celebrity in different ways, they are seen as being along the same lines. Indeed, artistic reputation is likely to have a positive effect on celebrity, because it can increase the perception of the individual's talent and innovation ability and thus sustain the positive emotional response from the members of the sector. Thus, we predict that artistic reputation is positively associated with celebrity.

H3a = The higher the artistic reputation, the more positive the target individual's celebrity

Similarly, operational reputation improves the perception of trustworthiness of the individual at stake, through several kinds of proofs. Thus, we hypothesize that it has a positive effect on celebrity:


H3b = The higher the operational reputation, the more positive the target individual's celebrity

Finally, public reputation is supposed to have a positive effect on celebrity. Therefore, we suggest that:

H3c = The higher the public reputation, the more positive the target individual's celebrity

Figure 1 presents the hypothesized relationships not only between the determinants for artistic, operational and public reputations, but also between these various reputations and celebrity.

Figure 1 – Signal for Reputation and Celebrity



METHODOLOGY

This section presents the data and method used to collect and analyze it so as to test our theoretical model.

Sample and data collection

We empirically investigated these relationships in the context of architecture, considered as a creative industry (Caves, 2000; Hartley, 2005). Architecture can be considered as reputation-driven by creative individuals. Such a context thus seems particularly appropriate for examining the hypotheses mentioned above. Moreover, we apply organizational reputation literature in this matter, because architects found their own companies and embody them completely. As a consequence, organizational reputation is here synonymous with individual reputation, as the founder and the company can't be dissociated in such creative contexts.

The sample of this study is composed of 103 French architects who are already considered as famous in French architecture. We established this list following Deephouse's statement about the importance of media coverage in establishing a reputation (2000), by collecting the names of French architects who appeared more than twice in the top-five French architecture magazines since 2000. We then selected only the architects who were still alive and working in 2008, and who obtained their diploma before 2000, so as to trace back their professional

trajectory. This list was validated by experts (French architects themselves and directors of architecture schools in France).

We collected data about these architects thanks to archival data and interviews. To follow the biographical data methodology (Denzin, 1989; Roberts, 2001), we first collected every data related to actions (voluntary acts from the target architects, such as participations to competitions) and events (unexpected elements, such as awards or honors) in their life through the architects' websites, CV and books, but also websites about architecture. French architectural press and French mass press from 1975 to today were also analyzed to gather as much information as possible⁴. We made sense of the information by creating from scratch a database that recounts every activity / event of the architects' professional life between their architecture diploma until the end of 2008.

To complete the archival data, interviews with 48 of these architects were performed between September 2008 and March 2009. The interviews were aimed at obtaining explanations and precisions about what happened in the architects' professional lives. We conducted these interviews thanks to the Merton's focused interview methodology (1990), to collect very specific data about the blurry parts of the trajectories.

To understand better the relationships between the signals that play a role in the construction of artistic, operational and public reputations, but also between the several reputations and celebrity, we elaborated a list of variables, based on the data collected for the database.

Dependent variables

Previous studies consider media coverage as a window to study the process of reputation-building (Deephouse, 2000; Rindova et al., 2006; Rindova, Petkova and Khota, 2007). We draw on this idea to elaborate the variables which will enable us to understand better how the several kinds of reputations are built, and how they are connected (or not) to celebrity.

Celebrity. Directly measuring celebrity is difficult, as it is a latent notion. As a consequence, we suggest the number of Google tags for these architects as a proxy of the level of celebrity at the organizational field level. We chose the Google tags because celebrity depends, as mentioned above, on many and varied determinants, recognizable by everybody. Google enables us to approach as many determinants as possible (competitions, awards, press articles,

⁴ M. Perruchione, an art historian working on the building industry, helped us with the huge amount of data to be collected and validated the chosen directions to study the architects' life.

books, exhibitions, conferences...), and the degree to which architects are widely diffused and media covered (Deephouse, 2000). Google tags were collected in January 2009, to see how often the 103 architects were cited and how widely they were diffused at the beginning of 2009.

Celebrity can't be established as such: we suggest moderating it by the three important reputations (artistic, operational and public).

Artistic reputation. Reputation among the peers was measured by each architect's occurrence in the top-five French architecture magazines. These magazines are known to trace innovative architects whose talent is considered as interesting for their peers. Moreover, these writings about the architects are indicators of reputation throughout their whole trajectory, capturing their capacity to maintain the critics and professionals' attention.

