DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT

DISSONANCE AND HARMONY:
A STUDY OF THE RECOGNITION OF ARTISTS
IN MODERNISTIC MUSIC IN BRUSSELS; 1919-1939

CHRISTOPHE BOONE, CAROLYN H. DECLERCK,
HAYAGREEVA RAO & KRISTIN VAN DEN BUIJS
Dissonance and harmony: A study of the recognition of artists in modernistic music in Brussels; 1919-1939

Christophe Boone, Carolyn H. Declerck, Hayagreeva Rao & Kristin Van Den Buys

RESEARCH PAPER 2009-016
ACED 2009-006
DECEMBER 2009

University of Antwerp, City Campus, Prinsstraat 13, B-2000 Antwerp, Belgium
ACED Administration - room Z.105
phone: (32) 3 275 50 64 - fax: (32) 3 275 50 79
e-mail: anne.vanderplanken@ua.ac.be

The papers can be also found at website: http://www.ua.ac.be/aced & http://www.ua.ac.be/TEW
(research > working papers)

D/2009/1169/016
ACED/2009/006
DISSONANCE AND HARMONY: A STUDY OF THE RECOGNITION OF ARTISTS IN MODERNISTIC MUSIC IN BRUSSELS; 1919-1939*

Christophe Boone
University of Antwerp

Carolyn H. Declerck
University of Antwerp

Hayagreeva Rao
Graduate School of Business
Stanford University

Kristin Van Den Buys
Royal Conservatory of Brussels/University of Brussels

December 2009

Word count: 9222 (tables and figures not included)
Number of tables: 4 Number of figures: 6
Running head: Modernistic music in Brussels

* Corresponding author: Christophe Boone, University of Antwerp, Faculty of Applied Economics, Department of Management, Prinsstraat 13, B-2000 Antwerp, Belgium, Tel: 0032 (0)3 265 50 59, Fax: 0032 (0)3 265 50 84, christophe.boone@ua.ac.be.
We thank Glenn Carroll, Henrich Greve, Mike Hannan, Greta Hsu, Ozgecan Kocak, and John Meyer for their invaluable comments and suggestions. We also appreciate the insightful feedback of the members of the Nagymaros Group.
DISSONANCE AND HARMONY: A STUDY OF THE RECOGNITION OF ARTISTS IN MODERNISTIC MUSIC IN BRUSSELS; 1919-1939

ABSTRACT

What explains the recognition gained by artists? Is it learning by doing? Or is it social structure? We study the recognition gained by modernistic composers in Belgium during the interwar years, and find that learning by doing increases recognition for pioneers, and that it matters only when there is fragmentation of the genre. However, novices secured recognition if they worked in a genre allied with a political ideology; more specifically, when the far right parties gained ground reflecting the rise of Flemish nationalism, expressionists belonging to the German pole garnered more recognition even if they were novices. Taken together, these results suggest that worlds of art shape the fates of works of art.
DISSONANCE AND HARMONY: A STUDY OF THE RECOGNITION OF ARTISTS IN MODERNISTIC MUSIC IN BRUSSELS; 1919-1939

Why do some artists gain recognition in artistic labor markets while others fail to do so? Recognition pertains to the assessment of an artist by peers and insiders in an art-world and is indicated by acceptance of art works in exhibitions, elections to juried societies, and awards won. By contrast, renown is more cosmopolitan and refers to how well an artist is known outside the art-world and may even be posthumous, and is measured through sales, museum purchases, and prices commanded (Lang and Lang 1988:84-85). Recognition is the precursor to renown – once an artist is overlooked, posterity would never know. Moreover, small differences in individual talent may lead to large variations in renown due to differences in recognition (MacDonald 1988).

At one extreme, art-works may be seen as individual accomplishments and the recognition gained by artists may be traced to individual differences in ability. Since artistic work is non-routine, it does not depend on skills gained through formal training; Filer (1990) found that the effect of schooling on artistic success measured by earnings was low. Many artists think of themselves as self-taught (Moulin 1992) and skills are acquired progressively over time (Menger 1999). At the other extreme, art can be viewed as social in character, and artistic recognition is determined less by ability and more by the fate of the genre to which art-works belong (Becker 1974; Bielby and Bielby 1994; Peterson 1997). In turn, genres are conventions about how materials and ideas may be combined, and serve as a set of codes that bind together performers, critics and fans, and demarcate one world from another (Lena and Peterson 2008:698).

Works of art and worlds of art are deeply connected. Galenson and Weinberg (2001) showed that artistic renown hinges on experience in genres that are experimental but not in genres that emphasize abstract and conceptual work. We extend their reasoning to artistic recognition, but
also consider how the returns to experience depend on whether one is a pioneer or not, whether a
genre is fragmented or not, and whether a genre is allied to a rising political ideology. We
propose that pioneers who break conventions garner recognition when they have experience. We
suggest that recognition flows to artists with experience when a genre is fragmented. Finally, we
build on the idea that art is tied to ideology, and posit that the returns to experience decline when
a genre is allied with an ascendant political ideology.

We test these predictions in a study of modernistic music during the interregnum between the
first and second World Wars in Brussels. Inter-war Brussels is a laboratory to unpack the
connections between individual experience of an artist and genres for the following reasons. First,
modernistic music as a genre rose and fell during this period. Modernistic compositions appeared
in ad hoc initiatives such as festivals in 1920, and then in organizations of chamber music in
1922 – these informal arenas gathered enthusiasts interested in avant-garde music. It was only
later that modernistic compositions were featured in philharmonic societies (1923) and opera
houses (1926) which drew mainstream audiences. Second, there was dissensus to the extent that
Brussels drew inspiration from the German pole of modernistic music personified by Schönberg
in Vienna and the Latin pole symbolized by Stravinsky in Paris. A hybrid of the German and
French poles also emerged during this period. Finally, modernistic music in Brussels was shaped
by the competing forces of an ascendant Flemish nationalism challenging French dominance.

THEORY

Galenson and Weinberg (2001) observed that Cezanne and Picasso made their best contributions
at very different stages in their careers, and argued that it was not a matter of chance. While
Cezanne’s best paintings in impressionism were produced from 1890 until 1906 near the time of
his death at the age of 67, Picasso’s most influential work, *Les Demoiselles d’Avignon*, which was the forerunner of cubism, was produced in 1907 when Picasso was 25.

