

2010/72



Success: talent, intelligence or beauty?

Olivier Gergaud and Victor Ginsburgh



**CORE**

DISCUSSION PAPER

Center for Operations Research  
and Econometrics

Voie du Roman Pays, 34  
B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve  
Belgium

<http://www.uclouvain.be/core>

CORE DISCUSSION PAPER  
2010/72

**Success: talent, intelligence or beauty?**

Olivier GERGAUD<sup>1</sup> and Victor GINSBURGH<sup>2</sup>

November 2010

**Abstract**

We analyze the Celebrity 100 annual list of the world's most "powerful celebrities" compiled and published by Forbes Magazine. The lists provide an interesting collection of people, that includes their earnings, and the perception of citizens concerning the attributes that made them become celebrities. We analyze the relationship between their earnings and the perceptions on their intelligence, talent, beauty and other attributes, and show that though beauty plays a role, intelligence and talent are more important.

**Keywords:** earnings, economic success, talent.

**JEL Classification:** C4, J3, Z1

---

<sup>1</sup> Université de Reims (Troyes Institute of Technology) and Reims Management School, France.  
E-mail: Olivier.gergaud@univ-reims.fr

<sup>2</sup> Université Libre de Bruxelles, ECARES, B-1000 Brussels, Belgium and Université catholique de Louvain, CORE, B-1348 Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium. E-mail: vginsbur@ulb.ac.be. This author is also member of ECORE, the association between CORE and ECARES.

This paper presents research results of the Belgian Program on Interuniversity Poles of Attraction initiated by the Belgian State, Prime Minister's Office, Science Policy Programming. The scientific responsibility is assumed by the authors.

# 1 Introduction

Physical beauty as an attribute that influences economic outcomes such as wages or productivity is described in many papers, starting with Hamermesh and Biddle (1994) and Biddle and Hamermesh (1998), who find that, in the United States, a good look causes a (mild) increase of earnings, both in general and in more homogeneous groups such as attorneys. This result is confirmed by Pfann et al. (2000) for another homogeneous group (advertising firms), and a different country, the Netherlands. Hamermesh and Parker (2005) go back to school and examine the productivity effects of beauty. They conclude, although with caution, that instructors who look better are also thought more productive by students. Johnston (2010) turns to blonde women and shows that their wage premium is “similar in size to the return of an extra year of schooling.” This premium is positively correlated with their spouses’ wages.

Mobius and Rosenblat (2006) consider the same issue in an experimental labor market. They single out that the beauty premium is due to various transmission channels, which leads them to suggest that blind interviews could reduce the premium. Preventing oral contact between employer and employee would even reduce it more, though they have to admit that this would be odd. Another experiment on fund raising led by Price (2008) shows that blondes “induce more households to contribute and elicit higher donations per contact” than others.

The idea in this paper is somewhat different, since it deals with the results of interviews concerning celebrities carried out by E-Poll Market Research (the so-called *E-Score Celebrity* index). Respondents are given a list of attributes that include “beauty,” and are asked which ones they would use to describe a given celebrity. The attributes are used as exogenous variables in a regression in which income is the left hand-side variable. The results show that beauty has a positive effect on wages, but this effect is dwarfed by other attributes such as talent and intelligence. This is good news. There is no need to be handsome or blond(e) to become successful. Talent and intelligence are sufficient.

## 2 Data

The *Forbes Celebrity 100* which lists incomes and professions was merged with data from the *E-Score Celebrity* index for 2006 and 2007, the only two years for which the index is publicly available. This leads to 200 celebrities, some of whom were already listed before, and some who entered the list in 2006 and were still there in 2007. To avoid *E-Score's* survey respondents to base their evaluations on previous lists published by *Forbes*, we restrict the data to newcomers only both in 2006 and 2007. This left us with 49 observations.<sup>3</sup>