Operational Reputation. Reputation among the clients was measured by the number of honorific public competitions these architects won throughout their professional trajectory. Honorific competitions are the national or international competitions for important buildings for society such as cultural, educational or institutional equipment. They are indicators of the prestige of the buildings these architects elaborated, and attest their capacity to maintain the clients' attention through time.

Public Reputation. Reputation among people at large was measured by each architect's occurrence in the top-five French mass press. We also draw on Hirsch's statement that "the presence or absence of coverage, rather than its favorable or unfavorable interpretation, is the important variable here" (1972: 647). The occurrence of mass publications seems to attest the level of interest these architects developed among society at large.

Independent variables

Signals for Innovation and Creation Ability. Five signals for innovation and creation ability were characterized. The first and second signals are rewards: *artistic honors*, related to the way architects are rewarded by the community for their works⁵ (measured by a dichotomous variable stating if the architects received or not such honors), and *awards for young architects*, as it is an award dedicated to promote the most talented and innovative young architects by the community (measured by a dichotomous variable stating if the

⁵ Receiving for instance a gold medal of the French Architects Institute

architects received or not the NAJA). The third and fourth signals for innovation and creation ability deal with the architects' artistic outcomes: *number of won competitions* (national and international) and *number of books written by the architects*. For each of them, we take the accumulation of the occurrences of these events from their diploma to 2009. The final signal listed was the *collaborative network*, measured by the number of collaborations engaged with other architects from their diploma to 2009.

Signals for Trustworthiness. These signals, as mentioned in the literature, are a priori opposed to signals for innovation and creation ability. Indeed, these signals reflect the artists' ability to prove that they will not disappoint people who work with them, that they can manage projects, respect dead-lines and budgets, but does not reflect the innovation ability. The first signal for trustworthiness is the *educational background*, tracing the schools where the architects went for their architectural education. It was measured by the prestige of the 23 architectural schools in France, classified in three categories: the most prestigious ones (Les Beaux Arts de Paris and l'ESA), the middle ones (the other Parisian schools), and the other ones (in French regions). We created this classification, as no one already exists, and it was validated by the architects during our interviews. The second and third signals are the rewards for an entire career, meaning that the artists proved their ability to build many good projects through time: the signal *national awards* was measured by the number of French awards received by their architects since their diploma, and *international awards* was measured by the number of international awards (such as the Pritzker Prize) since their diploma. The fourth signal relates to a broader kind of reward, the one given for societal concern. It was measured by the type of honors the architects received in their life, categorized in 1 if they received the Legion of Honor, 2 if they received a medal in a French State authority, and 3 if they received a medal in an International Public authority. The final signal for trustworthiness analyzed here is the *commercial network*. The latter may be important to be confident in the work of an architect, knowing that (s)he has already worked a lot with other clients. As public clients represent most of the architects' clients (more than 90%), this signal was measured by the number of public clients the architects worked with since their architectural diploma.

Signals for Visibility. The first signal for visibility corresponds to the number of *books written about the architects* (not written by them): it reflects the extent to which architects are diffused within society at large. The second signal deals with a visible explanation of the architects' works and views on architecture through *exhibitions*: it was measured by the

number of national and international exhibitions done by the architects during their professional life.

Control variables

Gender. As only 20% of architects are women, *gender* might be an important issue in determining who gets reputed or not in such a sector. It was coded as a dichotomous variable: 0 for men, 1 for women.

Complementary education. We saw during the data collection that a lot of architects obtained other diplomas, in addition to their architecture one. We thought it might be interesting to see if obtaining a degree in engineering for instance was important for the several kinds of reputations. As a consequence, we measured *complementary education* by the kind of other diplomas the architects obtained: 0 for no, 1 for engineering diplomas, 2 for specializations in architecture.

Company age. We finally elaborated on the fact that age may be a relevant criterion for reputation-building, as we understand it as a cumulative process. But the beginning of the trajectories was quite varied from one architect to the other (some created their company right after their diploma, others worked several years as architectural advisers for State authorities before creating their own company). As a consequence, and taking into account that architecture is reputation-driven by individuals and their names, architects' age might not have been interesting to analyze; as a consequence, we preferred to control our analysis thanks to the architects' *company age*, as they all started to make their own buildings once their company was created. It was measured by the number of years the architects owned their own company.