Drawing on the work of psychologists (e.g., Simonton 1994) and economists (e.g., Bartel and Sicherman 1998), Galenson and Weinberg (2001) proposed that the relationship between age and artistic quality depends on genre. They suggested that the best creative work was likely to be produced at younger ages in genres that were abstract and conceptual, but at older ages in genres that dealt with complex and concrete ideas relying on experimentation, because creative ideations can be produced and elaborated more rapidly in the former compared to the latter. They studied the posthumous sale prices of art-works produced by 33 painters and found that in impressionism, a genre that relied on experimentation, artists produced their renowned works at an older age, whereas in cubism, which was more abstract and conceptual, artists such as Picasso produced their renowned works at an earlier age. In another study, Galenson (2005) analyzed the careers of eleven leading 20th century poets and used the frequency with which poems are reprinted in anthologies as a measure of their renown. He found that conceptual poets (e.g., Sylvia Plath, TS Eliot) produced their renowned work at an earlier age, and experimental poets (Robert Frost, Wallace Stevens) produced their renowned poems at a later age. Although these arguments relate to posthumous renown, we suggest that they also pertain to contemporary recognition. Therefore:

H1) Artist experience increases recognition of art-works in experimental but not in conceptual art genres.

Emerging genres lack conventions that define the genre as a distinctive one, and make it harder for artists to gain recognition. Artistic conventions specify how materials and ideas are to be
combined, define the scope and length of works, and demarcate the rights and obligations of artists. “The possibility of artistic experience arises from the existence of a body of conventions that artists and audiences can refer to in making sense of the work” (Becker 1974:771).

Pioneers in a genre face an acute problem because they breach conventions. The literature on new industries and new products suggests that there is controversy about whether pioneers are advantaged or disadvantaged. Some writers hold that first-movers or pioneers gain quick recognition in new industries (e.g., Lieberman and Montgomery 1988); others suggest that pioneers are unsuccessful in gaining enduring recognition (e.g., Golder and Tellis 1993). In an early study, Olleros (1986:8) held that “again and again we see industries emerge over the dead bodies of their early pioneers”. Min, Kalwani and Robinson (2006) show that first movers are advantaged when new product categories are established through incremental innovations, but fail when such categories embody very new technologies.

In art-worlds, skills and experience are very essential for pioneers to successfully break conventions. For one, conventions make unconventional work very costly, increasing an artist’s troubles in producing art. In addition, breaking conventions hampers the appeal of art-works, reducing its circulation and the artist’s recognition (Becker 1974). Becker (1974:772) provides the example of Harry Partch – a composer who pioneered a new genre of music which rebelled against the tyranny of the piano. He also championed a change from the western chromatic musical scale of 12 tones to one including 42 tones between the octaves, and even built new instruments to produce these microtones, and introduced a new notation to score 42 tone music. “Whereas a performance of music scored for conventional tones can be performed adequately after relatively few hours of rehearsals, forty-two tone music requires much more work, time, effort... seven or eight months of work result in two hours of music” (Becker 1974:772).
Moreover, such breaches of conventions are often associated with strong emotional reactions as they are regarded as an attack against aesthetic and even moral values (Becker 1974). For example, in May 1913, the day after the first performance of Stravinsky’s modernistic composition *Le Sacre du Printemps* -- one of the most revolutionary art-works of the 20th century --, in Paris, the newspapers emotionally referred to it as *Le Massacre du Tympan*. To successfully overcome these liabilities associated with breaking conventions and artistic freedom, we expect that a pioneer’s skills and experience are very important. Therefore:

H2) Artist experience increases recognition of art-works by pioneers.

Emerging genres lack legitimacy or taken-for-granted understandings about the label, the conventions, and more generally, the schemata underlying the category. Hannan, Polos and Carroll (2007) propose that nascent categories start with fuzzy boundaries and become crystallized when enthusiasts begin to cluster entities on the basis of similarity, label clusters, and then decide which entities belong to the label fully, partially, or not at all – as claims that might or might not be borne out. As evidence accumulates about previously-unseen producers and about the behaviors of the producers whose features served as the material for categorization, the initial hypotheses become codified into a schema. Thus, activists have to reach consensus on labels and their attributes, and thereby, the meaning of categories. In short, they have to develop a schema, and the schema has to diffuse to other audiences. Consensus about the meaning of the category eliminates the need for detailed scrutiny, and increases the reliance on defaults. When consensus is low, audiences need to rely on direct evidence and deliberate scrutiny to see if an alleged member fits the underlying schema. Thus, genres such as country music (Peterson 1997), folk music (Roy 2004), heavy metal (Bryson 1996), or micro brewing (Carroll and Swaminathan
2000), films (Hsu 2006), and graphical art (Becker 1984) all rest on schemas that tell what features are relevant and what values of those features fit the category label.

Fragmentation of a genre implies disagreement about the conventions underlying a genre and impairs the legitimacy of the genre. In a study of the emergence of the Dutch audit industry, Bogaert, Boone and Carroll (2006) found that fragmentation in the industry increased the death rates of firms. In art-worlds, the greater the dissensus in a genre, the lower is the legitimacy of the genre, and the harder it is for artists to gain recognition. Experience buffers an artist from the dearth of legitimacy when legitimacy is low; works produced by artists at a later age are more likely to be of higher quality and gain a better chance of acquiring recognition amidst dissensus. Therefore:

H3) Artist experience increases recognition of art-works when genre fragmentation is high.

Artistic styles are closely tied to, and deeply intertwined with political ideologies. At one extreme, totalitarian ideologies control aesthetic production. Thus, the Bolshevik revolution led to far-reaching changes in film, poetry, painting, and music because “the critical issue facing the Bolsheviks in 1917 was not the seizure of power, but the seizure of meaning” (Bonnell 1997:1). At the other extreme, artistic genres thrive because they resonate with a political ideology despite the lack of state control. Guilbaut (1983) argued that abstract expressionist art in America thrived because it resonated with a new liberalism that dominated American politics after the 1948 presidential elections – an ideology that neither embraced the extreme left nor the right, and instead, made room for avant-garde dissidence and made it valuable. Johnson (2008) argues that the egalitarian ideology of the French Revolution led to the eradication of privileged art institutions in the world of theatre with the exception of the Royal opera which survived because of the widespread understanding that it was a national treasure.
More specifically, musical styles symbolize and reinforce important ideological aspects of social structure in all cultures (Keller 2007). Indeed, music is said to be the “ideological art” par excellence: “every time people make music, somebody’s values and attitudes are performed” (Dreyfus and Crotty 2007:90). As a result, there is no such thing as “universal” music, or apolitical music (Sandu-Dediu 2007). Studies suggest that music often plays an important role in the construction of nationalism (Brincker 2008). For instance, during the construction of Danish consensus nationalism in the 1930s and 1940s, which united the Danish people in face of the German enemy, the modernist continental expression of serious music in Denmark was repressed in favor of a local and traditional expression (Brincker 2008).

