The Right Look: Conservative Politicians Look Better and Voters Reward It

Niclas Berggren, Henrik Jordahl and Panu Poutvaara

THE RIGHT LOOK: CONSERVATIVE POLITICIANS LOOK

BETTER AND VOTERS REWARD IT[*]

NICLAS BERGGREN, HENRIK JORDAHL, AND PANU POUTVAARA[#]

Revised version: February 8, 2012

Political candidates on the right are more beautiful or are seen as more competent than candidates on the left in Australia, Finland, France, and the United States. This appearance gap gives candidates on the right an advantage in elections, which could in turn influence policy outcomes. As an illustration, the Republican share of seats increased by an average of 6% in the 2000–2006 U.S. Senate elections because they fielded candidates who looked more competent. These shifts are big enough to have given the Republicans a Senate majority in two of the four Congresses in the studied time period. The Republicans also won nine of the 15 gubernatorial elections where looks were decisive. Using Finnish data, we also show that beauty is an asset for political candidates in intra-party competition and more so for candidates on the right in low-information elections. Our analysis indicates that this advantage arises since voters use good looks as a cue for conservatism when candidates are relatively unknown.

I. INTRODUCTION

Voters in representative democracies delegate considerable power to elected politicians. It is crucial that this is carried out in a well-informed and knowledgeable fashion, as stressed by one of the founding fathers of the United States, James Madison:

> A popular Government, without popular information, or the means of acquiring it, is but a Prologue to a Farce or a Tragedy; or, perhaps both. Knowledge will forever govern ignorance: And a people who mean to be their own Governors, must arm themselves with the power which knowledge gives.[1]

Unfortunately, there are ample indications that a large fraction of voters fall short of such a knowledge ideal – see, e.g., Somin (2006), Caplan (2007), and Nyhan and Reifler (2010). Instead, they often rely on various heuristics when choosing whom to vote for, as demonstrated by, e.g., Lau and Redlawsk (2001) and Gigerenzer and Gaissmaier (2011). One such heuristic is candidate appearance. Todorov et al. (2005) were able to make surprisingly accurate predictions of elections to the U.S. Congress (for 72% of Senate races and for 67% of House races) by comparing inferences of competence from photos of competing candidates. Since the appearance of candidates may differ systematically between political parties, this opens up for the possibility that the use of heuristics gives either the political left or the right an advantage in elections.[2]

We show that candidates on the right have an appearance advantage over candidates on the left in Australia (election to the House of Representatives), Finland (municipal and parliamentary elections), France (parliamentary elections), and the United States (Senate and gubernatorial

---

[1] The quote is from a letter to W. T. Barry in 1822, reproduced in Kurland and Lerner (2000, vol. 1, ch. 18, doc. 35). A similar point is made in Brennan (2011).

[2] Besley and Coate (1997) explicitly mention a preference for good looks as a reason for voters to care about the identity of representatives in their citizen-candidate model. In a similar vein, the impact of candidate appearance can be captured in probabilistic voting models (Lindbeck and Weibull 1987, 1993) by interpreting the non-policy-related preference for a candidate as stemming from his or her appearance.

elections).[3] Given that previous research has shown that candidate appearance is related to electoral success in all of these countries, our results suggest that the appearance gap tilts policy outcomes to the right.[4]

The consequences of appearance are politically relevant. Counterfactual calculations for U.S. Senate races from 2000 to 2006 indicate that equalizing the appearance of the Democratic and Republican candidates would have changed the winner in one in five races. Appearance differences gave the Republicans a 6% net increase in their share of Senators in these elections. Furthermore, according to our calculations, the looks of candidates have switched the Senate majority in three out of the four U.S. Congresses under study. According to the same method, one in eight U.S. gubernatorial elections between 1995 and 2006 has been decided by the appearance advantage of one of the candidates, mostly the Republican one.

