Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster

Institut für Organisationsökonomik

Diskussionspapier des
Instituts für Organisationsökonomik

6/2013

Scholars' Physical Appearance, Research Performance and Feelings of Happiness

Alexander Dilger/Laura Lütkenhöner/
Harry Müller

Discussion Paper of the
Institute for Organisational Economics

Diskussionspapier des
Instituts für Organisationsökonomik
6/2013

Juni 2013

ISSN 2191-2475

Scholars' Physical Appearance, Research Performance and Feelings of Happiness

Alexander Dilger/Laura Lütkenhöner/Harry Müller

Abstract

Our study aims to analyse whether former feelings of happiness and/or physical appearance have influence on the subsequent observable research performance of scholars. Therefore we photographed 49 persons attending the 72nd annual conference of the German Academic Association for Business Research (VHB), which took place in Bremen in 2010. We interviewed them about their feelings of happiness. Later we asked students to evaluate the photographed persons' attractiveness, competence, trustworthiness, likeability and their feelings of happiness. To determine the academics' research performance we compiled a list of their recent journal publications, considering different journal weights and dividing them by the number of authors. Regression analyses reveal that feelings of happiness in 2010 significantly increase research performance in 2011/2012. In addition, they suggest that scholars' physical appearance can affect their research performance. In particular we observe that a trustworthy appearance has a significantly positive effect.

JEL-Codes: I23, J01, M00, M50

Aussehen, Forschungsleistung und Glücksempfinden von Wissenschaftlern

Zusammenfassung

Wir untersuchen empirisch, ob vorheriges Glücksempfinden und/oder Aussehen die zu einem späteren Zeitpunkt beobachtbare Forschungsleistung von Wissenschaftlern beeinflussen. Im Jahr 2010 wurden 49 Teilnehmer der 72. Jahrestagung des Verbands der Hochschullehrer für Betriebswirtschaft (VHB) fotografiert und danach gefragt, wie glücklich sie sind. Anschließend wurden Studenten gebeten, anhand der Portraits die Attraktivität sowie die ausgestrahlte Kompetenz, die Vertrauenswürdigkeit, die Sympathie und das Glücksempfinden der fotografierten Personen zu bewerten. Deren Forschungsleistung wurde anhand ihrer Veröffentlichungen in Fachzeitschriften in den letzten Jahren quantifiziert, wobei unterschiedliche Gewichtungen von Zeitschriften berücksichtigt wurden und eine Division durch die Anzahl der Autoren stattfand. Regressionsanalysen ergeben, dass Glücksempfinden in 2010 die Forschungsleistung in 2011/2012 signifikant erhöht. Außerdem deuten sie darauf hin, dass sich das Aussehen von Wissenschaftlern auf ihre Forschungsleistung auswirkt. Insbesondere ist zu beobachten, dass ein vertrauenswürdiges Aussehen einen signifikant positiven Einfluss hat.

Im Internet unter:

http://www.wiwi.uni-muenster.de/io/forschen/downloads/DP-IO_06_2013.pdf

Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster
Institut für Organisationsökonomik
Scharnhorststraße 100
D-48151 Münster

Tel: +49-251/83-24303 (Sekretariat)
E-Mail: io@uni-muenster.de
Internet: www.wiwi.uni-muenster.de/io

Scholars' Physical Appearance, Research Performance and Feelings of Happiness*

1. Introduction

An attractive appearance fosters work-related success (see e. g. Mobius/Rosenblat 2006 or Hamermesh/Biddle 1994) and may also give rise to better student evaluations of teaching (see e. g. Felton et al. 2008). Happiness seems to promote work-related success as well (see Graham/Eggers/Sukhtankar 2004 or Diener et al. 2002). However, to the best of our knowledge, the relationship between physical appearance and research performance has not been analysed yet. The same holds for the relationship between feelings of happiness and successful research.

A relationship between scholars' physical appearance and their research performance might exist, even though at first glance this idea seems to be abstruse. When reviewers know the authors' names, they might find their photos on the internet. Therefore it cannot be excluded that manuscripts submitted to a journal have a higher chance of acceptance when the author looks for example very trustworthy or competent. Hence scholars' physical appearance might affect the total amount of publications as well as the impact factors of the publications. For journals which apply a double-blind peer-review process, at least the editor knows the author's name. Moreover, authors often cite themselves and from these citations their names can be revealed irrespective of the review process. More important is that physical appearance, such as appearing very trustworthy or competent, might improve scholars' opportunities for research cooperation, which increases their research performance.

Our study aims to find out whether former feelings of happiness and/or physical appearance influence scholars' subsequent observable research performance. The next section gives an overview of the relevant literature. The third section describes our data and the method. We report our empirical results in the fourth section and discuss them in section five. Section six concludes.

* The authors are grateful to Johanna Metker for taking photos of scholars attending the 72nd annual conference of the German Academic Association for Business Research (VHB) in Bremen 2010. We also thank the participants of the annual meeting of the Section of Academic Management of the VHB in Duisburg 2013 for valuable suggestions.

2. Literature Review

2.1. The Impact of Physical Appearance on Work-Related Success

Empirical studies suggest that physical appearance has a positive effect on work-related success in various professional fields, like elections (see Rosar/Klein/Beckers 2008, Klein/ Rosar 2005 or Todorov et al. 2005), teaching (see Rosar/Klein 2009, Felton et al. 2008, Riniolo et al. 2006, Hamermesh/Parker 2005 or Goebel/Cashen 1979) or CEOs' performance (see Graham/Harvey/Puri 2010 or Rule/Ambady 2008). The following paragraphs give an overview of these studies.

Rule/Ambady (2008, p. 109) asked 50 undergraduates to make judgements on the faces of photographed CEOs (only men) from 50 companies of the Fortune 1,000. The participants assessed the photographs with respect to five dimensions of physical appearance: competence, dominance, likeability, facial maturity and trustworthiness (see ibidem, p. 109). Afterwards the authors conducted a principal component analysis and obtained two factors: Power (competence, dominance, and facial maturity) and Warmth (likability and trustworthiness) (see ibidem, p. 110). Partial correlations revealed that power-related traits from CEOs' faces were significantly related to company profits ($r(41) = 0.36$; $p < 0.025$, see ibidem, p. 110). However, the authors also pointed to the fact that they "cannot draw any causal inferences as to whether more successful companies choose individuals with a particular appearance to be their CEOs or whether individuals with a particular appearance emerge as more successful in their work as CEOs" (Rule/Ambady 2008, p. 110). A similar study was conducted by Graham/Harvey/Puri (2010). The authors ran several experiments in which persons evaluated the photographs of CEOs in terms of beauty, competence, trustworthiness, and likeability (see ibidem, p. 3). They found that more competent looking CEOs tend to earn higher wages (see ibidem, p. 4). But their results did not reveal that CEOs' facial attributes are related to firm performance (see ibidem, p. 4).