*E-Score's* list contains 46 attributes (activist, aggressive, approachable, articulate, attractive, beautiful, boring, can identify with, charming, classy, cold, compassionate, confident, creepy, cute, distinctive voice, down-to-earth, dynamic, emotional, exciting, experienced, funny, glamorous, good energy, good listener, handsome, impartial, influential, insincere, intelligent, interesting, intriguing, kooky/wacky, mean, over-exposed, physically fit, rude, sexy, sincere, stylish, talented, trend-setter, trustworthy, unique, versatile, warm). Only 22 are evoked as most popular attributes for the 49 celebrities appearing in the database. They are aggregated into six groups:<sup>4</sup> (1) Talent (talented); (2) Intelligence (intelligent); (3) Beauty (attractive, beautiful, cute, handsome, sexy, stylish); (4) Physical attributes (physically fit); (5) Other attributes, positive (confident, distinctive voice, experienced, funny, good energy, influential, interesting, trend-setter, trustworthy, warm) and (6) Other attributes, negative (aggressive, kooky/wacky, over-exposed). The two attributes most often cited for each celebrity are used in our regressions, and appear as *Most often cited* and *Second often cited* in Table 1. Talent is invoked 34 times, Intelligence, 11 times, and the different forms of Beauty, 18 times. These three main categories make for 64 percent of the cited attributes. Beauty is cited quite often, but less so than Talent.

Professions were also regrouped into four categories: Cinema/Television/Broadcasting (25 celebrities), Music (seven celebrities), Sports (seven celebrities), and Other (10 celebrities). There are 35 males and 14 females, 42 Caucasians, three Hispanics, two Afro-americans, and two Asians. The average and median incomes are equal to \$22.7 million and \$17 million, respectively.

---

<sup>3</sup>We discarded three observations from the full list of 52, to avoid an almost singular moments' matrix when "Sports" is used as control variable.

<sup>4</sup>The name of the group is given first, followed by the attributes used by *E-Score*.

Note that celebrity is not exclusively connected to extreme earnings, since the lowest income is \$2 million (the highest is \$83 million). The average celebrity is 43 years old.

### 3 Estimation Results

Two estimation methods are used: Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) and Maron-na and Yohai’s (2000) robust method (MS) that takes into account possible outliers known to be pervasive in extreme data sets such as the one we use. It combines a S-estimator (for continuous variables) and a M-estimator (for dummy variables), and is well-known for both its high resistance to outliers and its high efficiency.<sup>5</sup>

The level of income (in logs) is regressed on dummies for aggregate attributes (Talent, Intelligence, Beauty, Other positive attributes; Other negative attributes is the control group), dummies for professions (Cinema/Television/Broadcasting, Music, Sports; Other is the control profession), age, a dummy for male, a dummy for race (Caucasians; Others as a control group) and an annual dummy for 2007. Attributes are added, whether they are *Most often cited* or *Second often cited*, with the exception of Talent in Equation (2).<sup>6</sup>

Estimation results appear in Table 2. The two equations differ since in Equation (2) talent is distinguished according to whether it is cited as most frequent and as second most frequent attribute. Note also that in both equations, two variables are included for beauty (Beauty and Beauty twice), since in four observations, the two attributes (most often and second often cited) are both concerned with beauty.<sup>7</sup>

In all cases (with the exception of Equation (1), MS), Intelligence has the largest effect on income, and Talent has roughly the same as Beauty. When a beauty attribute appears twice, Beauty has a large effect on income as well. Our results are obviously not in contradiction with previous results – beauty is important – but so are talent, intelligence, and other positive attributes.

---

<sup>5</sup>See Verardi and Croux (2009) for details.

<sup>6</sup>Physical attributes are dropped because they are almost collinear with the Sports dummy.

<sup>7</sup>Hayden Panetierre is cute (cited first) *and* attractive (cited second), Jessica Alba and Scarlet Johansson are beautiful *and* sexy, Keira Knightley is attractive *and* beautiful.

They all pick positive signs when compared with negative attributes (normalized to zero). As expected, sports, music and cinema/tv/radio personalities have larger rewards than others (such as poor Alan Greenspan who is one of the celebrities in our sample). Age has a positive but very small effect. An aged celebrity can beat a talented one if, all other things equal, she is thirty years older! Males make more money than females, and caucasians more money than their non-caucasian colleagues.

## 4 Conclusions

Using a quite different data set than those used in most papers that examine the discriminating effect of beauty on earnings, we show that other attributes, such as talent and intelligence, have larger returns on income than beauty.