In the present study, we also investigate whether the effect of an appealing appearance, in terms of more votes, is the same for candidates on the right and on the left. We test this hypothesis using data on candidate appearance and electoral success from Finland. As Finland has a proportional electoral system with multi-member districts, personal votes, and within-party competition, we can study how candidate appearance affects electoral success within party lists. This avoids any problems of reverse causality (where parties may attract more beautiful candidates in districts where they expect to be electorally successful). Such an analysis is not possible to perform in elections between one right and one left candidate, which are typical of countries that have a plurality system. In fact, the existence of an appearance advantage for candidates on the right in such settings introduces a risk for spurious

---

[3] Budge and Robertson (1987, 394–395) differentiate between left and right in terms of "economic-policy conflicts – government regulation of the economy through direct controls or takeover … as opposed to free enterprise, individual freedom, incentives and economic orthodoxy." On the fruitful cross-national usage of left-right terminology, see Bobbio (1996) and Mair (2007).

[4] Previous studies that show that better-looking candidates win more votes include Ballew and Todorov (2007), Rosar, Klein, and Beckers (2008), Antonakis and Dalgas (2009), Poutvaara, Jordahl, and Berggren (2009), King and Leigh (2009), Berggren, Jordahl, and Poutvaara (2010), Lawson et al. (2010), Lutz (2010), Olivola and Todorov (2010), and Rule at al. (2010).

correlation when estimating the average beauty premium in elections where either the left or the right performed particularly well. In order to avoid bias one would need to control for all the determinants of the vote, which is difficult given that most variation in election outcomes is not accounted for (Benjamin and Shapiro 2009).

Our findings show that the beauty premium is twice as large for candidates on the right in municipal (i.e., low-information) elections but that there is no partisan difference in electoral returns to beauty in parliamentary (i.e., high-information) elections. In municipal elections, a beauty increase of one standard deviation attracts about 30% more votes for the average right non-incumbent candidate and about 15% more votes for the average left non-incumbent candidate. In the parliamentary election, the corresponding figure is about 20% for left and right candidates alike.

Why do the beauty premia differ between the left and the right in low-information elections? The reason seems to be that voters use beauty as a cue for candidate ideology. Voters on the right expect visually appealing candidates to be closer to them ideologically. To test this, we asked respondents to make photo-based inferences of which party (left or right) Finnish political candidates represent. We find that candidates who represent the left as well as those who represent the right are seen as better looking if they are inferred to represent the right, suggesting that beauty is indeed used as a cue for ideology. This finding accords well with indications in a few early studies that analyzed small samples of politicians in the United Kingdom. Jahoda (1954), Bull and Hawkes (1982), and Bull, Jenkins, and Stevens (1983) found that MPs who were perceived to belong to the Conservative Party were rated as more attractive and intelligent than MPs who were perceived to belong to the Labour Party. However, unlike the present analysis, these early studies did not explore whether right politicians actually looked better.

Why do parties on the right field better-looking candidates than parties on the left? On the supply side, we argue that beautiful people are more inclined to be conservative both because beauty is positively related to earnings (Hamermesh and Biddle 1994) and because beautiful people are treated better throughout life (Langlois et al. 2000). Therefore, beautiful people tend to see the world as a just place. On the demand side, the larger beauty premium for right candidates in municipal (low-information) elections provides an added incentive for good-looking persons to enter politics if they

belong to the political right.

Still, the fact that the beauty premium does not differ between candidates on the left and on the right in parliamentary (high-information) elections shows that beauty is valued by voters across the political spectrum. This general advantage of good-looking candidates could be explained either by a belief that they are more productive or by emotional reasons to express support for them.[5] Regardless of why beauty matters, candidates on the right have an edge in elections as a result of their better looks, which could tilt policies to the right.

II. DATA

In order to study candidate appearance on the left and right we make use of our own data from Finland as well as data from Australia, France, and the United States, generously provided to us by other groups of researchers. The data from the United States allow us to examine how appearance might benefit one party over the other in Senate and gubernatorial elections. However, as described in the introduction, it is not possible to estimate beauty premia – the extent to which a given beauty level translates into votes – for left and right candidates separately using data from elections with one left and one right candidate. For this purpose, we use Finnish data, derived from an electoral system with intra-party competition. Another advantage of the Finnish proportional electoral system that has a personal vote is that it allows us to study competition between non-incumbents. Voters can be expected to rely more on appearance when evaluating non-incumbents, most of whom are unfamiliar to them.