Rosar/Klein/Beckers (2008) analysed the election success of 512 politicians in the North Rhine-Westphalia state election of 2005. Their results showed that "attractive constituency candidates receive a higher poll" (Rosar/Klein/Beckers 2008, p. 76). In an earlier study Klein/Rosar (2005) analysed the relationship between physical attractiveness and election success using data of the German federal elections of 2002. The study revealed a statistically significant and a politically relevant influence of politicians' physical attractiveness on their first-vote result, irrespective of their gender (see Klein/Rosar 2005, p. 283). Similar studies

for American politicians were conducted by Todorov et al. (2005), who asked participants to evaluate photographs of candidates for the U. S. Senate (2000, 2002, and 2004) and the House of Representatives (2002 and 2004) with respect to competence (see ibidem, p. 1624). Pair-wise comparisons showed that perceived competence does not only predict the winner but is also positively correlated with the differences in the share of votes (see ibidem, p. 1624).

Felton et al. (2008, p. 49) analysed 6,852 ratings of professors' teaching published on *RateMyProfessors.com*. They reported that the correlation for Quality and Hotness is significant on the level of 0.01 and that the correlation coefficient amounts to 0.64 (see ibidem, p. 49). A similar study based on 2,745 ratings of university lecturers published on *MeinProf.de* (the German pendant to *RateMyProfessors.com*) was conducted by Rosar/Klein (2009). The authors reported that *ceteris paribus* attractive male lecturers receive better student evaluations of their teaching than their less attractive male colleagues (see ibidem, p. 632). However, for female lecturers their results indicate the contrary (see ibidem, p. 633). In contrast, Riniolo et al. (2006), who also analysed data provided by the website *RateMyProfessors.com*, suggested that professors perceived as attractive receive better student evaluations regardless of their gender. Hamermesh/Parker (2005), who analysed data collected at the University of Texas at Austin, came to the conclusion that the influence of perceived attractiveness on students' instructional ratings is larger for male than for female instructors. An older study, conducted by Goebel/Cashen (1979) also suggested that attractive lecturers receive better teaching evaluations. However, to the best of our knowledge, possible relations between research performance and academics' physical appearance have not been analysed yet.

2.2. The Impact of Feelings of Happiness on Work-Related Success

Graham/Eggers/Sukhtankar (2004, p. 332) found that "unexplained or residual happiness has positive and significant effects on second period income". In other words, this means that people who were happier in 1995 reported a higher income in a survey 5 years later (see ibidem, p. 319). This result is based on 4,457 observations, which are part of a large panel for Russia: the Russia Longitudinal Monitoring Survey (see ibidem, p. 321/333). The panel contains observations on happiness and income for respondents who were questioned at different points of time (see ibidem, p. 322). Such data are very rare (see ibidem, p. 322). Diener et al. (2002) conducted another longitudinal study over a 19-year period. Their analysis showed "that individuals with a higher cheerfulness rating at college entry have a

higher current income and a higher job satisfaction rating and are less likely ever to have been unemployed than individuals with a lower cheerfulness rating“ (Diener et al. 2002, p. 229). The authors used information provided by three databases, (a) the “College and Beyond” survey database, (b) an institutional records database, and (c) “The American Freshman” survey database, and they linked them with the help of a special identification number (see ibidem, p. 237). In total, their sample comprises 13,676 individuals (see ibidem, p. 239).

Boehm/Lyubomirsky (2008) and Lyubomirsky/King (2005) conducted meta-analyses considering three kinds of studies (cross-sectional, longitudinal, and experimental studies) and also found evidence that happiness promotes career success. In addition, Hom/Arbuckle (1988) found in an experiment with young children that a happy mood state has a significant positive effect on goal setting and on performance. Furthermore, Pannells/Claxton (2008) reported, based on observations on 171 university students, that happiness positively affects creativity. This finding also supports our hypothesis suggesting that feelings of happiness have a positive influence on scholars’ research performance.

3. Data and Method

3.1. Feelings of Happiness and Physical Appearance

We took portrait photographs of scholars attending the 72nd annual conference of the German Academic Association for Business Research (VHB) in Bremen in the year 2010. We also interviewed them about their feelings of happiness. In total, pictures of 60 people were taken. The results presented in section 4, however, only refer to those interviewees who agreed to answer our question about their feelings of happiness, who had published at least one article in a professional journal in the period from 2005 to 2012 and whose exact age was traceable. This group of scholars consists of 14 women and 35 men. The respective photos were taken on May 28th, 2010. At that time the majority of the photographed persons held at least a doctoral degree and many of them were university professors. To inquire about their feelings of happiness we used a Likert scale ranging from 0 (very unhappy) to 10 (very happy).

3.2. Evaluation of the Photographed Scholars

Scholars’ physical appearance was quantified by applying the *Truth-of-Consensus Method* (Patzer 1983, p. 230). This method is used as a standard procedure in attractiveness-research (see Rosar/Klein/Beckers 2008, p. 70). According to this method the physical appearance of a

scholar is the arithmetic average of the ratings he or she obtains from different persons. Rosar/Klein/Beckers (2008, p. 70) report that in applying the Truth-of-Consensus Method an attractiveness score can be calculated by using a small number of independent persons who rate the attractiveness.

In this study we designed an online-survey, asking students of the University of Münster to look at the photos and to assess the photographed persons' attractiveness, competence, trustworthiness, likeability and their feelings of happiness.[1] The survey was conducted using the online evaluation system EvaSys.[2] In regards to the evaluation of the photos the students used a Likert scale from zero to ten, with ten representing the best possible score. Each participant was asked to look at 20 pictures one after another. The order of the pictures was determined by chance. In total, twelve different questionnaires were created. Each questionnaire comprised 20 of the 60 pictures and each picture was presented in four of these questionnaires. The students were not informed that they were evaluating scholars.

In the summer semester of 2011 an invitation to participate in the online survey was sent to 364 students via e-mail. Those students were selected out of three different business administration lectures held by a professor of the Institute for Organisational Economics. One of these lectures consisted only of students enrolled in the master course "Business Administration". The other two lectures were particularly addressed to students enrolled in dual-subject Bachelor programs (for example "Economics and Law" or "Politics and Economics"). The twelve different questionnaires were evenly distributed to the participants of each lecture.[3] Thus, each picture had the chance to be evaluated by the same number of students. In total 86 students (62 women and 24 men) participated in the online survey. The rate of return was 23.63 %. The respondents' age varied between 17 and 30 years, averaging 23 years. Each picture was assessed by at least 19 and at most 37 students. On average each picture was evaluated by 28.5 students (with a standard deviation of 4.35). In the study of Rosar/Klein/Beckers (2008, p. 71) "[each] package of photographs was rated by an average of 28.6 raters (standard deviation: 3.70)".

Table 1 summarises descriptive statistics concerning the standard deviations of scholars' physical appearance scores. Remarkably the minimum, the maximum, and the mean are quite

[1] Graham/Harvey/Puri (2010, p. 3) also considered four of these dimensions: beauty, competence, trustworthiness, and likeability.