Data analysis

Our model needs to simultaneously test the relationships between celebrity, the three reputations, the independent and control variables. To take into account this particular structure, in which some dependent variables are endogenous (figure 1), we estimate simultaneously the system of 4 equations using the Three-stage Least Square method⁶ (for more details, see Appendix B) using the Reg3 instruction in STATA. The hypothesized model

⁶ The three-stage least squares (3SLS) estimation procedure consists of a feasible generalized least squares (FGLS) version of the two-stage least squares estimation and leads to consistent and asymptotically more efficient estimates. 3SLS method is well suited to estimate parameters and covariance matrix.

consists of four exogenous variables (celebrity, artistic, operational and public reputations) and the set of independent and control variables cited above. The endogenous variables are treated as correlated with the disturbance in the system of equations. Hence, errors are supposed to be “contemporaneously” correlated across equations, but not across observations. Finally, the independent and control variables are treated as exogenous to the system, and are considered as uncorrelated with the disturbance.

Limits

The first limit of our study concerns our variables. Indeed, the Google tags that can't be traced back: we only have the January 2009 measurement for these architects celebrity, which means that we are not able to follow its evolution over the trajectories. To be coherent with that, we base our empirical study on the hypothesis that reputation is accumulated over the years, and thus can be approached by our observation in cross-section at a given time.

The second limit deals with the non-sufficiency of some of our data. Indeed, some variables were very difficult to complete, because some data were not available or difficultly traceable. For instance, data about exhibitions were collected thanks to several websites, but we cannot validate the sufficiency.

The third limit lies in that the context of French architecture may create a specific environment, which will not be perfectly similar to a more international one (related to laws, public and private funding for buildings among others). These elements will be taken into account in the possible generalization of this study.

RESULTS

Correlations among the variables of our model are presented in Table 1. The means and standard deviations are presented in Appendix A. We computed these correlations thanks to a Pearson test on STATA.

Table 1 – Correlations between the variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	
1. Celebrity	1.0000																			
2. Artistic Reputation	.35***	1.0000																		
3. Operational Reputation	.24**	.41***	1.0000																	
4. Public Reputation	.48***	.72***	.50***	1.0000																
5. Gender	-.20**	-.25**	-.24**	-.22**	1.0000															
6. Complementary education	.35***	.33***	.18*	.40***	-.10	1.0000														
7. Company age	.09	.28***	.34***	.25**	-.25**	-.01	1.0000													
8. Artistic honors	.05	.32**	.18*	.30***	-.10	.07	.24**	1.0000												
9. Awards for young architects	-.13	.01	-.13	.11	.11	-.13	-.20**	-.21**	1.0000											
10. Won competitions	.04	.39***	.74***	.31***	-.22**	-.01	.45***	.16	-.12	1.0000										
11. Books by the target architects	.28***	.13	-.05	.21**	-.13	.12	.02	.05	-.11	-.11	1.0000									
12. Collaborative network	.28***	.26***	.18*	.23**	-.31***	.24**	.16*	.01	-.25**	.16**	.22**	1.0000								
13. School	.24**	.18*	.38***	.30***	-.27***	.09	.22**	.19*	-.26***	.24**	.16	.22**	1.0000							
14. National awards	-.01	.42***	.12	.33***	-.09	.04	.29***	.49***	.02	.13	.01	-.07	.17*	1.0000						
15. International awards	.41***	.30***	.14	.47***	.01	.26***	.10	-.03	.08	-.02	.06	.05	.13	-.08	1.0000					
16. Public honors	.16	.45***	.28***	.33***	-.20**	.10	.27***	.36***	-.20**	.28***	.12	.37***	.33***	.37***	.08	1.0000				
17. Commercial network	.23**	.26***	.29***	.28***	-.25***	.14	.16	.28***	-.23**	.16*	.11	.33***	.15	.14	.04	.24**	1.0000			
18. Books about the target architects	.28**	.69***	.23**	.59***	-.05	.21**	.32***	.28**	.19**	-.04	.18*	.13	.36***	.49***	.34***	.12	1.0000			
19. Exhibitions	.03	.25**	.16*	.21**	.14	.27***	.27	.20**	-.04	.03	.07	-.04	-.02	.07	.25**	-.02	-.09	.45***	1.0000	

$N = 103$; * $p < .1$; ** $p < .05$; *** $p < .01$

Thanks to this table, first impressions can be formulated. When the variables are connected two by two, the several kinds of reputations seem to be connected: the public reputation seems to be linked to the artistic and operational ones. Nevertheless, some coefficients indicate with a great level of confidence that the reputations are not only determined by some specific signals; for instance, operational reputation is particularly linked to books written about the target architects, which is a signal for visibility (and not an operational one).