The data set is unfortunately quite small, since we wanted to avoid opinions on celebrities to be influenced by their earnings, and bias the estimated parameters. We also use an estimation method that minimizes the impact of outlying observations.

## 5 References

- Biddle, Jeff and Daniel Hamermesh (1998), Beauty, productivity and discrimination: Lawyers' looks and lucre, *Journal of Labor Economics* 16, 172-201.
- Biddle, Jeff Hamermesh, Daniel and Jeff Biddle (1994), Beauty and the labor market, *American Economic Review* 84, 1174-1194.
- Hamermesh, Daniel and Amy Parker (2005), Beauty in the classroom: Instructors' pulchritude and the putative pedagogical productivity, *Economics of Education Review* 24, 369-376.
- Johnston, David (2010), Physical appearance and wages: Do blondes have more fun?, *Economics Letters* 108, 10-12.
- Maronna, Ricardo and Victor Yohai (2000), Robust regression with both continuous and categorical predictors, *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 89, 197-214.

- Mobius, Markus and Tonya Rosenblatt (2006), Why beauty matters, *American Economic Review* 96, 222-235.
- Pfann, Gerard, Jeff Biddle, Daniel Hamermesh and Ciska Bosman (2000), Business success and business beauty capital, *Economics Letters* 67, 201-207.
- Price, Michael (2008), Fund-raising success and a solicitor's beauty capital: Do blondes raise more funds?, *Economics Letters* 100, 351-354.
- Verardi, Vincenzo and Christophe Croux (2009), Robust regression in Stata, *Stata Journal* 9(3), 439-453.

Table 1. Number of citations of attributes

Original attribute	Most often cited	Second often cited	Group
Aggressive	1	0	Other negative
Attractive	1	3	Beauty
Beautiful	2	1	Beauty
Confident	1	4	Other positive
Cute	4	0	Beauty
Distinctive Voice	0	1	Other positive
Experienced	0	1	Other positive
Funny	7	0	Other positive
Good Energy	1	0	Other positive
Handsome	1	1	Beauty
Influential	0	2	Other positive
Intelligent	5	6	Intelligence
Interesting	0	2	Other positive
Kooky/Wacky	0	2	Other positive
Over-Exposed	1	0	Other negative
Physically Fit	5	2	Physical
Sexy	0	2	Beauty
Stylish	0	3	Beauty
Talented	18	16	Talent
Trend-Setter	1	2	Other positive
Trustworthy	0	1	Other positive
Warm	1	0	Other positive



Table 2. Estimation Results

	Equation (1)		Equation (2)	
	OLS	MS	OLS	MS
Talent	0.7172*	0.9205***		
	(0.369)	(0.214)		
Talent most often cited			0.9784**	1.2358***
			(0.366)	(0.049)
Talent second often cited			0.4586	0.5923***
			(0.378)	(0.064)
Intelligence	1.7062***	1.8530***	1.7933***	2.1244***
	(0.523)	(0.227)	(0.514)	(0.060)
Beauty	0.7363	0.5440**	0.9814*	1.2628***
	(0.493)	(0.219)	(0.493)	(0.070)
Beauty twice	0.7062	1.4708***	0.6684	1.1791***
	(0.637)	(0.216)	(0.638)	(0.047)
Other positive attributes	1.1512**	1.7653***	1.3385**	1.4764***
	(0.528)	(0.255)	(0.511)	(0.080)
Cinema/TV/Broadcasting	1.0583*	1.9131***	1.3090**	1.1470***
	(0.541)	(0.216)	(0.510)	(0.094)
Music	1.8376***	1.9929***	1.7830***	0.9327***
	(0.556)	(0.127)	(0.587)	(0.103)
Sports	2.9466***	4.2157***	3.5433***	3.6967***
	(1.028)	(0.320)	(1.005)	(0.160)
Age	0.0081	0.0336***	0.0126	0.0225***
	(0.013)	(0.005)	(0.013)	(0.002)
Male	0.3227	0.0181	0.3297	0.6910***
	(0.335)	(0.140)	(0.349)	(0.086)
Caucasian	0.0310	0.0522	0.0784	0.1641**
	(0.208)	(0.093)	(0.212)	(0.065)
2007 dummy	0.1858	0.2389***	0.2997	0.3424***
	(0.198)	(0.076)	(0.201)	(0.056)
Intercept	-0.9108	-2.9293***	-1.6143	-2.5044***
	(1.372)	(0.528)	(1.314)	(0.226)
No. of observations	49	49	49	49
R-squared	0.6109		0.6448	