[2] The main function of this system is to collect student evaluations of teaching.

[3] None of the contacted students participated in more than one of the three lectures.

similar for all of the five dimensions of physical appearance. This indicates that the results of the attractiveness research are transferable to the other dimensions of physical appearance which we also consider in our study (perceived competence, trustworthiness, likeability and happiness).

Dimension of physical appearance	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Attractiveness	60	1.16	2.33	1.80
Competence	60	1.11	2.43	1.66
Trustworthiness	60	1.15	2.67	1.76
Likeability	60	1.21	2.57	1.82
Happiness	60	1.08	2.19	1.53

Table 1: Standard deviation of scholars' physical appearance scores

To test for the internal consistency of the evaluations, attractiveness-researchers usually calculate Cronbach's alpha, taking the evaluating persons as variables and the photographs as cases (see Rosar/Klein/Beckers 2008, p. 72). In our study the groups of students having filled out the same questionnaire are quite small. Each group consists of at least 4 and at most 13 students. For these groups Cronbach's alpha amounts on average to 0.80 for the attractiveness scores, 0.62 for the competence scores, 0.66 for the trustworthiness scores, 0.70 for the likeability scores and 0.73 for the happiness scores. By tendency, Cronbach's alpha has higher values for our larger groups. The values are particularly low for the two groups consisting of only four students. However, it should be noted that each scholars' photo was evaluated by at least 19 students.

Torgler/Antić/Dullek (2008, p. 314) found that female responders perceived the presented (solely male) researchers to be happier than male respondents. In our study the proportion of female students ranges from 67 % to 81 %. To analyse whether this proportion has an influence on the average physical appearance scores we calculated linear regressions using three explanatory variables: (1) the proportion of female students, (2) scholars' age, and (3) scholars' gender. The results (which are presented in Appendix 1) show that the proportion of female students does not significantly influence any of the five dimensions of physical appea-

rance. For this reason it seems appropriate to combine evaluation scores by female and male students.

To reduce dimensionality, the principle component procedure of SPSS was used considering all five dimensions of physical appearance. The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy is 0.559. Values above 0.5 are considered to be acceptable in order to reliably use a factor analysis for data analysis (see Kaiser/Rice 1974, p. 112). The Bartlett's test of sphericity is 293.91 with a significance level of $p < 0.00$. A significant value indicates that the data are appropriate for a principal component analysis (see Dziuban/Shirkey 1974, p. 358). The results of the principle component analysis reveal that a single factor loads for the five dimensions of physical appearance. With the assistance of SPSS, factor scores were saved in a new variable using the regression method. This new variable was denoted *overall physical appearance*. Its mean is standardised to zero and the variance is standardised to one.

3.3. Research Performance

To quantify research performance of the photographed persons, a list of their respective publications in academic journals in recent years was compiled. To that end we looked at their publication lists in the internet and we used the program *Publish or Perish 3* that informs about publications in the database of *Google Scholar*. For each journal we looked up the journal weights in the *Handelsblatt-BWL-Ranking 2012* (0.1 to 1.0) and in the *VHB-JOURQUAL 2.1 Ranking* (A+ to E, with an A+ representing the highest weight). Another possibility to operationalise research performance includes the usage of citations as suggested by Dilger/Müller (2012). However, since we are especially interested in the research performance in the last two years, 2011/2012, we did not pursue this approach. Many of the articles included in our analysis have just recently been published and thus have not yet been cited.

According to the approach of the *Handelsblatt-BWL-Ranking 2012* (see Schläpfer/Storbeck 2012), we also transformed the scale of the *VHB-JOURQUAL 2.1 Ranking* to a scale ranging from 0 to 5 (A+ = 5; A = 4; B = 3; C = 2; D = 1; E = 0). On the basis of this data we generated three indexes to quantify the research performance. All indexes have in common that the journal weights have been divided by the number of authors. The indexes are equivalent to the sum scores of the publications in the considered years. The index *Handelsblatt2012* is based on the *Handelsblatt-BWL-Ranking 2012* and the index *JQ2.1* is based on the *VHB-JOURQUAL 2.1 Ranking.* In the index *ref.Journal* all journals have the same weight and we only considered journals applying a peer-review process. To identify these journals we used the

JournalRankingGuide provided by the ZBW (Leibniz Information Centre of Economics) and IAB (Institute for Employment Research).

3.4. Statistical Evaluation

We used *SPSS Statistics* for the statistical evaluation of the data, particularly for the calculation of correlations and linear regressions. In total we computed six OLS-regression models for each of the three measures of research performance. The models differ in respect to the considered dimension of physical appearance. As control variables we always included gender and age of the photographed persons. To consider non-linear relations between age and research performance, age squared was included in all models. In addition we controlled for the academic position.

4. Empirical Results

4.1. Descriptive Statistics

Our data comprises 14 female and 35 male scholars in economics. A summary of the statistics for the variables used in this study is given in Table 1. The photographed persons' age, their feelings of happiness and their physical appearance refer to the year in which we took the photos (2010) while the research performance refers to the years 2011 and 2012. The mean values of the indexes for calculated research performance differ because of diverging journal weights. A consideration of the different dimensions of physical appearance shows that *attractiveness* has the lowest average score while *happiness* has the highest average score. In addition, Appendix 2 presents results of Mann-Whitney-U-Tests, revealing that female scholars were perceived more trustworthy and likeable than their male colleagues. The difference is significant at the 0.05 level and amounts to 0.56 (trustworthiness) and 0.59 (likeability) score points. Index *JQ2.1* shows a weak significant difference between male and female scholars. More precisely, male scholars have a higher mean value than female scholars. This indicates that male scholars publish more often than female scholars and/or male scholars publish in higher ranked professional journals. However, female and male scholars do not significantly (not even weakly) differ in the indexes *Handelsblatt2012* and *ref.Journal* that also measure research performance.

	Minimum	Maximum	Median	Mean	Standard deviation
Age (2010)	26	71	40.00	40.90	10.26
Feelings of happiness (2010)	2	10	8.00	7.73	1.87
Physical appearance (2010)					
Attractiveness	2.62	7.10	4.75	4.75	1.09
Competence	5.49	8.92	7.29	7.19	0.82
Trustworthiness	4.38	8.46	6.96	6.88	0.84
Likeability	4.50	8.54	6.89	6.76	1.00
Happiness	5.29	8.93	7.55	7.32	0.89
Overall	-1.99	1.69	0.00	0.02	0.97
Research performance 2011/2012					
Handelsblatt2012	0.00	1.43	0.23	0.33	0.37
JQ2.1	0.00	10.38	2.00	2.93	2.80
ref.Journal	0.00	3.98	0.83	1.04	1.04

Note: N = 49 scholars

Table 2: Overview of descriptive statistics

4.2. Correlation Analyses

Correlation analyses were conducted to examine the relations between gender, age, feelings of happiness, physical appearance and research performance in 2011/2012. The results are presented in Appendix 3. All three measures of research performance are significantly correlated between themselves ($p \leq 0.001$). The same applies to all dimensions of physical appearance. In most cases these variables are also significantly (at least weakly at the 0.1 level) positively correlated with the measures of research performance in 2011/2012. However, the correlations between feelings of happiness reported in 2010 and research performance in 2011/2012 are weakly significant in only one of the three cases (*ref.Journal*). Age and feelings of happiness are correlated significantly positively, while age and attractiveness are correlated significantly negatively. This indicates that, compared to younger scholars, older scholars are happier but less attractive. In addition, Appendix 3 illustrates that perceived feelings of happiness are weakly significantly correlated with scholars' reported feelings of happiness. This result is especially interesting in view of the study conducted by

Torgler/Antić/Dulleck (2008, p. 311), which analysed Nobel Prize winners' perceived happiness but did not ask them about their feelings of happiness.