With a view to confirm (or not) these first insights, we suggest using a more multiple frame with a Three-Stage Least Square regression (Table 2).

Table 2 – The Three-Stage Least Square coefficients for celebrity

Audiences	Celebrity
Artistic Reputation (Peers)	-192.16***
Operational Reputation (Clients)	-222.53
Public Reputation (People at large)	548.11***
<i>Constant</i>	6822.21***
<i>R²</i>	-.0610
<i>Chi2</i>	27.52***
<i>N</i>	103

Variables	Artistic Reputation	Operational Reputation	Public Reputation
<i>Control Variables</i>			
Gender	-9.19	-.54	-5.28
Complementary education	6.46***	.83*	6.40***
Company age	-4.46*	-.02	-.28
<i>Signals for Innovation and Creation Ability</i>			
Artistic and architectural honors	1.77	-.25	2.16
Won competitions	.52***	.26***	.33***
Architecture awards for young architects	7.67**	.47	-.01
Books by the architects	.05	-.05	.53**
Collaborative network	5.46	-.67	3.35
<i>Signals for Trustworthiness</i>			
School	-.16	2.13***	3.88
National architecture awards	11.67***	-.29	6.78**
International architecture awards	1.01	1.6	25.83***
Public honors	5.55	.17	-1.16
Commercial network	.31	.17***	.33
<i>Signals for Visibility</i>			
Books about the architects	2.40***	-.02	1.03***
Exhibitions	.01	.06**	-.11
<i>Constant</i>	13.54	-5.43***	-6.75
<i>R</i> ²	.6718	.6702	.5998
<i>Chi</i> ²	211.77***	209.7***	159.75***
<i>N</i>	103	103	103

* $p < .1$; ** $p < .05$; *** $p < .01$

Estimations of the artistic, operational and public reputations present acceptable goodness of fit, with R^2 around 0.6, and significant Wald test statistic. To prevent multicollinearity between the exogenous variables, we checked the variance inflation indicator condition numbers (equivalent in each reputation equation regression). Following Greene (2008), the final set of variables seems not to suffer from dramatic multicollinearity (the TOL coefficient is never under 0.5).

Artistic, Operational and Public Reputations

First, we discuss the results for the hypothesized determinants for the three types of reputations.

Our first hypothesis tested the distinctiveness of signals for each reputation, proposing that each audience conferred reputation thanks to specific determinants. Table 2 shows that the several audiences are not clear-cut: some signals influence the reputation-building process within several audiences. An additional analysis progressively tested the correlations between the several categories of signals and each reputation, and confirms the non-distinctiveness of the signals integrated with each reputation (Appendixes C, D and E).

Based on the significant estimates, our hypothesis can be discussed. Infirming Hypothesis 1a, Table 2 shows that artistic reputation (among peers) is more a confirmatory building process than a real search for innovation and creation in architecture. Indeed, this reputation is more based on established signs of an already acquired recognition (national awards) and visibility (books) than on a real creative ability (number of won competitions, architecture awards for young architects): peers confirm the talent of already established architects, and search more for proofs of high expected competences (complementary education) than innovation and risk taking competences. But the negative estimate associated with company age seems to indicate a decrease of artistic reputation with the age. Either newcomers benefit from a new and good reputation, or the older the company, the harder the recognition for innovation and creation. They also value directing the works through books, which is mostly done after having already established a name, as an architect of the sample said: “most of the architects I know write books when they have already built several projects; otherwise they are not credible”. We were hypothesizing that artistic reputation may be quite volatile and quickly obsolete; nevertheless, the results show that the reputed architects among peers are highly maintained through years.

Supporting Hypothesis 1b, operational reputation appears to be established on proofs for trustworthiness. Indeed, clients want a trustful relationship with the architects they hire for huge buildings; they want to be sure that the architects will respect the budget and schedule. In this matter, trust is based on the prestige of their education (architectural schools and complementary education), which can be considered as a sign of security and quality. Moreover, they value architects who have already worked a lot with other public clients (clients network), which is another proof for trust. Finally, exhibitions attest their capacity to be visible: it is both reassuring and comforting the clients’ own reputation. The surprise here lies in the fact that awards, as proofs for quality and talent maintained through time, do not appear at all in the clients’ evaluation.