II.A. Finland

Our own data on municipal and parliamentary Finnish candidates were collected in a web

---

[5] On the evolutionary origins of an appreciation of beauty, see the original contribution by Darwin (1871) and recent evidence in Grammer et al. (2003) and Rhodes (2006).

survey with 2,513 respondents from outside of Finland to ensure that the candidates were not recognized. We study candidates from one party to the right, the National Coalition Party, and from two parties to the left, the Social Democratic Party and the Left Alliance. The majority of our respondents were from Sweden or the United States, but we also had significant participation from France, Germany, and Denmark. (Table S.I in the online Supplementary Material reports the number of respondents per country.) Each respondent was shown four photographs (two of each gender), one at a time, randomly chosen from the database of photographs, and was asked to evaluate each photograph, e.g., in terms of attractiveness and competence. Our main question was:

What is your evaluation of the physical appearance or attractiveness of this person compared to the average among people living in your country of residence?

Very unattractive (1)

Below average (2)

Average (3)

Above average (4)

Very handsome or beautiful (5)

Cannot say/Prefer not to answer

For our data analysis, the replies were coded from 1 to 5, as indicated above. Our survey comprised 1,356 photographs, which were on average evaluated by nine respondents each. There was substantial agreement among respondents; if we concentrate on two groups of beauty assessments – above average (4 and 5) and below average (1 and 2) – the kappa coefficient of inter-rater agreement was 0.47, which was statistically significant at the 1% level. The corresponding kappa coefficient for competence was 0.19, which was also statistically significant at the 1% level. The photographs were divided into 684 of women and 673 of men; 575 from the 2003 parliamentary election and 782 from the 2004 municipal elections; and 1,170 of non-incumbents and 187 of incumbents.[6] The photographs only showed the faces of the candidates and no information was given about them. These photographs

_____

[6] By *incumbent,* we mean a political candidate who served in the office in question, or as members of the national or the European parliaments, at the time of the election.

had previously been displayed by the political parties on their campaign posters as well as in newspaper ads. Most voters can be expected to have seen most candidate photographs.

Finland has a proportional electoral system in both municipal and parliamentary elections. Each voter has to vote for one candidate on a party list. Unlike in some other countries, it is not possible to vote for a list without picking a candidate. The seats are allocated to different parties based on their vote shares, using the d'Hondt seat allocation rule. Candidates from a given party are elected in the order of their personal votes in their district.

II.B. *Australia, the United States, and France*

For Australian candidates, we rely on data from King and Leigh (2009), who asked four Australian respondents to rate the physical attractiveness of 286 candidates in the 2004 election to the federal House of Representatives. Australia uses preferential voting, also known as the automatic run-off, and voting is compulsory. The candidates represent one party to the left, the Australian Labor Party, and two parties to the right, the Liberal Party of Australia and the National Party. The two latter parties operate in coalition with one another and do not run candidates against a sitting member of the other party.

King and Leigh used candidate photographs from archived versions of party websites and were able to verify that almost all of these photographs were used on the How-to-Vote cards that party representatives hand out to voters at polling stations. They measured physical attractiveness on a scale from 1 to 10 and asked their respondents to try to maintain an average rating of 5. The scores of each individual rater were standardized to a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of unity. Beauty ratings were then obtained by summing the four standardized ratings of each politician and standardizing those sums.

For the United States, we use data collected by Todorov et al. (2005) and Ballew and Todorov (2007) for 240 candidates running in the Senate elections between 2000 and 2006 and for 248 candidates running in the gubernatorial elections between 1995 and 2006. A large sample of Princeton University students were shown black-and-white headshots of two candidates at a time and were asked

to indicate who looked more competent. The resulting competence ratings reflect the proportion of participants who judged one of the two candidates in a race as more competent.

For France, we obtained competence ratings collected by Antonakis and Dalgas (2009) of 114 candidates from the run-off stages of the 2002 French parliamentary election. In each of the 57 run-off elections, one candidate belonged to the right coalition (*Majorité présidentielle*) and the other to the left coalition of parties (*Gauche parlementaire*). Competence ratings were assembled from 684 Swiss public university students who compared pairs of faces using a 6-point rating scale.