4.3. Regression Analyses

4.3.1. Research Performance in 2011/2012 as the Dependent Variable

Linear regression analyses were conducted to determine whether research performance in 2011/2012 (dependent variable) could be predicted from feelings of happiness in 2010 as well as physical appearance. Table 3 reveals the results. Overall we calculated 18 models. They differ in respect to the dimensions of physical appearance and in respect to the measure of research performance.

It is recognisable that high values for feelings of happiness in 2010 have a significant (or at least weakly significant) positive effect on the research performance in 2011/2012. This finding is robust for all models considering different dimensions of physical appearance and it is also robust for the three different kinds of operationalisation of research performance in 2011/2012. In 14 of 18 models scholars' reported feelings of happiness in 2010 are significant on the 0.05 level. In three models the significance level is 0.10 and in one model it is 0.01.

Moreover, regardless which of the three indexes for research performance in 2011/2012 is chosen as the dependent variable, regression analyses show that a trustworthy appearance affects research performance significantly positively. This indicates that scholars who are perceived to be more trustworthy publish more and/or publish in academic journals featuring higher impact factors. Considering perceived trustworthiness, in two of the three models the significance level of trustworthiness is 0.01, in one model it is 0.05.

A higher score for the overall physical appearance (the result of a principal component analysis with SPSS) has a somewhat weaker effect on the research performance in 2011/2012. The effect is significant ($p \leq 0.05$) with *Handelsblatt2012* as the dependent variable and it is weakly significant ($p \leq 0.10$) for *JQ2.1* as the dependent variable. However, the effect is not significant at all when *ref.Journal* is the dependent variable. When *Handelsblatt2012* is the dependant variable, high values for perceived likeability have a significant positive influence ($p \leq 0.05$) and perceived happiness has a weakly significant positive influence ($p \leq 0.10$). However, these variables are not significant when *JQ2.1* or *ref.Journal* are the dependent variables. In addition, it could not be observed that scholars' attractiveness and their perceived competence significantly influence their research performance in 2011/2012.

	Handelsblatt2012						JQ2.1		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Gender (male = 1)	0.244* [0.303]	0.203(*) [0.252]	0.340** [0.422]	0.303** [0.376]	0.244* [0.302]	0.273* [0,338]	2.035* [0.332]	1.691(*) [0.276]	2.813** [0.459]
Age (2010)	-0.095(*) [2.643]	-0.111* [-3.082]	-0.088(*) [-2.464]	-0.090(*) [-2.507]	-0.096* [-2.687]	-0.084(*) [-2.353]	-0.794(*) [-2.913]	-0.819* [-3.003]	-0.679(*) [-2.491]
Age^2 (2010)	0.001* [3.082]	0.001* [3.467]	0.001* [2.770]	0.001* [2.886]	0.001* [3.118]	0.001(*) [2.713]	0.010* [3.244]	0.010* [3.248]	0.008* [2.684]
Academic position									
Not appointed as professor yet or before 2011	0.234 [0.316]	0.236 [0.318]	0.317* [0.427]	0.286(*) [0.386]	0.280(*) [0.378]	0.287(*) [0.387]	0.968 [0.172]	1.034 [0.184]	1.621 [0.288]
Appointed as professor in 2009/2010	0.279 [0.296]	0.306(*) [0.325]	0.355* [0.378]	0.335* [0.356]	0.336* [0.357]	0.311* [0.331]	1.556 [0.218]	1.560 [0.218]	2.008(*) [0.281]
Emeritus before 2011	-1.043* [-0.566]	-1,119** [-0.607]	-0.882* [-0.479]	-0.920* [-0.500]	-1.102** [-0.598]	-0.902* [-0.489]	-8.090* [-0.578]	-7.681* [-0.549]	-6.311* [-0.451]
Feelings of happiness (2010)	0.070* [0.357]	0.073* [0.369]	0.066* [0.332]	0.058* [0.295]	0.060* [0.304]	0.062* [0.312]	0.467* [0.312]	0.474* [0.317]	0.422* [0.282]
Physical appearance (2010)	**A**	**C**	**T**	**L**	**H**	**Overall**	**A**	**C**	**T**
	0.060 [0.177]	0.072 [0.160]	0.180** [0.410]	0.123* [0.333]	0.101(*) [0.247]	0.123* [0.324]	0.299 [0.116]	0.777 [0.228]	1.375** [0.411]
Constant	0.982	1.137	-0.106	0.390	0.618	1.111	11.577	8.540	1.143
Adjusted R^2	0.225	0.226	0.339	0.299	0.261	0.296	0.173	0.214	0.302

*Notes: N = 49; A, C, T, L and H denote perceived attractiveness, competence, trustworthiness, likeability and happiness. Standardised beta coefficients are presented in parentheses. (*), * and ** denote significance at the 10 per cent, 5 per cent and 1 per cent level respectively.*

Table 3: OLS-Regressions for research performance in 2011/2012 with different dimensions of physical