## Recent titles

### CORE Discussion Papers

- 2010/32. Axel GAUTIER and Dimitri PAOLINI. Universal service financing in competitive postal markets: one size does not fit all.
- 2010/33. Daria ONORI. Competition and growth: reinterpreting their relationship.
- 2010/34. Olivier DEVOLDER, François GLINEUR and Yu. NESTEROV. Double smoothing technique for infinite-dimensional optimization problems with applications to optimal control.
- 2010/35. Jean-Jacques DETHIER, Pierre PESTIEAU and Rabia ALI. The impact of a minimum pension on old age poverty and its budgetary cost. Evidence from Latin America.
- 2010/36. Stéphane ZUBER. Justifying social discounting: the rank-discounting utilitarian approach.
- 2010/37. Marc FLEURBAEY, Thibault GAJDOS and Stéphane ZUBER. Social rationality, separability, and equity under uncertainty.
- 2010/38. Helmuth CREMER and Pierre PESTIEAU. Myopia, redistribution and pensions.
- 2010/39. Giacomo SBRANA and Andrea SILVESTRINI. Aggregation of exponential smoothing processes with an application to portfolio risk evaluation.
- 2010/40. Jean-François CARPANTIER. Commodities inventory effect.
- 2010/41. Pierre PESTIEAU and Maria RACIONERO. Tagging with leisure needs.
- 2010/42. Knud J. MUNK. The optimal commodity tax system as a compromise between two objectives.
- 2010/43. Marie-Louise LEROUX and Gregory PONTIERE. Utilitarianism and unequal longevity: A remedy?
- 2010/44. Michel DENUIT, Louis EECKHOUDT, Ilia TSETLIN and Robert L. WINKLER. Multivariate concave and convex stochastic dominance.
- 2010/45. Rüdiger STEPHAN. An extension of disjunctive programming and its impact for compact tree formulations.
- 2010/46. Jorge MANZI, Ernesto SAN MARTIN and Sébastien VAN BELLEGEM. School system evaluation by value-added analysis under endogeneity.
- 2010/47. Nicolas GILLIS and François GLINEUR. A multilevel approach for nonnegative matrix factorization.
- 2010/48. Marie-Louise LEROUX and Pierre PESTIEAU. The political economy of derived pension rights.
- 2010/49. Jeroen V.K. ROMBOUTS and Lars STENTOFT. Option pricing with asymmetric heteroskedastic normal mixture models.
- 2010/50. Maik SCHWARZ, Sébastien VAN BELLEGEM and Jean-Pierre FLORENS. Nonparametric frontier estimation from noisy data.
- 2010/51. Nicolas GILLIS and François GLINEUR. On the geometric interpretation of the nonnegative rank.
- 2010/52. Yves SMEERS, Giorgia OGGIONI, Elisabetta ALLEVI and Siegfried SCHAIBLE. Generalized Nash Equilibrium and market coupling in the European power system.
- 2010/53. Giorgia OGGIONI and Yves SMEERS. Market coupling and the organization of counter-trading: separating energy and transmission again?
- 2010/54. Helmuth CREMER, Firouz GAHVARI and Pierre PESTIEAU. Fertility, human capital accumulation, and the pension system.
- 2010/55. Jan JOHANNES, Sébastien VAN BELLEGEM and Anne VANHEMS. Iterative regularization in nonparametric instrumental regression.
- 2010/56. Thierry BRECHET, Pierre-André JOUVET and Gilles ROTILLON. Tradable pollution permits in dynamic general equilibrium: can optimality and acceptability be reconciled?
- 2010/57. Thomas BAUDIN. The optimal trade-off between quality and quantity with uncertain child survival.
- 2010/58. Thomas BAUDIN. Family policies: what does the standard endogenous fertility model tell us?
- 2010/59. Nicolas GILLIS and François GLINEUR. Nonnegative factorization and the maximum edge biclique problem.
- 2010/60. Paul BELLEFLAMME and Martin PEITZ. Digital piracy: theory.