Often artists themselves are actively involved in defining the nationalistic features of genres. For instance, Darius Milhaud, a prominent French modernistic composer of Jewish origin, wrote two seminal articles in the early 1920s on the controversy regarding the meaning of polytonality versus atonality in new music (De Médicis 2005). Being vulnerable to racist attacks, he skillfully turned the issues of the debate to his advantage by focusing on their nationalistic ideological underpinnings. Specifically, he portrayed Viennese atonality as the natural outcome of the Teutonic tradition of Wagnerian chromaticism, and polytonality as the natural extension of the Latinate tradition of French diatonic modality. By linking polytonality to national pride and ethnic tolerance, he tried to spur dissemination of this innovative musical idiom, and to define a French style of modernistic music (De Médicis 2005). On a more general level, Milhaud used nationalism rhetoric as a legitimating device against extreme right.

All this makes clear that the rise of new ideologies de-legitimates existing genres, and legitimates new genres. Artistic materials, such as music and painting, are elements of culture that are readily available for people to draw symbolic boundaries around social groups on the
basis of ideology, ethnicity or nationalism. Conversely, political intolerance to a genre of art and cultural dislike are forms of taste (Bryson 1996; Lizardo 2008). The more ascendant an ideology, and the more legitimate the art genre associated with it, the easier it is for artists to gain recognition. Skill and experience no longer serve as a filter for recognition; instead, ideological compatibility and acceptability to audiences matter. Therefore:

H4) Artist experience does not increase recognition of art-works of a genre affiliated with an ascendant political ideology.

MODERNISTIC MUSIC IN BRUSSELS; 1919-1939

Contemporary avant-garde music knew a remarkable surge in Europe in the beginning of the 20th century. Although the movement is known under the common “modernistic music” label, it emerged and developed around different musical poles in different cities. The German or expressionistic pole originated in Vienna around 1908 as a response to the dramatic paradigm shift exemplified by new scientific and philosophical insights of, among others, Freud (sub-consciousness versus rationality), Marx (the emancipation of the working class), Nietzsche (God is dead) and Darwin (Man among animals). The elite felt a strong need to express the mental crisis resulting from these metaphysical shifts, and to replace tradition with renewal. In Vienna, which was a very traditional society, expressionism represented the “revolution of the bourgeois ego”. Some contemporary musicians felt that music should express this profound mental crisis with all associated feelings of fear, chaos, alienation, and violence. The old musical “grammar”, however, was deemed to be inadequate to express this new inner state. Instead, the essence of music had to be found behind the notes implying that all habitual forms of expressing the beautiful should be replaced by features that permit the artist to manifest his own personality.
This led to the development of a new “grammar” characterized by atonality, and experimentation with structure, rhythm and orchestration.

The Latin pole of modernistic music originated in Paris and did not represent as much of a revolution as in Vienna. The reason is that Paris, unlike Vienna, was already a very liberal city. Here, modernistic composers reacted against the futility of impressionistic music and its emphasis on aesthetics, which did not fit the horror of WWI. The French rivaled against Vienna in claiming “new music” but with a different form compared to expressionism. “New music” should be pure and abstract (cf., “music an sich”) and should create beauty by structure (cf., “a sounding architecture”) by introducing new simplicity and “retour à l’ordre”. As these composers were inspired by the musical ideal of the classical music of the late 18th century (cf., Mozart and Haydn), this pole is also known as neo-classicism. This pole was closer to the “old grammar”, keeping tonality and form, but inserted German pole innovations of rhythm and orchestration.

The following three composers were the driving pioneers of new music. Satie and later Stravinsky are regarded as the forerunners of the Latin pole, whereas Schönberg is considered the vanguard of the German pole. Between both extremes several variants were developed (e.g., by Bartok and the members of the group of 6 including Poulenc, Milhaud and Honneger), mixing elements of expressionism and neo-classicism. These composers introduced new musical techniques (closer to expressionism) but remained faithful to tonality.

**Modernistic Music in Brussels**: In the early 1920s, shortly after WWI, Belgium showed almost no interest in modernistic music compared to other forms of contemporary music like post-romantic or post-impressionistic music. Often lacking harmonic sounds, modernistic music is not “easy listening” and requires a certain level of musical training to be truly appreciated. As
a consequence, modernistic music never became appealing to the masses. However, it attracted the attention of prominent people of the Brussels’ cultural elite who became passionate missionaries of the form. Among them were Henry Le Boeuf, director general and financier of the *Concerts Populaires* (1919-1929) and later the *Philharmonic Society of Brussels* (1927-1935), and Corneil de Thoran, the director of the Royal Opera House, *La Monnaie*. These enthusiasts – who belonged to the rich, liberal bourgeois class – were attracted by the intellectual and ideological value that modernistic music had to offer, which fitted their ethos of “Burgertumbuilding.” The mission of these institutional entrepreneurs was to promote and develop “modern” music. This was a daunting task given the complexity and revolutionary character of the music. In a program book of the *Concerts Populaires* Henry Le Boeuf (1926) wrote: “The largest part of the former generation, who followed the musical evolution till the impressionistic music of Debussy and Ravel, was against the new musical formulas. It is not clear whether these new formulas are just a transition, a real innovation or an accidental state of the art of sounds. But it is the task of the board of the *Concerts Populaires* to include representative works of Stravinsky, Milhaud and others in their musical programs. The public has the right -- one can even say the task -- to be informed.”

The latter implied that audiences had to be “created” and that traditional concert institutions were reluctant at first to program modernistic compositions. After the first performance of *Le Sacre du Printemps* of Stravinsky in Brussels in May 1923, the public reacted furious and spoke of “an abracadabrant piece of music.” Le Boeuf replied: “Stravinsky is not my favorite composer either, but I have to admit that he introduced new forms into music.” The cultural elite therefore had to expend much (including financial) effort in order to try to institutionalize the new form. For this purpose they also engaged critics and experts (e.g., musicologists) to define and explain
the form. In Brussels, Paul Collaer, who was director and pianist between 1922 and 1934 of Pro Arte concerts (a famous avant-garde chamber music organization specialized in contemporary music), was such a path breaking musicologist.