	JQ2.1			ref.Journal					
	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Gender (male = 1)	2.348* [0.383]	2.012* [3.328]	2.236* [0.365]	0.637(*) [0.280]	0.603(*) [0.265]	0.903** [0.397]	0.778* [0.343]	0.663* [0.292]	0.716* [0.315]
Age (2010)	-0.762* [-2.796]	-0.829* [-3.041]	-0.697(*) [-2.555]	-0.247 [-2.443]	-0.234(*) [-2.318]	-0.174 [-1.720]	-0.192 [-1.900]	-0.211 [-2.084]	-0.186 [-1.843]
Age^2 (2010)	0.009* [3.086]	0.010* [3.370]	0.008(*) [2.820]	0.003(*) [2.769]	0.003(*) [2.611]	0.002 [1.925]	0.002 [2.178]	0.003 [2.398]	0.002 [2.114]
Academic position									
Not appointed as professor yet or before 2011	1.242 [0.220]	1.133 [0.201]	1.310 [0.233]	0.631 [0.302]	0.645 [0.309]	0.845(*) [0.405]	0.743 [0.356]	0.716 [0.343]	0.737 [0.353]
Appointed as professor in 2009/2010	1.839 [0.257]	1.832 [0.256]	1.695 [0.237]	0.923(*) [0.348]	0.892(*) [0.336]	0.987* [0.372]	0.937(*) [0.353]	0.935(*) [0.353]	0.894(*) [0.337]
Emeritus before 2011	-7.396* [-0.529]	-8.561** [-0.612]	-6.934* [-0.495]	-2,692* [-0.519]	-2.405* [-0.483]	-1.827 [-0.352]	-2.078(*) [-0.401]	-2.459* [-0.474]	-2.089(*) [-0.403]
Feelings of happiness (2010)	0.402(*) [0.269]	0.430(*) [0.287]	0.408(*) [0.272]	0.225* [0.405]	0.223** [0.403]	0.206* [0.371]	0.196* [0.353]	0.203* [0.366]	0.204* [0.367]
Physical appearance (2010)	**L**	**H**	**Overall**	**A**	**C**	**T**	**L**	**H**	**Overall**
	0.642 [0.230]	0.390 [0.125]	0.769(*) [0.268]	0.001 [0.002]	0.102 [0.081]	0.422* [0.341]	0.227 [0.220]	0.160 [0.138]	0.212 [0.199]
Constant	8.271	11.108	11.348	3.243	2.331	-1.180	0.664	1.416	2.089
Adjusted R^2	0.209	0.177	0.227	0.147	0.153	0.242	0.189	0.165	0.183

*Notes: N = 49; A, C, T, L and H denote perceived attractiveness, competence, trustworthiness, likeability and happiness. Standardised beta coefficients are presented in parentheses. (*), * and ** denote significance at the 10 per cent, 5 per cent and 1 per cent level respectively.*

Table 4 (continued): OLS-Regressions for research performance in 2011/2012 with different dimensions of physical

Apart from feelings of happiness and physical appearance, Table 3 reveals that male gender increases research performance. In 10 out of 18 models the gender variable is significant on the 5 % level. In four models the significance level is 1 % and in four other models it is 10 %. The variables *Age* and Age^2 are both significant (respectively weakly significant) in 13 of our 18 models. In all these cases the algebraic signs of the age variables indicate that the research performance follows a U-shaped curve. This indicates that, compared to middle-aged scholars, younger and older scholars (but not retired scholars) publish more often and/or publish in professional journals featuring higher impact factors. At the bottom of the U-shaped curves the age varies between 39 and 55 years depending on the different models. In all models except one the variable *emeritus before 2011* has, compared to the reference group (scholars who were appointed as professor before 2009 and who were not retired before the end of 2012), a significant (or at least weakly significant) negative influence on the research performance in 2011/2012. The significance level is 5 % in 12 models, 1 % in three models and 10 % in two models. The two other control variables for the academic position have a somewhat weaker effect on the research performance in 2011/2012. In five out of the 18 models the variable *appointed as professor in 2009/2010* is significant on the 5 % level and in seven models the variable is weakly significant (10 % level). The algebraic sign of the regression coefficient is positive. The same is true for the variable *not appointed as professor yet or before 2011*. However, this variable has only in one model a significant influence ($p \leq 0.05$). In four other models the variable is weakly significant ($p \leq 0.10$).

4.3.2. Feelings of Happiness in 2010 as the Dependent Variable

Linear regression analyses show that feelings of happiness influence the research performance in the following years. However, it might also be possible that scholars' feelings of happiness are influenced by their former research performance. For this reason we conducted linear regression analyses, using *feelings of happiness in 2010* as the dependant variable and the research performance in 2008/2009 as explanatory variable. Further explanatory variables are gender, age and age squared. In addition we controlled for the academic position distinguishing between four groups of scholars: (1) *not appointed as professor yet or before 2010*, (2) *appointed as professor in 2008/2009*, (3) *appointed as professor before 2008*, (4) *emeritus before 2010*. The reference group is formed by scholars who were appointed as professor before 2008 (group 3). In total we calculated 18 models (see Appendix 4). They differ in respect of the considered dimension of physical appearance and in respect of the measure of research performance. None of the models reveals any significant effect of the

research performance in 2008/2009 on feelings of happiness in 2010. This indicates that feelings of happiness influence research performance but not vice versa.

5. Discussion

Happiness seems to significantly promote work-related success (see Graham/Eggers/Sukhtankar 2004 or Diener et al. 2002). Our results indicate that this holds also true for scholars in regard to their research performance, but they do not suggest the reverse causation. An explanation for this observation could be a positive relationship between happiness and creativity, as suggested by Pannells/Claxton (2008). It might be that happier scholars' generate more and/or better research ideas than their less happy colleagues. Conceivably, they are also more motivated to encourage their projects even though research performance does not seem to affect their feelings of happiness. Our results help to understand differences in regard to scholars' research performance. Nevertheless, they do not reveal whether and how universities can enhance scholars' feelings of happiness in order to increase their research performance.

Moreover, our results indicate that even in the field of research people use the physical appearance to make assumptions about a person's expertise. In this respect, our results are in line with studies analysing related subjects (see e. g. Felton et al. 2008 or Rosar/Klein/Beckers 2008). However, the dimensions of physical appearance, which have an influence on the research performance, seem to differ from those dimensions of physical appearance affecting student evaluations of teaching (that is attractiveness, see Felton et al. 2008, Rosar/Klein 2009, Riniolo et al. 2006, Hamermesh/Parker 2005 or Goebel/Cashen 1979), politicians' election success (attractiveness respectively competence, see Rosar/Klein/Beckers 2008 or Todorov et al. 2005) or CEOs' performance (competence respectively power-related traits, see Graham/Harvey/Puri 2010 or Rule/Ambady 2008). In our study, scholars' research performance is especially affected by perceived trustworthiness while neither attractiveness nor perceived competence have a significant influence. In research trustworthiness is very important, since the possibilities to check the correctness of methodical procedure and reported results are limited. For this reason, it seems not surprising that the perceived trustworthiness is the relevant variable in our study. Even in the case of only considering articles in journals applying a peer-review process, perceived trustworthiness has a significant influence. Nevertheless, our results do not allow us to determine exactly how perceived trustworthiness affects research performance. Appearing trustworthy might influence editors'

decision as well as reviewers' judgement, in case they know the author's name. In addition, academics might prefer to work together and swap ideas with colleagues who appear to be particularly trustworthy. Such research cooperation also might lead to more and/or higher ranked publications in academic journals. However, there might be another explanation for the relationship between research performance and perceived trustworthiness. As our results show that perceived happiness is weakly significantly correlated with reported happiness, perceived trustworthiness might be correlated with characteristics which positively influence the quality of manuscripts. Finally, we do not know whether and how perceived trustworthiness is correlated with real trustworthiness.