Hypothesis 1c predicts that visibility positively impacts public reputation. Indeed, people at large are sensitive to products such as books, and to events such as exhibitions, which are highly relayed by media. It is a way to create a link between the art and the public; architects reach society thanks to the books they write, by explaining their work to people (books). But our results show that signals for innovation (number of won competitions) and trustworthiness (international awards) are also relevant signals so as to become icon of French architecture. Finally, people at large are sensitive to architects' complementary education, which can be explained by the search for expertise both in aesthetics and technique.

Contrary to what we expected, the collaborative network does not appear at all in our results: being connected to the peers is not an important determinant to build a reputation in the three audiences.

From reputation in an audience to celebrity

We now present the results for the hypothesized effects of the three types of reputation on celebrity.

Contrary to what we expected with H2, celebrity is not the combination of the three types of reputation. H2 was not supported, due to a conflicting relationship between artistic and public reputations. Apparently, when the public reputation is high, the artistic one is low. Related to Boutinot's exploratory study about the links between the three kinds of reputation (2010), we can explain this conflict of reputations due to a time lag in the way they are constructed. Indeed, this study elaborates on the fact that the three reputations happen in a specific order, and are converted with a view to creating a reputation at the field level. But as the exploratory study showed that public reputation cannot be reached without previous artistic and operational reputation, we can conclude that celebrity is dependent on the three reputations, but not as an accumulation of the three per se. Such a reputation results from society's acceptance of artists, which is possible if these artists detach themselves from the closed circle of their professional community.

Related to the roles and weight of each kind of reputation on celebrity, H3a is rejected: the more famous an artist in a sector, the less artistic (s)he is. Moreover, operational reputation does not impact celebrity; this result also rejects H3b. Finally, H3c is confirmed: there is a positive relationship between public reputation and celebrity. The surprising part of these results lies in the fact that artistic and public reputations are conflicting, and that one may

have to abandon his/her innovation ability to give priority to a recognizable signature in each of his/her building: making the same kind of buildings or using the same shapes to create a recognizable signature improves reputation within society at large, and thus celebrity. Nevertheless, while public reputation increases, artistic reputation gets lower, due to a lack of innovation. As an architect from our sample said, “[Architect A] makes the same architecture over and over again, because this is what society is waiting for. He was a brilliant architect, but now he is not innovative anymore”. The professional community thus doesn’t judge Architect A as being innovative anymore, while society highlights his capacity to make beautiful and societal buildings. We can definitely make the parallel with the academic world and the difficulty for researchers to combine academic and public reputations.

As a consequence, we can also conclude that some combination does exist between the several kinds of reputations, but it is not like our theoretical hypotheses were predicting: artistic and public reputations are conflicting to establish celebrity, while the operational one seems to have no impact at all.

DISCUSSION

In this article, we examine the complex but possible links between reputation and celebrity. We have addressed these points by suggesting that celebrity consists of being established on public reputation and diluting artistic reputation, and that the several kinds of reputation don’t add but connect with each other. Below are suggested some contributions to the reputation and celebrity literatures.

This paper contributes to our understanding of the links between reputation and celebrity by showing that the several kinds of reputations can’t be added for but do connect with celebrity. On the one hand, our empirical study shows that celebrity in creative sectors is connected to public reputation. If previous research focused on their opposition (McCracken, 1989; Sanders and Hambrick, 2007) or studied them separately, we here show that to become famous, one has to privilege public reputation. As celebrity is positively determined by public reputation, which is itself earned over time, we can advance that it is deserved and not artificially constructed. Our results thus provide empirical support for the argument about celebrity representing talented people (Frank and Cook, 1995) by showing that it may not be the result of an artificial construction or an unearned characteristic.

But on the other hand, celebrity is not positively connected to artistic reputation. Indeed, if artists become celebrities, they may not be considered as regular innovators anymore by their peers, because they conform to what society at large (which does not search for creation *per se*) expects from them. As a consequence, celebrity damages artistic reputation. This opposition highlights a tension between creation and visibility, and thus questions the role of talent validation in the construction of celebrity. Nevertheless, Rindova et al. (2006) show that before becoming a market leader (a conventional and positively assessed organization), one has to be a rebel (a non-conventional but positively assessed organization). Our empirical study supports their theoretical proposition: in creative industries, a non-conventional artist is at first spotted by the other artists (the peers); this non-conventionality is then relayed by the media among clients and society at large. This non-conventionality can evolve towards conformity, and if competitors align with the artist behavior, then (s)he can become a market leader.