Most financiers, directors and musicologists of Brussels were part of the same cultural elite sharing the agenda of turning Brussels into a major musical center of Europe. These musicologists had an important impact on the development of the modernistic movement in Brussels in several ways. They defined and defended modernistic music through seminars and publications in general art- and music periodicals, thereby simultaneously convincing the public and concert organizers of the value of modernistic music. They promoted particular modernistic composers through letters and publications prior to their performance in concert halls. They also acted as intermediaries between national and international composers on the one hand, and concert organizers on the other hand. The French composer Darius Milhaud, for instance, was one of Paul Collaer’s best friends. As a result his work was performed many times in Brussels and Belgium. Finally, they established and financed concert institutions with the specific purpose to boost the diffusion of modernistic compositions (e.g., the Pro Arte concerts).

A necessary, bottom line condition in order to establish the genre is public performance of modernistic compositions in organized concerts. Four major types of organizations can be distinguished: 1) opera houses, 2) philharmonic societies (such as Concerts Defauw), 3) organizations of chamber music (such as Pro Arte), and 4) ad hoc chamber music initiatives. Many of these organizations were commercial trying to sell as many tickets as possible per concert performance in order to make a profit. Others (e.g., Pro Arte) were non-commercial and represented initiatives of the cultural elite with the specific goal to promote modernistic music. These non-commercial organizations therefore programmed a larger relative number of
modernistic compositions in comparison to the commercial institutions that were more concerned with attracting a broader audience with a more varied musical program.

Insert Figure 1 Here

The opera house occupies the top of the pyramid, followed by the philharmonic societies, then the organizations of chamber music, and all other ad hoc initiatives forming the base of the pyramid. The former two organizations represented the dominant mainstream musical audiences of the time, consisting of high and middle class people. In contrast, the latter two forums attracted enthusiasts of the avant-garde subculture. Between 1920 and 1924, for instance, ad hoc initiatives in modern music were mainly taken by smaller organizations like student unions (among them *La Lanterne Sourd* of the Free University of Brussels), galleries of modern Art (among them Gallery Giroux), editors of music (e.g., *Maison Chester*), unions of artists and writers, and Art Magazines (e.g., *7 Arts*). Such initiatives were sometimes also taken by people from the financial elite, like Henry Le Boeuf and Adolphe Stoclet, who invited musicians, composers and musicologists at their homes to perform or discuss modern music. These smaller organizations carried less weight in the number of people they could reach with a single performance, but because of their small size and relatively low costs, they could occur more frequently and were more flexible. They were also more receptive to cultural diversity and new artistic developments and acted as trend setters for institutions higher up in the pyramid. Subsequently, some ad hoc initiatives became true concert-organizations like the *Pro Arte Concerts* (1922-1934) when they gained the systematic financial support of the Brussels’ elite.

The year of first appearance of modernistic compositions in each level of the pyramid follows a clear sequence. Modernistic music was first performed in ad hoc initiatives (1920), before it
moved up to organizations of chamber music (1922), to philharmonic societies (1923), and finally, to the opera houses (1926).

The institutional entrepreneurs in Brussels were quite successful at first. In the thirties, top orchestras gained international reputation and magnificent new concert halls were erected, like the *Palais de Beaux-Arts* (1929), in which several new world creations enjoyed their first performance. For example, the first performance of Stravinsky’s *Psalm symphony* in Brussels in 1930 serves as a testimony of its high status comparable to the other major European centers of modern music.

**Fragmentation of Modernistic Music:** The concert directors and musicologists in Brussels were part of the producer elite - concert directors had a monopoly over programming in their own institutions, but the musicologists could influence programming because they were the ones who popularized modernistic music through public lectures, publications in music periodicals, and letters. Both the concert directors and musicologists of Brussels were part of the same cultural elite who shared the agenda of turning Belgium into a major international musical heart of Europe. Since the Belgian audience was not aware of the new international currents in modern music before WWI, the cultural elite not only wanted to inform the Belgian public about those trends but also to create a new international platform for it.

Between 1920 and 1923 there was, however, little agreement whatsoever among critics and the public on what features modernistic music should have. It wasn’t clear whether the “new music” came from Paris (the Latin pole) or Vienna (the German pole) - both poles differing substantially in terms of their conception of music, technical ingredients and style (for a summary see Table 1). The exemplars in this period were Satie for the Latin pole and Schönberg for the German pole.
Critics recurrently referred to this contestation between different sub-forms as “bataille” and “combat” in contemporaneous periodicals. Most critics considered the Latin pole as the one to follow, and Satie as the new leader of the avant-garde. Paul Collaer, for instance, wrote about Schönberg as follows: “Schönberg’s music arrived at a dead point. His music is very chaotic and he expresses feelings of a nightmare.” As a result, Schönberg and the German pole were regularly referred to in these periodicals, but their music was seldom performed in Brussels.

From 1923 onwards Stravinsky started to complement and eventuallyreplace Satie as the leader of the French avant-garde. Consensus grew among the major critics in Brussels about the definition of “new music,” which was generally described in terms of the features of the Latin pole: abstract, clear, well-structured, tonal and melodious music. This, however, did not end the contestation which is attested by the well-documented public rivalry between Stravinsky and Schönberg, the oppositional exemplars of modernistic music. They did not appreciate, at least at that time, each others compositions. In this respect, Schönberg referred to Stravinsky as “der kleine modernsky.”

As of 1927 enthusiasts became more open to the German pole, and in 1932 one of the critics, Denijs Dille, considered Bela Bartok, Hindemith and Alban Berg as the new exemplars. Although the Latin pole stayed the most popular in Brussels, German new music gained some footage. Important works, like Berg’s opera Wozzeck, were performed in Brussels, and, in the 1930s, Schönberg and atonality re-appeared as important discussion issues in the specialized periodicals.

The contestation among the opposite poles inspired many composers to mix elements of both Neo-Classicism and Expressionism. Some of these compositions composed by, for instance,
Prokofief, Honegger, and Milhaud, were closer to the Latin neo-classical pole, while the work of others like Hindemith, Berg, and Bartok contained much more features of the German expressionist pole. Important is that gradually more and more hybrid compositions were composed, resulting in a clearly recognizable, separate sub-form amidst the two poles of modernistic music.

**Political Ideologies:** A noteworthy feature of modernistic music in Brussels is that producers and consumers (enthusiasts and mainstream) were also influenced by their political ideologies. The Latin composers resonated with those espousing a French-liberal political affiliation, while Flemish-Catholics sought to promote the German pole along with Flemish composers. These ideological differences became increasingly salient during the period of our study. At the same time, from 1932 onwards, the rise of Nazi Germany also amplified discord. Immediately after WWI there was a preference among these actors for compositions belonging to the Latin pole. Obviously, this is because of the linguistic and cultural association between Brussels and Paris, where this pole originated. In fact, Collaer claimed the victory of neo-classicism around 1924 after a short period of experimentation of what was available and new at that time. Gradually, however, the German pole also gained significance with a rising number of performances in avant-garde chamber music organizations, such as *Pro Arte*. Interestingly, Collaer, who was an enthusiast of Stravinsky, Satie and Milhaud, programmed expressionistic compositions, not because he found it so important, but rather because the musicians of *Pro Arte* insisted.