6. Conclusion

The results of our study reveal that feelings of happiness have a significant positive influence on scholars' research performance. Conversely, research performance does not seem to affect scholars' feelings of happiness. Moreover, the results suggest that scholars' physical appearance does not only affect their students' evaluations of teaching (as indicated by previous studies) but also their research performance. However, while scholars' evaluations of teaching are influenced by attractiveness, their research performance is not influenced by attractiveness but by (perceived) trustworthiness. Our results help to understand differences in regard to scholars' research performance. Nevertheless, they do not reveal whether and how universities can enhance scholars' feelings of happiness in order to increase their research performance.

Literature

Boehm, Julia K./Lyubomirsky, Sonja (2008): "Does happiness promote career success?", Journal of Career Assessment 16, pp. 101-116.

Diener, Ed/Nickerson, Carol/Lucas, Richard E./Sandvik, Ed (2002): "Dispositional affect and job outcomes", Social Indicators Research 59, pp. 229-259.

Dilger, Alexander/Müller, Harry (2012): "Ein Forschungsleistungsranking auf der Grundlage von Google Scholar", Zeitschrift für Betriebswirtschaft (ZfB) 82, pp. 1089-1105.

Dziuban, Charles D./Shirkey, Edwin C. (1974): "When is a correlation matrix appropriate for factor analysis? Some decision rules", Psychological Bulletin 81, pp. 358-361.

Felton, James/Koper, Peter T./Mitchell, John/Stinson, Michael (2008): "Attractiveness, easiness and other issues: Student evaluations of professors on Ratemyprofessors.com", Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education 33, pp. 45-61.

Goebel, Barbara L./Cashen, Valjean M. (1979): “Age, sex, and attractiveness as factors in student ratings of teachers: A developmental study”, Journal of Educational Psychology 71, pp. 646-653.

Graham, Carol/Eggers, Andrew/Sukhtankar, Sandip (2004): “Does happiness pay? An exploration based on panel data from Russia”, Journal of Economic Behavior & Organization 55, pp. 319-342.

Graham, John R./Harvey, Campbell R./Puri, Manju (2010): “A corporate beauty contest”, Discussion Paper, online at http://ssrn.com/abstract=1571469 (last request on 28th of June 2013).

Hamermesh, Daniel S./Biddle, Jeff E. (1994): “Beauty and the labor market”, American Economic Review 84, pp. 1174-1194.

Hamermesh, Daniel S./Parker, Amy (2005): “Beauty in the classroom: Instructors’ pulchritude and putative pedagogical productivity”, Economics of Education Review 24, pp. 369–376.

Hom, Harry L./Arbuckle, Barry (1988): “Mood induction effects upon goal setting and performance in young children”, Motivation and Emotion 12, pp. 113-122.

Kaiser, Henry F./Rice, John (1974): “Little jiffy, mark Iv”, Educational and Psychological Measurement 34, pp. 111-117.

Klein, Markus/Rosar, Ulrich (2005): “Physische Attraktivität und Wahlerfolg: Eine empirische Analyse am Beispiel der Wahlkreiskandidaten bei der Bundestagswahl 2002”, Politische Vierteljahresschrift 46, pp. 263-287.

Lyubomirsky, Sonja/King, Laura (2005): “The benefits of frequent positive affect: Does happiness lead to success?”, Psychological Bulletin 131, pp. 803–855.

Mobius, Markus M./Rosenblat, Tanya S. (2006): “Why beauty matters ”, American Economic Review 96, pp. 222-235.

Pannells, Tammy C./Claxton, Amy F. (2008): “Happiness, creative ideation, and locus of control”, Creativity Research Journal 20, pp. 67-71.

Patzer, Gordon L. (1983): “Source credibility as a function of communicator physical attractiveness”, Journal of Business Research 11, pp. 299-241.

Riniolo, Todd C./Johnson, Katherine C./Sherman, Tracy R./Misso, Julie A. (2006): “Hot or not: do professors perceived as physically attractive receive higher student evaluations?”, Journal of General Psychology 133, pp. 19-35.

Rosar, Ulrich/Klein, Markus (2009): “Mein (schöner) Prof.de: Die physische Attraktivität des akademischen Lehrpersonals und ihr Einfluss auf die Ergebnisse studentischer Lehr-evaluationen”, Kölner Zeitschrift für Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie 61, pp. 621-645.

Rosar, Ulrich/Klein, Markus/Beckers, Tilo (2008): “The frog pond beauty contest: Physical attractiveness and electoral success of the constituency candidates at the North Rhine-Westphalia state election of 2005”, European Journal of Political Research 47, pp. 64 – 79.

Rule, Nicholas O./Ambady, Nalini (2008): “The face of success: Inferences from chief executive officers’ appearance predict company profits”, Psychological Science 19, pp. 109-111.

Schläpfer, Jörg/Storbeck, Olaf (2012): “BWL-Ranking 2012: Methodik und Zeitschriftenliste”, Handelsblatt 15.06.2012, online at http://www.handelsblatt.com/

politik/oekonomie/bwl-ranking/bwl-ranking-2012-bwl-ranking-2012-methodik-und-zeitschriftenliste/6758368.html (last request on 28th of June 2013).

Todorov, Alexander/Mandisodza, Anesu N./Goren, Amir/Hall, Crystal C. (2005): “Inferences of competence from faces predict election outcomes”, Science 308, pp. 1623-1626.

Torgler, Benno/Antić, Nemanja/Dulleck, Uwe (2008): “Mirror, mirror on the wall, who is the happiest of them all?”, Kyklos 61, pp. 309-319.

Appendix

Appendix 1: OLS-Regressions using physical appearance scores as dependent variables

	Model 1	**Model 2**	**Model 3**	**Model 4**	**Model 5**
Dependent variable / **Explanatory variables**	Attractive-ness	Competence	Trust-worthiness	Likeability	Happiness
Proportion of female raters	1.581 [0.049]	0.898 [0.036]	0.105 [0.004]	2.014 [0.068]	3.736 [0.141]
Scholars' age	-0.025(*) [-0.245]	0.018 [0.224]	0.022* [0.279]	0.015 [0.153]	0.016 [0.190]
Scholars' gender	-0.447 [-0.189]	0.278 [0.152]	-0.559* [-0.305]	-0.607(*) [-0.276]	-0.156 [-0.080]
Constant	4.958	5.640*	6.324*	5.166	4.083
Adjusted R^2	0.045	0.021	0.106	0.029	-0.013

*Notes: (*) and * denote significance at the 10 per cent and 5 per cent level respectively. Standardised beta coefficients are presented in parentheses.*

Appendix 2: Female versus male scholars

	Mean		**Significance (Mann-Whitney-U-Test)**
	Women (N = 14)	**Men** (N = 35)	
Age (2010)	40	41	
Feelings of happiness (2010)	7.64	7.77	
Physical appearance (2010)			
Attractiveness	5.09	4.61	
Competence	6.99	7.27	
Trustworthiness	7.28	6.72	*
Likeability	7.18	6.59	*
Happiness	7.39	7.30	
Overall	0.24	-0.12	
Research performance 2011/2012			
Handelsblatt2012	0.23	0.38	
JQ2.1	1.86	3.36	(*)
ref.Journal	0.74	1.16	