This paper also suggests contributing to reputation theory. First, we complement previous studies about the possible addition of the several kinds of reputation (Fombrun and Shanley, 1990; Delmestri et al, 2005) by showing that they can't easily be combined. By drawing on three important types of reputation in creative industries – artistic, operational and public reputations – this study shows that they are not along the same line. Indeed, artistic reputation can be damaged while public reputation increases. If previous studies mentioned that reputation is the result of a consensus between several stakeholders (Fombrun, 1996; Fombrun and Shanley, 1990), this consensus seems really difficult to achieve in creative industries: regular innovation and differentiation is valued by peers, but difficultly transposed to people at large. The several kinds of reputation don't seem compatible at the same time. Reputation-building is not a transitive process: artistic reputation is not easily converted to public, because they cancel on each other.

Second, by studying creative sectors, we conceptualize reputation determinants other than corporate and financial ones: artistic-related signals, trust-based signals and visibility signals. Thanks to this conception, our results complement previous research on reputation among various stakeholders (Fombrun and Shanley, 1990; Rindova et al., 2005) by providing evidence that if the various kinds of reputation can't be added, they are not completely disjoint. Echoing to studies about creative performance (Cattani, Ferriani, 2008), the several

reputations are interconnected to each other, because some signals are used by several profiles to assess a creative organization or individual. Indeed, contrary to some research about the determinants of reputation in creative sectors, in which the creative community is viewed as judging other artists mostly on artistic outcomes (Becker, 1988; Florida, 2000; Lang and Lang, 1988), our findings show that the artistic reputation is not only determined by artistic signals; trustworthiness and visibility are also important to establish a reputation among the peers.

This paper suggests understanding better the relationships between celebrity and reputation. Thanks to our quantitative analysis on already reputed French architects, we managed to combine apparently contradictory notions and discussed how the several kinds of reputation in a creative sector impact on celebrity. The results show that the various reputations don't combine for celebrity, but are connected to achieve it.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Becker, H. S. (1988). *Les Mondes de l'Art*. Poche: Paris

Boutinot, A. (2010). From Reputation in One Audience to Reputation in an Organizational Field: The Case of Architects' Trajectories. Paper to be presented at AoM 2010, Montréal, Canada. Working paper.

Caves, R. E. (2000). *Creative Industries: Contracts between Art and Commerce*. Harvard University Press

Caves, R. E. (2003). Contracts between Art and Commerce. *Journal of Economic Perspective*, 17(2)

Deephouse, D.L. (2000). Media Reputation as a Strategic Resource: An Integration of Mass Communication and Resource-Based Theory. *Journal of Management*, 26

Delmestri, G., Montanari, F., Usai, A. (2005). Reputation and Strength of Ties in Predicting Commercial Success and Artistic Merit of Independents in the Italian Feature Film Industry. *Journal of Management Studies*, 42(5): 975-1002

- Denzin, N.K. (1989). *Interpretive Biography*. Sage
- Dyer, R. (1979). *Stars*. London: British Film Institute.
- Florida, R. (2002). *The Rise of the Creative Class*. Basic Books: New York
- Fombrun, C.J. (1996). *Reputation: Realizing Value from the Corporate Image*. Harvard University Press
- Fombrun, C.J., Gardberg, N.A., Sever, J.M. (2000). The Reputation Quotient: a Multi-Stakeholder Measure of Corporate Reputation. *The Journal of Brand Management*, 7(4), p. 241-255
- Fombrun, C.J., Shanley, M. (1990). What's in a Name? Reputation Building and Corporate Strategy. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33 (2): 233 – 258
- Frank, R. H., & Cook, P. 1995. *The winner-take-all society*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Galenson, D. W. (2005). Anticipating Artistic Reputation. *World Economics*, 6(2)
- Gamson, J. (1994). *Claims to Fame: Celebrity in Contemporary America*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Greene W. (2008) *Econometric Analysis*. Prentice Hall, 6th Edition
- Hartley, J. (2005). *Creative Industries*. Blackwell Publishing
- Hirsch, P.M. (1972). Proceeding Fads and Fashions: an Organization-set Analysis of Cultural Industry System. *American Journal of Sociology*
- Jones, C., Narasimhan, A., Alvarez, J.L. (2005). Manufactured Authenticity and Creative Voice in Cultural Industries. *Journal of Management*
- Lang, G.E. and Lang, K. (1988). Recognition and Renown: The Survival of Artistic Reputation. *American Journal of Sociology*, 94, p. 79-109
- McCracken, G. (1989). Who is the Celebrity Endorser? Cultural Foundations of the Endorsement Process. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 16, p. 310-321
- Merton, R. K., Fiske, M., Kendall, P. L. (1990). *The focused interview: a manual of problems and procedures* (2nd edition). New York: Free Press