III.   THE APPEARANCE GAP BETWEEN LEFT AND RIGHT CANDIDATES

In this section, we compare beauty and competence evaluations of left and right candidates in Finland, Australia, the United States, and France. As long as we stick to within-country comparisons between left and right candidates, the appearance gaps between them should be comparable between countries, since respondents in different Western countries have been found to make similar evaluations (Berggren, Jordahl, and Poutvaara 2010). Lawson et al. (2010) generalize this finding to more dissimilar countries by demonstrating that evaluations by subjects living in the United States and India predict actual election outcomes in Mexico and Brazil. Likewise, Rule et al. (2010) report that U.S. and Japanese participants made similar inferences from the faces of both U.S. and Japanese political candidates and that their evaluations predicted election outcomes between cultures.

III.A.   *Finland*

We begin by reporting the average evaluations of Finnish municipal candidates. Table I shows that right candidates are seen as more beautiful than left candidates and are, to a lesser extent, seen as more competent. Female candidates (both right and left) receive higher beauty evaluations than male candidates, whereas competence evaluations are roughly equal for men and women. Incumbents are

generally evaluated as better looking and more competent than non-incumbents.[7] The correlation coefficient between beauty and competence is 0.39.

Table II shows that right candidates are judged to be better looking than left candidates in the parliamentary election as well. In general, right parliamentary candidates are also seen as more competent than left candidates.[8] The correlation coefficient between beauty and competence is 0.36. Compared with the municipal candidates in Table I, the parliamentary candidates look slightly better and more competent.

---

[7] The differences in Table I cannot be explained by age differences between left and right candidates. The mean age of left and right candidates differ by less than one year. Male candidates are four years older than female candidates and incumbents are seven years older than non-incumbents, on average.

[8] The differences in Table II cannot be explained by age differences between left and right candidates. As in Table I, the mean age of left and right candidates differ by less than one year.

TABLE I

AVERAGE EVALUATIONS IN FINNISH MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS IN 2004 (STANDARD DEVIATIONS IN PARENTHESES)

	Beauty	Competence	Number of candidates
Right candidates	2.89 (0.71)	3.32 (0.41)	262
p-value of difference	0.000	0.001	
Left candidates	2.59 (0.61)	3.20 (0.45)	518
Right female candidates	3.08 (0.79)	3.34 (0.37)	139
p-value of difference	0.000	0.000	
Left female candidates	2.63 (0.67)	3.17 (0.41)	240
Right male candidates	2.68 (0.53)	3.30 (0.45)	123
p-value of difference	0.045	0.247	
Left male candidates	2.56 (0.60)	3.24 (0.49)	278
Right female incumbents	3.07 (0.75)	3.32 (0.33)	21
p-value of difference	0.160	0.741	
Left female incumbents	2.78 (0.63)	3.36 (0.47)	26
Right male incumbents	2.77 (0.51)	3.48 (0.28)	25
p-value of difference	0.055	0.640	
Left male incumbents	2.50 (0.52)	3.43 (0.48)	24
Right female non-incumbents	3.08 (0.80)	3.34 (0.38)	118
p-value of difference	0.000	0.000	
Left female non-incumbents	2.61 (0.67)	3.14 (0.39)	214
Right male non-incumbents	2.65 (0.54)	3.26 (0.47)	98
p-value of difference	0.184	0.582	
Left male non-incumbents	2.56 (0.55)	3.23 (0.78)	254
All municipal candidates	2.69 (0.66)	3.25 (0.44)	780

Notes. Right candidates belong to the National Coalition Party. Left candidates belong to the Social Democratic Party or to the Left Alliance. An incumbent is a political candidate who served in the office in question, or as a member of the national or the European parliaments, at the time of the election. One observation is the average evaluation of one candidate. P-values from a t-test of equal means are reported between each pair of average evaluations of right and left candidates.