*Note: (*) and * denote significance at the 10 per cent and 5 per cent level respectively.*

Appendix 3: Correlation analyses for relations between gender, age, feelings of happiness, physical appearance and research performance

	Feelings of happiness (2010)	**Physical appearance** (2010)						**Research performance 2011/2012**		
		Attrac-tiveness	Compe-tence	Trust-worthiness	Like-ability	Happiness	Overall	Handels-blatt2012	JQ2.1	ref.Journal
Gender (male)	0.03	-0.20	0.16	-0.31*	-0.27(*)	-0.04	-0.17	0.18	0.24(*)	0.18
Age (2010)	0.38**	-0.29*	0.20	0.27(*)	0.12	0.16	0.13	-0.03	-0.04	-0.04
Feelings of happiness (2010)		-0.09	0.08	0.15	0.21	0.27(*)	0.17	0.23	0.19	0.27(*)
Physical appearance (2010)										
Attractiveness			0.51***	0.38***	0.59***	0.45***	0.68***	0.30*	0.24(*)	0.15
Competence				0.65***	0.53***	0.44***	0.74***	0.27(*)	0.33*	0.18
Trustworthiness					0.83***	0.60***	0.86***	0.33*	0.31*	0.25(*)
Likeability						0.86***	0.95***	0.35*	0.26(*)	0.24(*)
Happiness							0.84***	0.33*	0.22	0.23
Overall								0.38**	0.33*	0.26(*)
Research performance 2011/2012										
Handelsblatt2012									0.92***	0.89***
JQ2.1										0.90***
ref.Journal										

*Notes: N = 49 (14 women and 35 men); (*), *, ** and *** denote significance at the 10 per cent, 5 per cent, 1 per cent and 0.1 per cent level respectively.*

Appendix 4: OLS-Regressions for feelings of happiness in 2010 considering research performance in 2008/2009

	Research performance in 2008/2009 = Handelsblatt2012						**Research performance in 2008/2009 = JQ2.1**		
	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3
Gender (male)	0.068 [0,017]	0.004 [0.001]	0.170 [0.041]	0.384 [0.094]	0.253 [0.062]	0.246 [0.060]	0.089 [0.022]	0.017 [0.004]	0.206 [0.050]
Age (2010)	0.418 [0.294]	0.395 [2.169]	0.422 [2.317]	0.464(*) [2.548]	0.542* [2.974]	0.475(*) [2.610]	0.415 [2.281]	0.392 [2.150]	0.418 [2.295]
Age^2 (2010)	-0.004 [-2.008]	-0.004 [-1.890]	-0.004 [-2.055]	-0.005 [-2.287]	-0.005(*) [-2,716]	-0.005 [-2.355]	-0.004 [-1.994]	-0.004 [-1.871]	-0.004 [-2.034]
Academic position									
Not appointed as professor yet or before 2010	0.028 [0.008]	0.046 [0.012]	0.159 [0.043]	0.300 [0.081]	0.495 [0.133]	0.253 [0.068]	0.015 [0.004]	0.037 [0.010]	0.147 [0.040]
Appointed as professor in 2008/2009	0.287 [0.054]	0.362 [0.068]	0.303 [0.057]	0.274 [0.052]	0.403 [0.076]	0.235 [0.044]	0.315 [0.060]	0.395 [0.075]	0.344 [0.065]
Emeritus before 2010	2.886 [0.221]	2.712 [0.207]	3.001 [0.229]	3.515 [0.269]	3.950 [0.302]	3.561 [0.272]	2.835 [0.217]	2.656 [0.203]	2.930 [0.224]
Research performance in 2008/2009	0.083 [0.013]	0.136 [0.022]	0.088 [0.014]	-0.149 [-0.024]	-0.302 [-0.048]	-0.092 [-0.015]	-0.006 [-0.009]	-0.001 [-0.001]	-0.011 [-0.017]
Physical Appearance (2010)	**A**	**C**	**T**	**L**	**H**	**Overall**	**A**	**C**	**T**
	0.101 [0.059]	0.027 [0.012]	0.198 [0.396]	0.430 [0.230]	0.645(*) [0.309]	0.358 [0.186]	-0.108 [0.063]	0.034 [0.015]	0.211 [0.094]
Constant	-2.986	-2.161	-4.008	-6.623	-10.101	-3.825	-2.950	-2.110	-3.986
Adjusted R^2	0.035	0.032	0.038	0.079	0.120	0.062	0.035	0.032	0.038

*Notes: N = 49; A, C, T, L and H denote perceived attractiveness, competence, trustworthiness, likeability and happiness. Standardised beta coefficients are presented in parentheses. (*) and * denote significance at the 10 per cent and 5 per cent level respectively.*

Appendix 4 (continued): OLS-Regressions for feelings of happiness in 2010 considering research performance in 2008/2009

	Research performance in 2008/2009 = JQ2.1			**Research performance in 2008/2009 = ref.Journal**					
	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Gender	0.454 [0.111]	0.316 [0.077]	0.309 [0.076]	0.070 [0.017]	0.006 [0.001]	0.174 [0.043]	0.406 [0.099]	0.289 [0.070]	0.260 [0.064]
Age (2010)	0.460(*) [2.526]	0.539* [2.960]	0.473(*) [2.598]	0.416 [2.286]	0.392 [2.151]	0.420 [2.306]	0.468(*) [2.572]	0.553* [3.038]	0.478 [2.627]
Age^2 (2010)	-0.004 [-2.269]	-0.005(*) [-2.708]	-0.005 [-2.348]	-0.004 [-1.998]	-0.004 [-1.870]	-0.004 [-2.043]	-0.005 [-2.315]	-0.005(*) [-2.787]	-0.005 [-2.375]
Academic position									
Not appointed as professor yet or before 2010	0.279 [0.075]	0.472 [0.127]	0.234 [0.063]	0.025 [0.007]	0.041 [0.011]	0.156 [0.042]	0.303 [0.082]	0.508 [0.137]	0.254 [0.068]
Appointed as professor in 2008/2009	0.318 [0.060]	0.442 [0.084]	0.278 [0.053]	0.293 [0.055]	0.375 [0.071]	0.314 [0.059]	0.288 [0.055]	0.432 [0.082]	0.246 [0.046]
Emeritus before 2010	3.446 [0.263]	3.891 [0.298]	3.506 [0.268]	2.870 [0.219]	2.678 [0.205]	2.976 [0.228]	3.527 [0.270]	3.992 [0.305]	3.569 [0.273]
Research performance in 2008/2009	-0.042 [-0.063]	-0.054 [-0.081]	-0.037 [-0.055]	0.021 [0.009]	0.032 [0.015]	0.016 [0.007]	-0.086 [-0.039]	-0.167 [-0.075]	-0.057 [-0.026]
Physical Appearance (2010)	**L**	**H**	**Overall**	**A**	**C**	**T**	**L**	**H**	**Overall**
	0.451 [0.242]	0.663* [0.317]	0.382 [0.199]	0.103 [0.060]	0.028 [0.012]	0.200 [0.089]	0.438 [0.235]	0.668* [0.320]	0.364 [0.190]
Constant	-6.646	-10.140	-3.742	-2.966	-2.097	-3.975	-6.749	-10.463	-3.871
Adjusted R^2	0.081	0.123	0.064	0.035	0.032	0.038	0.080	0.123	0.063