- Rao, H. (1994). The Social Construction of Reputation: Certification Contests, Legitimation and the Survival of Organizations in the Automobile Industry: 1895- 1912. *Strategic Management Journal*, 15, p. 29-44
- Rein, I., Kottler, P., and Stoller, M. (1987). *High Visibility*. New York: Dodd, Mead and Company.
- Rhee, M., Valdez, M.E. (2009). Contextual Factors Surrounding Reputation Damage with Potential Implications for Reputation Repair. *Academy of Management Review*, 34(1)
- Rindova, V. P., & Fombrun, C. J. (1999). Constructing competitive advantage: The role of firm-constituent interactions. *Strategic Management Journal*, 20: 691–710.
- Rindova, V.P., Petkova, A.P., Kotha, S. (2007). Standing Out: How New Firms in Emerging Markets Build Reputation. *Strategic Organization*, 5(1)
- Rindova, V. P., Pollock, T.G., Hayward, M.L.A. (2006). Celebrity Firms: The Social Construction of Market Popularity. *Academy of Management Review*, 31(1)
- Rindova, V.P., Williamson, I.O., Petkova, A.P., Sever, J.M. (2005). Being Good or Being Known: an Empirical Examination of the Dimensions, Antecedents and Consequences of Organizational Reputation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 48(6), p. 1033-1049
- Roberts, B. (2001). *Biographical Research*. Open University Press
- Roberts, P.W., Dowling, G.R. (2002). Corporate Reputation and Sustained Superior Financial Performance. *Strategic Management Journal*, 23, p. 1077-1093
- Sanders, S. G. & D. C. Hambrick (2007). Swinging for the Fences: The Effects of CEO Stock Options on Company Risk Taking and Performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 50, p. 1055-1078.
- Weigelt, K., & Camerer, C. (1988). Reputation and corporate strategy: A review of recent theory and applications. *Strategic Management Journal*, 9: 443–454.
- Zellner A, Theil H (1962). Three-Stage Least Squares: Simultaneous Estimation of Simultaneous Equations. *Econometrica*, 30(1), 54-78.

APPENDIXES

Appendix A – Means and Standard Deviations for the variables of the celebrity

Variable	Mean	S.D.
1. Celebrity	7280.27	12066.27
2. Artistic Reputation	50.33	38.92
3. Operational Reputation	5.37	7.45
4. Public Reputation	20.66	28.21
5. Gender	.23	.42
6. Complementary education	.61	1.02
7. Company age	21.95	9.54
8. Artistic honors	.42	.77
9. Awards for young architects	.34	.60
10. Won competitions	21.80	19.24
11. Books by the target architects	2.47	6.19
12. Collaborative network	.53	.50
13. School	2.03	.70
14. National awards	.39	.61
15. International awards	.04	.31
16. Public honors	.32	.66
17. Commercial network	3.77	7.82
18. Books about the target architects	10.84	11.23
19. Exhibitions	12.33	17.80

Appendix B – Structural Equation Model

$$Y_{celebrity} = \gamma_{artistic} Y_{artistic} + \gamma_{operational} Y_{operational} + \gamma_{public} Y_{public} + \varepsilon_{celebrity}$$

$$Y_{artistic} = constant + X\beta + \varepsilon_{artistic}$$

$$Y_{operational} = constant + X\beta + \varepsilon_{operational}$$

$$Y_{public} = constant + X\beta + \varepsilon_{public}$$

Where Y are the four reputation measures. β is a vector of parameters to be estimated. X is the matrix of exogenous variables (common in three reputation equations). ε are the error vectors. The disturbances are “contemporaneously” correlated across the equations.