## Recent titles

### CORE Discussion Papers - continued

- 2010/61. Axel GAUTIER and Xavier WAUTHY. Competitively neutral universal service obligations.
- 2010/62. Thierry BRECHET, Julien THENIE, Thibaut ZEIMES and Stéphane ZUBER. The benefits of cooperation under uncertainty: the case of climate change.
- 2010/63. Marco DI SUMMA and Laurence A. WOLSEY. Mixing sets linked by bidirected paths.
- 2010/64. Kaz MIYAGIWA, Huasheng SONG and Hylke VANDENBUSSCHE. Innovation, antidumping and retaliation.
- 2010/65. Thierry BRECHET, Natali HRITONENKO and Yuri YATSENKO. Adaptation and mitigation in long-term climate policies.
- 2010/66. Marc FLEURBAEY, Marie-Louise LEROUX and Gregory PONTHERE. Compensating the dead? Yes we can!
- 2010/67. Philippe CHEVALIER, Jean-Christophe VAN DEN SCHRIECK and Ying WEI. Measuring the variability in supply chains with the peakedness.
- 2010/68. Mathieu VAN VYVE. Fixed-charge transportation on a path: optimization, LP formulations and separation.
- 2010/69. Roland Iwan LUTTENS. Lower bounds rule!
- 2010/70. Fred SCHROYEN and Adekola OYENUGA. Optimal pricing and capacity choice for a public service under risk of interruption.
- 2010/71. Carlotta BALESTRA, Thierry BRECHET and Stéphane LAMBRECHT. Property rights with biological spillovers: when Hardin meets Meade.
- 2010/72. Olivier GERGAUD and Victor GINSBURGH. Success: talent, intelligence or beauty?

### Books

- J. GABSZEWICZ (ed.) (2006), *La différenciation des produits*. Paris, La découverte.
- L. BAUWENS, W. POHLMIEIER and D. VEREDAS (eds.) (2008), *High frequency financial econometrics: recent developments*. Heidelberg, Physica-Verlag.
- P. VAN HENTENRYCKE and L. WOLSEY (eds.) (2007), *Integration of AI and OR techniques in constraint programming for combinatorial optimization problems*. Berlin, Springer.
- P-P. COMBES, Th. MAYER and J-F. THISSE (eds.) (2008), *Economic geography: the integration of regions and nations*. Princeton, Princeton University Press.
- J. HINDRIKS (ed.) (2008), *Au-delà de Copernic: de la confusion au consensus ?* Brussels, Academic and Scientific Publishers.
- J-M. HURIOT and J-F. THISSE (eds) (2009), *Economics of cities*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- P. BELLEFLAMME and M. PEITZ (eds) (2010), *Industrial organization: markets and strategies*. Cambridge University Press.
- M. JUNGER, Th. LIEBLING, D. NADDEF, G. NEMHAUSER, W. PULLEYBLANK, G. REINELT, G. RINALDI and L. WOLSEY (eds) (2010), *50 years of integer programming, 1958-2008: from the early years to the state-of-the-art*. Berlin Springer.

### CORE Lecture Series

- C. GOURIÉROUX and A. MONFORT (1995), *Simulation Based Econometric Methods*.
- A. RUBINSTEIN (1996), *Lectures on Modeling Bounded Rationality*.
- J. RENEGAR (1999), *A Mathematical View of Interior-Point Methods in Convex Optimization*.
- B.D. BERNHEIM and M.D. WHINSTON (1999), *Anticompetitive Exclusion and Foreclosure Through Vertical Agreements*.
- D. BIENSTOCK (2001), *Potential function methods for approximately solving linear programming problems: theory and practice*.
- R. AMIR (2002), *Supermodularity and complementarity in economics*.
- R. WEISMANTEL (2006), *Lectures on mixed nonlinear programming*.