**Insert Table 2 Here**

Table 2 compares the number of modernistic compositions relative to the total number of compositions performed across the avant-garde enthusiast (i.e., ad hoc initiatives and chamber music organizations of contemporary music) and mainstream (i.e., philharmonic societies and
opera houses) audiences in Brussels. In addition, a distinction is made between modernistic compositions by international Latin, Germanic, and National Flemish composers. During the time span 1920-1924, modernistic music was slowly introduced and performed in modest numbers, mostly from international composers (primarily Stravinsky and Satie of the Latin pole). Flemish modernistic compositions were notoriously absent at that time in most institutions. Modernistic compositions started to appear more frequently in programs during the years spanning 1924-1927 (now also including works by Prokofief, Honegger, and Milhaud). The peak of modernistic music resided in the time span 1927-1933. While more Flemish compositions appeared in the programs at this time, the bulk of modernistic compositions were still by international composers (now also including the German pole, Hindemith, Schönberg, Berg, and Bartok). Drastic changes took place during the years spanning 1933–1936. One of the concert organizations which had been established specifically with the aim of promoting modernistic music (The Pro Arte concert organization) disappeared. Fewer ad hoc initiatives performed modernistic music, while the well-established philharmonic societies and opera houses almost stopped programming them completely. A renewed interest in modernistic music emerged in 1936, but from that time on modernistic music was sponsored almost exclusively by the National Broadcasting Institute. The latter promoted, due to Collaer’s efforts (see note 4), a well-balanced program of modernistic performances by a wide range of composers (from both the Latin and German poles), including also a wider array of Flemish compositions than ever before.

DATA AND METHODS

We collected data on the names, locations, programs, and dates of modernistic music concerts in Brussels from various libraries and private archives in Belgium. We started our period of
observation in 1919 – right after World War 1 (when the first modernistic compositions were performed in Brussels), and ended it in 1939 – on the eve of World War II (when performances dropped to near zero). Figure 2 plots the number of Neo-Classical, Expressionistic and Hybrid modernistic compositions performed in Brussels each season during the interbellum (first performances only).

Insert Figure 2 Here

**Dependent variable:** An important baseline indicator of recognition by peers is whether or not an artist’s composition is being performed in the first place (Lang and Lang 1988), and the resulting rate at which these performance events occur. Therefore we model the hazard rate of all modernistic compositions that were performed in Brussels between 1919 and 1939. Note that modernistic music composers authored hundreds of compositions which were sometimes repeatedly played. We limit our analysis to the rate at which a composition was performed for the first time to understand the recognition associated with the specific art-work (i.e., all compositions shown in Figure 2). We focused on first performances only because the modernistic music wave in Brussels thrived on the element of surprise, as is typical for any avant-garde movement. Note in this respect that almost 75 percent of the modernistic compositions that were performed in Brussels during this period were only played once. Up to 95 percent were performed less than 4 times, with multiple performances generally clustered in the same month to realize “economies of scale”. So our dependent variable is the rate at which modernistic music compositions being at risk to be performed in Brussels between 1919 and 1939 were first performed. Compositions that are composed before 1919 are assumed to enter the Brussels’ risk set as of 1919; all other compositions as of the date of composition. Given that we know the month in which each composition was performed we modeled the rate at the month
level. 383 modernistic compositions, composed by 68 composers, were performed in the period under study.  

**Independent Variables:** Following Galenson and Weinberg (2001), the age of the composer at the date of composition of the art-work is used as a proxy for experience. This is a very straightforward measure of experience particularly in the case of serious music as most artists typically start their career in early childhood gradually mastering the complexities of music. The average age at composition equals 32 with a wide range from 15 to 60. The variable’s frequency distribution is presented in Figure 3. Note that this focal variable is not related to the passage of time in the period under study; it does not increase nor decrease with time.

We are primarily interested in the moderating effects of four independent variables: type of genre (experimental or conceptual), pioneer, genre fragmentation, and ascendant political ideology.

With respect to the genre, all modernistic compositions can readily be classified by musicologists in three major discrete, mutually exclusive categories: Expressionist, Neo-Classical and Hybrid. The latter compositions mix elements from expressionism with neoclassicism. We used three dummy variables to code the subgenre to which each composition performed in Brussels belongs (EX composition, NC composition, and Hybrid). It follows from our comparison summarized in Table 1 that EX compositions are much more abstract and conceptual in nature than NC compositions, which return to the musical principles of the 18th century and introduce incremental innovations. This is underscored by a quote of Darius Milhaud, whose compositions lean towards the NC pole, claiming that: “Each time we speak of newness, of revolution for a musician, we may be sure that any rich new element that is introduced is
underpinned by a solid tradition” (De Médicis 2005:589). Translating Hypothesis 1 to the present context, we, therefore, expect that composer experience will increase recognition and thus the performance hazard rate of the compositions belonging to the NC but not to the EX subgenre.

We created a dummy variable Pioneer that equals 1 for the compositions of the three major first-movers, Satie, Stravinsky, and Schönberg (zero otherwise), to test whether the value of experience with respect to recognition depends on being a pioneer or not (Hypothesis 2). Twenty percent of the compositions performed in Brussels were composed by one of the pioneers.

Following Bogaert et al. (2006), we measured genre fragmentation at time $t$ with the Simpson (1949) index of diversity applied to the frequency distribution of modernistic music compositions over the three subgenres defined above (i.e., EX, NC and Hybrid). The Simpson (also known as the Herfindahl and Blau) index is defined as one minus the sum of the squared proportions of compositions belonging to each of the three subgenres. A high index implies genre fragmentation, and dissensus about the conventions and codes that apply to the genre. As an example, if in year $t$ only NC compositions were performed, the Simpson index would be zero and consensus about the genre would be high. In contrast, if in year $t$ an equal number of EX, NC and Hybrid compositions were performed, disagreement about conventions is expected to be high, and the Simpson index would reach its maximum value [i.e., .67 which is $(1-(3*((1/3)^2))]$. The mean of genre fragmentation equals .34, and ranges between .13 and .61. Hypothesis 3 predicts that the value of experience is higher when genre fragmentation is high.