TABLE II

AVERAGE EVALUATIONS IN FINNISH PARLIAMENTARY ELECTION IN 2003 (STANDARD DEVIATIONS IN PARENTHESES)

	Beauty	Competence	Number of candidates
Right candidates	2.93 (0.62)	3.55 (0.45)	202
p-value of difference	0.000	0.000	
Left candidates	2.70 (0.67)	3.31 (0.51)	373
Right female candidates	3.06 (0.67)	3.52 (0.40)	108
p-value of difference	0.000	0.000	
Left female candidates	2.82 (0.74)	3.29 (0.46)	195
Right male candidates	2.78 (0.51)	3.58 (0.49)	94
p-value of difference	0.002	0.000	
Left male candidates	2.56 (0.56)	3.34 (0.55)	178
Right female incumbents	3.54 (0.52)	3.87 (0.36)	16
p-value of difference	0.001	0.001	
Left female incumbents	2.93 (0.53)	3.45 (0.36)	25
Right male incumbents	2.92 (0.57)	3.64 (0.44)	21
p-value of difference	0.012	0.214	
Left male incumbents	2.52 (0.49)	3.45 (0.55)	28
Right female non-incumbents	2.98 (0.66)	3.45 (0.38)	92
p-value of difference	0.070	0.001	
Left female non-incumbents	2.81 (0.76)	3.27 (0.76)	170
Right male non-incumbents	2.73 (0.49)	3.56 (0.50)	73
p-value of difference	0.035	0.001	
Left male non-incumbents	2.57 (0.57)	3.31 (0.55)	150
All parliamentary candidates	2.78 (0.66)	3.39 (0.50)	575

Notes. Right candidates belong to the National Coalition Party. Left candidates belong to the Social Democratic Party or to the Left Alliance. An incumbent is a political candidate who served in the office in question, or as a member of the European parliament, at the time of the election. One observation is the average evaluation of one candidate. P-values from a t-test of equal means are reported between each pair of average evaluations of right and left candidates.

Ethnicity does not have any significant impact on the results, since only 1.1% of right candidates and 1.8% of left candidates have immigrant backgrounds, based on their photo appearances. A potential problem relating to the validity of the evaluations, however, is that right and

left candidates may choose to present themselves in somewhat different fashions (e.g., with regard to clothing and jewelry). Therefore, there is a risk that the evaluations reflect the political orientations of respondents. In particular, our use of foreign respondents could be problematic if, for instance, U.S. respondents are more conservative on average and, therefore, evaluate right political candidates as relatively better looking.

We address this issue from three angles. First, we divide respondents according to their views on taxes and redistribution in order to investigate whether the evaluation differences are driven by the political orientations of respondents. Second, we compare the evaluations of respondents from Sweden with those of U.S. respondents. Third, we test whether political candidates who wear a tie (for men) or a blouse and/or a suit (for women) are given different evaluations than those who do not.

As reported in Table A.I in the Appendix, the beauty differences between right and left candidates remain both for right and for left respondents (as classified by whether they agree or disagree with the suggestion "to increase taxes on those with high incomes in your country, and distribute the money to those with low incomes."). For male candidates, the beauty difference is, however, not statistically significant when evaluated by left respondents. The differences in competence also remain, but are generally smaller and in some cases not statistically significant. Table S.II in the online Supplementary Material shows that right candidates are perceived as more beautiful and competent by respondents both from Sweden and from the United States (although for male candidates the differences are not statistically significant among respondents from Sweden). Table S.III in the online Supplementary Material demonstrates that what candidates wear only seems to affect how competent they are perceived to be. For beauty, the differences are smaller and statistically insignificant for both female and male candidates. We conclude that the higher beauty and competence evaluations of right candidates do not only reflect the political opinions of respondents.

Another concern is that the appearance gap in favor of right politicians could result from differences in the quality of photographs; perhaps right parties spend more on photographers so that their candidates look better in campaign material. We tested for photograph-quality differences by having two men and two women from Germany and from Sweden evaluate 100 randomly selected

pairs of photographs.[9] This photograph-quality evaluation was conducted independent of the collection of appearance ratings. Respondents indicated whether one of the photographs was of higher quality, whether the photographs were of similar quality or whether an assessment could not be made, and in so doing they were explicitly instructed to disregard any aspects concerning the appearance of the persons in the photographs. Photographs of left candidates were evaluated to be of higher quality more often than photographs of right candidates: in 57% and in 34% of the cases, respectively.[10] Therefore, the appearance gap in favor of right politicians does not seem to be driven by the quality of the photographs. If anything, the photograph-quality evaluations may be taken to imply that we underestimate this gap.