We assume that there is no correlation of the disturbance terms across observations, so that

$$E(u_{in}, u_{jm}) = 0, \quad \forall n \neq m$$

Where i and j indicate the equation number and n and m denote the observation number, where the number of observations is the same for all equations. However, we explicitly allow for contemporaneous correlation, i.e.,

$$E(u_{in}, u_{jn}) = \sigma_{ij}$$

Thus, the covariance matrix of all disturbances is

$$E(u, u') = \Sigma \otimes I_N$$

Where $\Sigma = [\sigma_{ij}]$ is the (contemporaneous) disturbance covariance matrix, \otimes is the Kronecker product, I_N is an identity matrix of dimension N . N is the number of observations in each equation.

In the case of 2 equations, the variance-covariance matrix has the following form:

$$E(u, u') = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_{11} & 0 & 0 & \sigma_{12} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sigma_{11} & 0 & 0 & \sigma_{12} \\ \sigma_{21} & 0 & 0 & \sigma_{22} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \dots & 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sigma_{21} & 0 & 0 & \sigma_{22} \end{pmatrix}$$

Appendix C – Linear Regression Models of Signals for Artistic Reputation

Artistic Reputation	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
<i>Control Variables</i>				
Gender	-14.22*	-6.54	-7.56	-9.70
Complementary education	11.89***	10.78***	7.34**	6.71**
Company age	.97**	.29	-.23	-.45
<i>Signals for Innovation and Creation Ability</i>				
Artistic and architectural honors		13.21***	3.70	1.44
Won competitions		.62***	.65***	.51***
Architecture awards for young architects		12.75**	6.79	8.01*
Books by the architects		.65	.62	.08
Collaborative network		10.63	8.76	6.06
<i>Signals for Trustworthiness</i>				
School			-5.81	-.17
National architecture awards			20.81***	10.48*
International architecture awards			33.67***	.44
Public honors			9.33*	6.10
Commercial network			.23	.34
<i>Signals for Visibility</i>				
Books about the architects				2.40***
Exhibitions				.01
<i>Constant</i>	24.92**	8.01	26.81**	13.27
<i>R² adj</i>	.1831	.3330	.4781	.6161
<i>F</i>	8.62	7.36	8.19	11.91
<i>N</i>	103	103	103	103

* $p < .1$; ** $p < .05$; *** $p < .01$

Appendix D - Linear Regression Models of Signals for Operational Reputation

Operational Reputation	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
<i>Control Variables</i>				
Gender	-2.9	-.75	-.16	-.52
Complementary education	1.25*	.88	1.06*	.82
Company age	.24***	.19**	-.02	-.02
<i>Signals for Innovation and Creation Ability</i>				
Artistic and architectural honors			.09	-.24
Won competitions			.27***	.26***
Architecture awards for young architects			.40	.45
Books by the architects			-.04	-.05
Collaborative network			-.70	-.69
<i>Signals for Trustworthiness</i>				
School		2.70**	2.07***	2.13***
National architecture awards		-.69	-.30	-.25
International architecture awards		.79	2.09	1.62
Public honors		.92	-.06	.15
Commercial network		.16*	.15*	.17***
<i>Signals for Visibility</i>				
Books about the architects				-.02
Exhibitions				.06**
<i>Constant</i>	-.14	-5.33**	-5.09	-5.42**
<i>R² adj</i>	.1481	.2226	.6061	.6134
<i>F</i>	6.91	4.65	13.0	11.79
<i>N</i>	103	103	103	103

* $p < .1$; ** $p < .05$; *** $p < .01$

Appendix E - Linear Regression Models of Signals for Public Reputation

Public Reputation	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
<i>Control Variables</i>				
Gender	-8.59	-9.49*	-6.10	-4.28
Complementary education	10.59***	7.93***	7.84***	5.89***
Company age	.64**	.12	-.17	-.31
<i>Signals for Innovation and Creation Ability</i>				
Artistic and architectural honors			4.69	2.79
Won competitions			.31**	.35***
Architecture awards for young architects			.50	-.68
Books by the architects			.42	.47
Collaborative network			1.16	2.19
<i>Signals for Trustworthiness</i>				
School				3.89
National architecture awards				9.10**
International architecture awards				26.93***
Public honors				-2.24
Commercial network				.27
<i>Signals for Visibility</i>				
Books about the architects		1.85***	1.66***	1.01***
Exhibitions		-.11	-.14	-.09
<i>Constant</i>	2.21	1.29	-1.74	-6.23
<i>R² adj</i>	.2106	.4368	.4670	.5373
<i>F</i>	10.07	16.82	9.94	8.90
<i>N</i>	103	103	103	103

* $p < .1$; ** $p < .05$; *** $p < .01$