The importance of nationalistic ideologies strongly increased in most countries in Europe in the period under study. In these countries nationalism went hand in hand with the success of extreme right political parties as exemplified by the rise of Nazi Germany in the 1930s. In the slipstream of these events, extreme-right Flemish nationalism in Belgium, which challenged the
French dominance, gained importance too. Given that this ascendant political ideology was strongly oriented towards the German ideology, the symbolic value of expressionistic compositions in the so-called Teutonic tradition increased (cf., the essays of Milhaud referred to above). To capture this ideological trend in the present study, we used the outcome of Parliament elections in Brussels and counted the percentage of votes that were obtained by extreme-right parties. We used interpolation to fill in data points in the years without elections. The average percentage equals 4.4%, ranging between 2.7% and 22.1%. Hypothesis 4 then predicts that the effect of composer age on the likelihood of performance of an EX composition will depend on the success of extreme-right parties in elections. Specifically, experience will have no value when the symbolic ideological value of EX compositions is high due to the rise of extreme right.

**Control Variables:** In our event history analyses the compositions become at risk to be performed in Brussels as of 1919. A number of these compositions, however, were composed before 1919. To control for left censoring we computed the difference in years between 1919, the start of our observation window, and the year in which the composition was first published. This variable was set to zero for all compositions composed after 1919. More than ¾ of all compositions performed in Brussels were composed after 1919.

A plausible alternative reason as to why modernistic music compositions rose and fell is that they were costlier to perform than classical music. Modernistic music required a greater number of repetitions that led to higher costs, and also entailed copyright payments. As a result, it was not profitable and relied on donations and gifts. In addition, elite cultures can only thrive when communities enjoy a sufficiently high baseline wealth (DiMaggio 1987). Accordingly, we used GDP per capita as a control variable to capture both mechanisms. A related reason as to why modernistic music rose and fell was that it needed trained, sophisticated audiences who could
appreciate dissonance and atonality. Therefore we used the yearly growth in the number of conservatory students in Brussels as a control variable.

We also expect the rate at which compositions were performed to differ between the different types of organizations. It will probably be lower in mainstream venues, such as opera houses and philharmonic societies, compared to avant-garde venues such as organizations of chamber music and ad hoc initiatives. We control for this by including a Mainstream dummy which equals 1 when the composition is performed in mainstream venues (zero otherwise).

To control for the possibility that some composers might have more appeal than others (irrespective of the specific art-work) we control for the number of modernistic compositions of composer \( i \) that were performed in the prior season. This variable also captures other unobserved differences between composers, such as social capital, that might affect the likelihood that their art-work is performed.\(^6\)

All independent variables are updated at the beginning of each season (i.e., at the beginning of October) or at the beginning of the calendar year for time series from secondary sources (i.e., GDP per capita and growth of the number of conservatory students), and are lagged one season or year. Finally, in all models we included month dummies to account for monthly fluctuations in modernistic music performances.

**Methods:** In order to examine the rate of first performance of a given modernistic composition, we used a piecewise-constant rate event history model (Tuma and Hannan 1984). The piecewise-constant model is an exponential hazard rate model which assumes a constant hazard rate within a pre-defined time-segment but allows this rate to vary between time-segments. Analyses of the time series data led us to create time pieces using the Stpiece command (Sørensen 1999) in STATA 10 with the following segments: 0 to 6 months, 6 to 18
months, 18 to 48 months, 48 to 144 months, and greater than 144 months. Analyses did not vary significantly with changes to the intervals. Formally, the hazard rate is expressed as

\[ h_i(t) = \exp[\alpha_i + \beta_i X' + \tau_j] \]

where \( \alpha_i \) represents the constant term for the \( i \)th composition, \( X' \) represents a vector of covariates, \( \beta_i \) represents its estimated coefficients and \( \tau \) is the timepiece dummy variable for the \( j \)th interval. We report robust standard errors of all estimates to account for clustering of observations within 68 composers.

**RESULTS**

Table 3 provides the descriptive statistics for all variables under study. Table 4 displays the results from the analysis of the rate at which modernistic music was first performed in Brussels. For the sake of parsimony we do not report the estimates of the time pieces and the month dummies. Model 1 shows the baseline model. The left-censor variable has a significant negative effect. GDP per capita has a strong positive effect on the rate, as expected. The effect of conservatory student growth is positive but not significant. Not surprisingly, the rate of performance appears to be much lower in mainstream venues. Interestingly, the number of modernistic compositions performed in the previous season of a focal composer has a significant negative effect on the rate. Apparently, being recognized as a composer does not spur the recognition of subsequent art-works. We speculate that this is due to the avant-garde nature of the music genre which thrives on surprise and innovation.

The rate of performance of Neo-Classical compositions is much higher than the rate of Expressionistic compositions as is revealed by the estimates of the two NC and EX composition dummies (Hybrid compositions is the reference category). This is consistent with Brussels’
orientation towards France and Paris, and the fact that the abstract EX compositions were more demanding to listen to for audiences. Finally, the extreme-right variable positively affects the rate suggesting that political and ideological turmoil was a fruitful seedbed for the diffusion of avant-garde, modernistic music in Brussels.

Insert Tables 3 and 4 Here

To check for non-linear effects of composer experience, Model 2 includes the square of composer age at composition, which is not significant. Hypothesis 1 is tested by including the product terms of age at composition and the subgenre to which the composition belongs, EX or NC, respectively. Both coefficients are not significant (Model 3 in Table 4). Hypothesis 1 – predicting that age at composition would increase the rate of NC but not of EX compositions – is therefore rejected.

Hypothesis 2 is confirmed as the estimate of the interaction between pioneer and age at composition is positive and significant (Model 4 in Table 4). Figure 4 shows that the multiplier of the rate increases with age for pioneers, but decreases with age for other composers.

Insert Figure 4 Here

Hypothesis 3 is also supported as the interaction between age at composition and genre fragmentation is significantly positive (Model 5 in Table 4). In Figure 5 we show the marginal effect of age on the hazard rate for three levels of genre fragmentation (at the minimum, the mean and the maximum). It appears that experience increases the multiplier of the rate at high levels of fragmentation, whereas it decreases the multiplier at mean and low levels.

Insert Figure 5 Here

In Model 6 (Table 4) we report the interaction effect of age at composition and extreme right for EX compositions only. As expected, this interaction is significant and negative, confirming
Hypothesis 4. Figure 6 shows that experience does not matter when the votes for extreme right parties are high (at maximum value for the period under study). Age at composition does increase the rate, but only at the mean and minimum level of extreme-right votes. Model 7 (Table 4) reports the same model but now for NC compositions only. As NC art-works are not affiliated with the specific ascendant political ideology we should not observe a significant interaction between NC composition and composer age. This is indeed the case.