*Notes: N = 49; A, C, T, L and H denote perceived attractiveness, competence, trustworthiness, likeability and happiness. Standardised beta coefficients are presented in parentheses. (*) and * denote significance at the 10 per cent and 5 per cent level respectively.*

Bisher erschienen:

Diskussionspapiere des Instituts für Organisationsökonomik

DP-IO 6/2013 Scholars' Physical Appearance, Research Performance and Feelings of Happiness
Alexander Dilger/Laura Lütkenhöner/Harry Müller
Juni 2013

DP-IO 5/2013 Vor- und Nachteile der W-Besoldung
Alexander Dilger
Mai 2013

DP-IO 4/2013 Hochschulräte in NRW
Mehr Hochschulfreiheit oder Staatseinfluss?
Alexander Dilger
April 2013

DP-IO 3/2013 Soll man das Handelsblatt-Ranking BWL boykottieren?
Alexander Dilger
März 2013

DP-IO 2/2013 Composition Effects of the German Federal Government on the Average Top Income Tax Burden
Katrin Scharfenkamp
Februar 2013

DP-IO 1/2013 Der Einfluss des Forschungsschwerpunkts auf den Zitationserfolg
Eine empirische Untersuchung anhand der Gesamtpublikationen deutschsprachiger Hochschullehrer für BWL
Harry Müller/Alexander Dilger
Januar 2013

DP-IO 12/2012 Wettbewerbsvorteile aufgrund des Vornamens?
Feldexperimente auf dem Beziehungs-, Nachhilfe- und Wohnungsmarkt
Laura Lütkenhöner
Dezember 2012

DP-IO 11/2012 The Impact of the Euro 2012 on Popularity and Market Value of Football Players
Stephanie Kiefer
November 2012

DP-IO 10/2012 2. Jahresbericht des Instituts für Organisationsökonomik
Alexander Dilger/Stephanie Kiefer
Oktober 2012

DP-IO 9/2012 How (Not) to Pay Non-executive Directors
Alexander Dilger
September 2012

DP-IO 8/2012 Effekte von Erhebungsart und -zeitpunkt auf studentische Evaluationsergebnisse
Laura Lütkenhöner
August 2012

DP-IO 7/2012 Prolegomena zu einer Analyse ethischer und anderer Normen am Beispiel des Hochschulmanagements
Alexander Dilger
Juli 2012

DP-IO 6/2012 The Impact of Physical Attractiveness on the Popularity of Female Tennis Players in Online Media

Stephanie Kiefer/Katrin Scharfenkamp
Juni 2012

DP-IO 5/2012 Förderung von Wissenschaft zu nationalen und europäischen Fragen
Alexander Dilger
Mai 2012

DP-IO 4/2012 Untersuchung von Indikatoren zur Qualitätsmessung von Reitschulen in Deutschland
Stephanie Kiefer
April 2012

DP-IO 3/2012 Rigor, wissenschaftliche und praktische Relevanz
Alexander Dilger
März 2012

DP-IO 2/2012 Socio-Demographic Characteristics and Human Capital of the German Federal Government's Members
Katrin Scharfenkamp/Alexander Dilger
Februar 2012

DP-IO 1/2012 Die Zitationshäufigkeit als Qualitätsindikator im Rahmen der Forschungsleistungsmessung
Harry Müller
Januar 2012

DP-IO 12/2011 Ein Forschungsleistungsranking auf der Grundlage von Google Scholar
Alexander Dilger/Harry Müller
Dezember 2011

DP-IO 11/2011 Besonderheiten der Bewerbung um Promotionsstellen und -gelegenheiten
Alexander Dilger
November 2011

DP-IO 10/2011 1. Jahresbericht des Instituts für Organisationsökonomik
Alexander Dilger/Stephanie Kiefer/Katrin Scharfenkamp
Oktober 2011

DP-IO 9/2011 Corporate Governance and Employee Power in the Boardroom
An Applied Game Theoretical Analysis
Benjamin Balsmeier/Andreas Bermig/Alexander Dilger/Hannah Geyer
September 2011

DP-IO 8/2011 Ein Ranking von Hochschulen und (Bundes-)Ländern
am Beispiel der Betriebswirtschaftslehre
Harry Müller/Alexander Dilger
August 2011

DP-IO 7/2011 Befragung der Kommission Hochschulmanagement zu VHB-JOURQUAL
Alexander Dilger
Juli 2011

DP-IO 6/2011 Director Interlocks and Executive Turnover in German Public Corporations
A Hazard Analysis for the Period from 1996 to 2008
Benjamin Balsmeier/Achim Buchwald/Alexander Dilger/Jörg Lingens
Juni 2011

DP-IO 5/2011 Personalökonomik
Stärken, Schwächen und ihr Platz in der Personalwirtschaftslehre
Alexander Dilger
Mai 2011

DP-IO 4/2011 Familienbewusste Personalpolitik und Unternehmenserfolg
Eine empirische Untersuchung
Christian Lehmann
April 2011

DP-IO 3/2011 Welche Unternehmen berufen Vorstandsvorsitzende und andere Vorstände als externe Kontrolleure?
Eine empirische Analyse der Präsenz von externen Vorständen in den Aufsichtsräten deutscher Großunternehmen
Achim Buchwald
März 2011

DP-IO 2/2011 Hat Julia aufgrund ihres Vornamens Wettbewerbsvorteile gegenüber Ayse und Chantal?
Ein Experiment auf dem Beziehungs-, Nachhilfe- und Wohnungsmarkt
Laura Lütkenhöner
Februar 2011

DP-IO 1/2011 Die dunkle Seite der Gerechtigkeit
Alexander Dilger
Januar 2011

DP-IO 3/2010 On the Overconfidence-Effect in Teams
Hanke Wickhorst
Dezember 2010

DP-IO 2/2010 Leistung, Identifikation oder die Unsicherheit über den Spielausgang – was zählt wirklich?
Relevante Einflussfaktoren auf die Zuschauerzahlen in der Basketball-Bundesliga
Hannah Geyer
November 2010

DP-IO 1/2010 A Citation Based Ranking of German-speaking Researchers in Business Administration with Data of Google Scholar
Alexander Dilger/Harry Müller
Oktober 2010

Herausgeber:
Prof. Dr. Alexander Dilger
Westfälische Wilhelms-Universität Münster
Institut für Organisationsökonomik
Scharnhorststr. 100
D-48151 Münster

Tel: +49-251/83-24303
Fax: +49-251/83-28429

www.wiwi.uni-muenster.de/io