Finally, we note that in the 2003 Finnish National Election Study, more than one third of voters reported that they were influenced by the presence and style of candidates and more than one fifth by their election campaigns and advertisements. Table A.II in the Appendix presents these numbers separately for right and left voters. For our purposes, it is eye-catching that voters who are politically to the right state that they were more influenced by education, presence and style, and campaigns and advertisements, whereas voters to the left say that they were more influenced by the gender of candidates.

III.B. Australia, the United States, and France

Next, we compare the appearance of left and right candidates in Australia, the United States, and France. These data were collected by other groups of researchers and they contain fewer candidates, fewer variables, and smaller shares of female candidates than our own data from Finland.

---

[9] This was carried out by randomly selecting 50 photographs of men and 50 photographs of women from the left, and then matching each photograph with a photograph of a candidate of the same gender in the same district from the right. Candidates were matched by choosing the candidate from the right who was closest in age.

[10] Furthermore, although there is a positive correlation between photograph quality and beauty evaluations, right candidates are evaluated as better looking both in photographs that are of lower and of higher quality than those of left candidates, as well as in photographs that are of similar quality.

As a consequence, we cannot carry out all the comparisons and examinations that we did for the Finnish candidates in Section III.A. Still, it is important to investigate other countries in order to assess the generality of an appearance gap in favor of right candidates.

Table III presents the evaluations for Australian candidates. The table demonstrates that there is also a beauty gap in Australian politics. This gap remains when controlling for candidate gender and for incumbency, although it is not statistically significant among the small group of female candidates (with an unexpected sign switch for female non-incumbents).

TABLE III
AVERAGE EVALUATIONS IN THE AUSTRALIAN HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ELECTION IN 2004

	Beauty	Number of candidates
Right candidates	0.165	137
p-value of difference	0.007	
Left candidates	-0.151	149
Right female candidates	0.583	31
p-value of difference	0.693	
Left female candidates	0.481	43
Right male candidates	0.042	106
p-value of difference	0.000	
Left male candidates	-0.408	106
Right female incumbents	0.597	16
p-value of difference	0.262	
Left female incumbents	0.184	18
Right male incumbents	-0.222	51
p-value of difference	0.029	
Left male incumbents	-.578	42
Right female non-incumbents	0.568	15
p-value of difference	0.732	
Left female non-incumbents	0.694	25
Right male non-incumbents	0.287	55
p-value of difference	0.001	
Left male non-incumbents	-0.296	64

Notes. Right candidates belong to the Liberal Party of Australia or to the National Party. Left candidates belong to the Australian Labor Party. The beauty ratings are standardized to a mean of zero and a standard deviation of unity (among all candidates). One observation is the standardized evaluation of one candidate. P-values from a t-test of equal means are reported between each pair of evaluations of right and left candidates.

For the United States, we analyze data for the 2000–2006 Senate elections and the 1995–2006 gubernatorial elections. Table 4 reports the shares of respondents who evaluated the Republican candidate as more competent than the Democratic candidate in different types of elections. Republican candidates are consistently seen as more competent, although levels of statistical significance vary (both because of the smaller difference in Senate than in gubernatorial races and because we have fewer observations than in Finland and in Australia).[11]

TABLE IV
SHARE OF RESPONDENTS EVALUATING THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE AS MORE COMPETENT IN U.S. ELECTIONS

	Competence	Number of races
All races	53.1% (0.021)	244
Senate races	51.9% (0.274)	120
Gubernatorial races	54.2% (0.036)	124
Same sex races	53.6% (0.033)	181
Races with an incumbent	53.3% (0.041)	169
Races with two non-incumbents	52.5% (0.278)	75
Same sex races with an incumbent	53.3% (0.082)	131
Same sex races with two non-incumbents	53.4% (0.211)	50

Notes. The competence evaluation is the average share of respondents who rated the Republican candidate as more competent than the Democratic candidate. The candidates are from the 2000–2006 Senate elections and the 1995–2006 gubernatorial elections. Only races that include one Republican and one Democratic candidate are included. Bernie Sanders, who ran as an independent in Vermont 2006, is counted as a Democrat since he won the Democratic primary and caucused with the Democratic Party. P-values from a t-test of equal evaluations of Republicans and Democrats are in parentheses.