DISCUSSION

Our study sought to deepen our understanding of why some artists and their art-work become successful while others are never recognized. We asked ourselves the question how learning by doing interacts with social structure in affecting contemporaneous success. We studied the recognition gained by modernistic composers in Belgium during the interwar years, and find that learning by doing matters for pioneers, and that it matters only when there is fragmentation of the genre. However, when the far right parties gained ground reflecting the rise of Flemish nationalism, expressionists belonging to the German pole garnered more recognition even if they were novices. Unlike Galenson and Weinberg (2001) and Galenson (2005), we do not find that the value of experience is larger for experimental (neo-classical) compared to conceptual (expressionist) modernistic music. This suggests that the former’s theory is not applicable to all art forms. We speculate that serious music is so complex and concrete that the creation of a new abstract language, such as atonality, is much more difficult in music as opposed to painting and poetry. This is consistent with the observation that major innovations in music generally occur later in chronological time compared to other art forms.
The major contribution of our paper lies in connecting two previously disconnected strands of research, i.e., the economics and sociology of art. The former traditionally has an atomistic approach arguing that success depends on individual characteristics. For instance, superstardom models aim to explain how small differences in talent lead to large income differences due to imperfect substitutability between price and quality (Hamlen 1994; MacDonald 1988; Knebel 2007). The work of Galenson and colleagues focuses on the value of individual artist experience and learning by doing, downplaying the importance of social context. In addition, typical for this approach is that success is assessed by measuring the long-run monetary value of art-work and/or the income of artists (Galenson and Weinberg 2001).

With respect to the outcome variable of interest, the sociology of art literature, in contrast, is more concerned with explaining how reputation survives. The challenge is to understand the social processes that account for why some art-works and artists become part of collective memory, which is not obvious as “all but a fragment of the past quickly disappears behind a curtain of oblivion” (Lang and Lang 1988:79). Here the simple fact of being recognized during an artist’s productive life time is an important precursor of long-run success and renown (Lang and Lang 1988).

In addition, in the sociology of art success is regarded as an outcome of social structures. Given that the production of art is a collective action, art conventions are a *conditio sine qua non* for recognition (Becker 1974). Systems of orientations, expectations and conventions bind actors together in genres (Lena and Petersen 2008), that are often ideologically laden and/or serve ideological purposes. In this respect, Sandu-Dediu (2007) claims that there is no such thing as apolitical music.
Our approach and findings enrich the sociology of art in two ways. First, prior work in this tradition implicitly assumes that consensus exists about the conventions, labels and schemata that distinguish different genres (Lena and Peterson 2008). However, recent work in sociology stresses that contestation and dissensus is the rule rather than the exception when new genres and cultural categories emerge (Hannan et al. 2007; Rao 1994, 1998). This in turn hampers the legitimacy and taken-for-grantedness of new genres. In this paper we explicitly take into account that genres are in constant flux due to this contestation which is often fueled by ideological and political changes that define what is legitimate or not.

Second, our findings reveal the value of bringing the “work of art” back in the “world of art”. Individual differences in experience appear to be important in shaping the impact of social context on recognition. To successfully break conventions pioneers need experience, which is not the case for second-movers. Similarly, the negative effect of dissensus about conventions on recognition can be overcome by an artist’s experience. Finally, ideologies shape the fate of specific genres and the value of experience: learning by doing is important when the genre is not affiliated with an ascendant political ideology.

Conversely, our findings also add to the economics of art tradition showing that the value of experience is contingent on these important social features of art genres. Specifically, the value of experience increases for those who break conventions (i.e., pioneers), and when there is no consensus about conventions (i.e., genre fragmentation). In contrast, experience becomes futile for genres that fit ascendant political ideologies.

We believe that these findings underscore the potential of linking individual and structural antecedents of artistic recognition. In this respect, Becker (1974:773) argued that: “we can understand any art work as the product of a choice between conventional ease and success and
unconventional trouble and lack of recognition, looking for the experiences and situational and structural elements that dispose artists in one direction or the other.” Our study showed that experience and situational elements interact to affect the consequences of this choice for an artist’s recognition. In future research, it would be interesting to find out whether and how contemporaneous recognition affects long-run renown and success in serious music and other art forms.
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Table 1

Main Differences between the German (Expressionistic) and Latin (Neo-Classical) Poles of Modernistic Music

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Expressionism (1908-1950)</th>
<th>Neo-Classicism (1918-1950) (New-Classicism)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Conception</strong></td>
<td>- Intensification of the Late-Romantic aesthetic and style</td>
<td>- Against Romanticism and Impressionism, back to the 18th century musical ideal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Composer seeking above all to express himself as intensely and as directly as possible, especially feelings of fear, chaos, images of war, violence...Essential subjectivism.</td>
<td>- Autonomic and abstract music</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Kandinsky about Schönberg: &quot;the refusal to employ the habitual forms of the beautiful leads one to admit as sacred all the procedures which permit the artist to manifest his own personality&quot;</td>
<td>- Composer looking for musical beauty through structure. “Retour à l’ordre”, “New simplicity”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Cocteau about Schönberg : “Le musicien de tableau noire”</td>
<td>- Cocteau about Satie : “la route blanche”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Stravinsky about himself : “my music doesn’t express anything”</td>
<td>- Stravinsky about himself : “my music doesn’t express anything”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Technical ingredients</strong></td>
<td>- Composer will be incapable of any reliance on traditional, generally accepted forms</td>
<td>- Traditional, generally accepted forms: clear melody and counterpoint but with the new characteristics of rhythm, harmony and orchestration of impressionism and expressionism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Defigurative, decentering, clenching in melody, rhythm, harmony and orchestration</td>
<td>- Tonality and post-tonality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Atonality (1908) and dodecaphony (1923); or post-tonality</td>
<td>- Sometimes technical ingredients of medieval, renaissance, baroque or classical style</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Dodecaphony can be considered as a “retour à l’ordre”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Structure</strong></td>
<td>- Since traditional, generally accepted forms are based on tonal music, very short rhapsodic structure (1809-1923) later dodecaphony</td>
<td>- Traditional, generally accepted forms, like the sonata-form but in a pre-romantic way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 2
Percentage of Modernistic Performances Programmed per Type of Organization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time period</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Total number of performances</th>
<th>% International modernistic Latin</th>
<th>% International modernistic German</th>
<th>% Flemish modernistic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1920-1924</td>
<td>Opera house</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philharmonic societies</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chamber music org.</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad hoc initiatives</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924-1927</td>
<td>Opera house</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philharmonic societies</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chamber music org.</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad hoc initiatives</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>5.3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927-1933</td>
<td>Opera house</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philharmonic societies</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chamber music org.</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad hoc initiatives</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933-1936</td>
<td>Opera house</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philharmonic societies</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>13.3%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chamber music org.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad hoc initiatives</td>
<td>Not existing anymore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-1940</td>
<td>Opera house</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Philharmonic societies</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chamber music org.</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ad hoc initiatives</td>
<td>Not existing anymore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: For the Opera we only have information on the number of new opera productions. NA means not available. Note in this respect that Pro Arte, the most important chamber music organization, stopped its activity in 1936.
### Table 3
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Min</th>
<th>Max</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Years left censored</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. GDP per capita</td>
<td>74.49</td>
<td>10.17</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>-18*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Growth of # of conservatory students</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>-0.02*</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Mainstream venue</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.06*</td>
<td>0.18*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. # of MM pieces of composer $i$ performed in prior season</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. NC composition</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.08*</td>
<td>-0.13*</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.11*</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. EX composition</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.07*</td>
<td>0.09*</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.03*</td>
<td>-0.22*</td>
<td>-0.75*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Pioneer</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44*</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>-0.02*</td>
<td>-0.29*</td>
<td>0.22*</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Genre fragmentation</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>0.56*</td>
<td>0.19*</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
<td>-0.11*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Extreme right</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>-0.12*</td>
<td>0.30*</td>
<td>0.26*</td>
<td>0.20*</td>
<td>-0.09*</td>
<td>-0.08*</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.07*</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Composer age at composition</td>
<td>31.77</td>
<td>8.33</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>-0.19*</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.05*</td>
<td>-0.25*</td>
<td>0.08*</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
<td>-0.06*</td>
<td>0.41*</td>
<td>0.02*</td>
<td>0.13*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Number of observations 14955; * p < 0.05 (two-tailed)
### Table 4

**Piecewise Exponential Hazard Rate Estimates of Modernistic Compositions Performed in Brussels, 1919-1939**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
<th>Model 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years left censored</td>
<td>-0.04*</td>
<td>-0.04*</td>
<td>-0.04*</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>-0.04**</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GDP per capita</td>
<td>0.04***</td>
<td>0.04***</td>
<td>0.04***</td>
<td>0.04***</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth of # of conservatory students</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.56)</td>
<td>(0.57)</td>
<td>(0.56)</td>
<td>(0.56)</td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(0.73)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mainstream venue</td>
<td>-0.65***</td>
<td>-0.66***</td>
<td>-0.64***</td>
<td>-0.68***</td>
<td>-0.63***</td>
<td>-0.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(1.15)</td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
<td>(2.6)</td>
<td>(1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># of MM pieces of composer $i$ performed in prior season</td>
<td>-0.07**</td>
<td>-0.07**</td>
<td>-0.07**</td>
<td>-0.07**</td>
<td>-0.07**</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NC composition</td>
<td>0.78***</td>
<td>0.81***</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.77***</td>
<td>0.80***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.75)</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EX composition</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>-1.13</td>
<td>-0.44</td>
<td>-1.17</td>
<td>-1.16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pioneer</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.80*</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.81**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
<td>(0.42)</td>
<td>(0.22)</td>
<td>(0.29)</td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genre fragmentation</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>-2.66*</td>
<td>-1.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.66)</td>
<td>(0.65)</td>
<td>(0.66)</td>
<td>(0.66)</td>
<td>(1.23)</td>
<td>(1.23)</td>
<td>(0.80)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extreme right</td>
<td>0.05***</td>
<td>0.05***</td>
<td>0.05***</td>
<td>0.05***</td>
<td>0.04**</td>
<td>0.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.05)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composer age at composition $(Age)$</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.01*</td>
<td>-0.05**</td>
<td>0.06*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td>(0.03)</td>
<td>(0.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age squared</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age * EX composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.08)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age * NC composition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age * Pioneer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.02*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age * Genre fragmentation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.10*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age * Extreme right</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.004**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Log pseudo likelihood</td>
<td>-270.58</td>
<td>-269.85</td>
<td>-270.40</td>
<td>-269.92</td>
<td>-268.33</td>
<td>-26.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of spells</td>
<td>14955</td>
<td>14955</td>
<td>14955</td>
<td>14955</td>
<td>14955</td>
<td>4745</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of events</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>383</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Data in parenthesis are robust standard errors of estimates adjusted for clustering in 68 composers. Estimates for constant, month dummies and composition age pieces are not reported.

* p < .05; ** p < .01; *** p < .001 (one-tailed).
Figure 1

Major Types of Organizations Performing Modernistic Compositions

Organizations

First appearance of modernistic compositions

Opera houses 1926
Philharmonic societies 1923
Organizations of chamber music 1922
Ad Hoc initiatives 1920
Figure 2

Number of Modernistic Compositions per Season
Figure 3

Frequency Distribution of Composer Age at Time of Composition
Figure 4

Multiplier of the Rate for Age*Pioneer Interaction
Figure 5

Multiplier of the Rate for Age*Genre Fragmentation Interaction
Figure 6

Multiplier of the Rate for Age*Extreme Right Interaction for EX Compositions
Notes

1 Hannan et al. (2007) mainly focus on understanding the emergence of new *organizational* forms. However, given that new organizational forms are instantiations of new categories, the theory is much more general and also applies to the emergence of new *cultural* categories.

2 Atonality refers to a tone system that replaces the traditional hierarchy among tones with a system in which each of the 12 tones is regarded as equal.

3 Note that Stravinsky switched from expressionism before 1913 (e.g., *Sacre du printemps*), to neoclassicism (e.g., Pulcinella) taking over the role of Satie as the Latin pole exemplar.

4 In 1936, after the collapse of modernistic music in Brussels, Paul Collaer became the director of music of the Belgium radio broadcast institute (NIR), which was established in 1930. Here he tried to promote modernistic music by broadcasting performances.

5 All analyses are based on these 383 compositions, which do not include the compositions performed in the first season, as we lagged all independent variables with one period.

6 We also decomposed this count variable into two separate counts, one for performances in mainstream venues (opera houses and philharmonic societies) and the other for performances by organizations of chamber music and ad hoc initiatives. The results of these analyses are almost exactly the same as the ones reported here.