We also have competence evaluations for the French candidates from the run-off stages of the 2002 parliamentary election. The ratings of the 114 candidates are based on pairwise comparisons.[12]

---

[11] Benjamin and Shapiro (2009) collected evaluations of video clips from a sample of 58 U.S. gubernatorial debates. In their data set, the Republican candidates are evaluated as more attractive but the difference is not statistically significant. We use the data set collected by Ballew and Todorov (2007) since it encompasses 248 gubernatorial candidates and since it – like our data for other countries – is based on photo evaluations.

[12] Participants were given a questionnaire with one pair of faces and were asked to rate which of the two individuals was

The results show that right candidates look more competent: their average rating is 3.75 with a standard deviation of 0.44. This can be compared with a rating of 3.5, which would imply a tie (and the difference is statistically significant at the 1% level).[13]

Table V summarizes the appearance gaps for the four countries for which we have obtained data. Although party systems and available measures vary (for countries other than Finland we only have either beauty or competence), the table suggests without exception that there is an advantage for right candidates in terms of having better looks compared with left candidates.

TABLE V

BEAUTY AND COMPETENCE ADVANTAGES FOR RIGHT POLITICAL CANDIDATES

	Beauty advantage	Competence advantage	Source
Australia, House of Representatives	32% ***	n.a.	King and Leigh (2009)
Finland, municipal	46% ***	27% ***	Own data
Finland, parliamentary	35% ***	48% ***	Own data
France, parliamentary	n.a.	59% ***	Antonakis and Dalgas (2009)
United States, gubernatorial races	n.a.	18% **	Ballew and Todorov (2007)
United States, Senate races	n.a.	8%	Todorov et al. (2005)

Notes. For Australia and Finland, "beauty advantage" is defined as the difference between the average beauty rating of right and left candidates, expressed as a percentage share of the standard deviation of the candidates' beauty ratings. "Competence advantage" is defined analogously for Finland. For France, competence advantage is based on pairwise comparisons and measured as a difference between the average rating of right politicians on a 1–6 scale and the rating of 3.5, which would imply a tie, expressed as a percentage share of the standard deviation of this variable. For the United States, the reported numbers are the difference between the share of respondents rating the Republican as more competent and the share rating the Democrat as more competent, divided by the latter. * difference is significant at 10%; ** difference is significant at 5%; *** difference is significant at 1%.

more competent using a 6-point rating scale: 1 (or 6)—definitely the person on the left (or right); 2 (or 5)—the person on the left (or right); and 3 (or 4)—most probably the person on the left (or right).

[13] Since the data only include pairs where the loser of the run-off was the incumbent and since female candidates were only involved in three run-offs, we do not divide the French data into subgroups.

III.C.   *Beauty and Conservatism*

Why do parties on the right field better-looking candidates? A simple economic explanation on the supply side is that beautiful people earn more money on the labor market (Hamermesh and Biddle 1994; Scholz and Sicinski 2011) and are therefore – for selfish reasons – more inclined to oppose redistribution and support parties to the right. A more general psychological explanation could be that good-looking people are more likely to perceive the world as a just place, since they are treated better than others (Langlois et al. 2000) and since they are happier (Hamermesh and Abrevaya 2011).[14] These reasons could make beautiful people inclined to embrace conservative opinions, implying that the pool of potential candidates will include a larger share of good-looking people on the right. In Sections V and VI, we examine whether there is also a demand-side explanation for there being more visually appealing candidates on the right.

IV.   THE IMPACT OF APPEARANCE IN U.S. ELECTIONS

In this section, we investigate the effect of the appearance gap on the success of Republicans and Democrats in U.S. Senate and gubernatorial elections. We do this using the data collected by Todorov et al. (2005) and Ballew and Todorov (2007) that we analyzed in Section III.B.

IV.A.   *Elections to the Senate*

To simulate the impact of appearance on elections to the U.S. Senate, we calculate counterfactual vote shares in the 2000–2006 Senate elections conditional on the removal of the appearance gap between each pair of candidates. To do this, we use the data collected by Todorov et al. (2005) and Ballew and Todorov (2007). For the effect of competence judgments, we use the partial standardized regression coefficient from Table 2 in Todorov et al. (2005).

---

[14] In fact, Napier and Jost (2008) present results to the effect that conservatives are happier precisely because they do not see a need for egalitarianism, i.e., because they by and large perceive the world as a just place.

Admittedly, this is a somewhat speculative exercise, but we consider it informative since it illustrates that differences in appearance can have major consequences for political outcomes. According to this exercise, the winner changes in 23 out of 120 Senate races (19% of all races covered in the data we have available). The winner changes from Republican to Democrat in 15 races and from Democrat to Republican in eight races. Therefore, the net gain from candidate appearance for the Republicans would be seven seats (6% of the contested seats in the data).

Studying races without an incumbent is particularly interesting as it avoids the risk of confusing the advantages of appearance and incumbency. In our data, 22 out of the 120 Senate races were contests over an empty seat. Equalizing the appearance of candidates would have changed the outcome in seven of the 22 races. In five, the winner would have changed from Republican to Democrat and in two from Democrat to Republican. The net shift from appearance equality would have been 14% of contested seats to the Republicans. Although this sample of races is small, the pattern that appearance matters more among non-incumbents is intuitive and in line with what Berggren, Jordahl, and Poutvaara (2010) find for Finnish elections.

These hypothetical seat changes are unevenly distributed over time. As shown in Table VI, our calculations indicate that Republicans won their Senate majorities in the 108th and 109th Congresses because they fielded better-looking candidates. The Senate of the 107th Congress was initially split, 50–50, between the two parties, but that would not have been the case if the Democrats had not benefited from the looks of their candidates in a few close races in the Senate elections of 2000 (notwithstanding the fact that Republican candidates looked slightly better on average). In all, majorities in three out of the four Senate elections for which we have data would actually have changed if the appearance difference between candidates had somehow been eliminated.

TABLE VI

THE IMPACT OF APPEARANCE ON U.S. SENATE MAJORITIES

US Congress	No. of Republican Senators	Estimated Republican net gain of the appearance gap	Majority change owing to the appearance gap
107th (2001–2003)	50	-2	Yes, but see the note
108th (2003–2005)	51	2	Yes
109th (2005–2007)	55	6	Yes
110th (2007–2009)	49	1	No

Notes. The Senate of the 107th Congress was initially evenly split, 50-50, between the two parties, but as soon as Dick Cheney was sworn in as Vice President, the tie-breaking power of the Vice President gave the Republicans the majority. However, on June 6, 2001, Senator Jim Jeffords, previously a Republican, declared himself an independent and announced that he would join the Democratic caucus, giving the Democrats control of the Senate with a margin of a single seat.

IV.B. Gubernatorial Elections

We also carried out the same type of calculation for the 1995–2006 U.S. gubernatorial elections. Based on the data collected by Ballew and Todorov (2007), we calculate counterfactual vote shares in these elections by removing the difference in perceived competence between each pair of candidates. For the effect of competence judgments, we use the standardized regression coefficient from Table 2 in Ballew and Todorov (2007). According to this exercise, the winner changes in 15 out of 124 races (12% of all races covered in the data). The winner changes from Republican to Democrat in nine races and from Democrat to Republican in six races. Although the net impact of appearance thus seems to be somewhat smaller in the gubernatorial than in the Senate elections, the considerable political power of a governor still makes a reversal of a gubernatorial election outcome a very significant event.

V. Beauty Premia in Low-Information and High-Information Elections

Elections between two (main) candidates cannot be used to investigate whether the effect of candidate appearance differs between the left and the right. To answer this question, we turn to Finland, a country that has a proportional electoral system and intra-party competition between a large number of candidates.

First, it bears noting that electoral competition works quite differently at the municipal and at the national level. To win a seat in parliament, a candidate normally has to first win a seat in the municipal council. Municipal elections can be characterized as low-information elections – defined by Buckley, Collins, and Reidy (2007, 176) as "elections which do not involve significant constitutional office and do not attract large scale media coverage" – because only a few candidates (especially among non-incumbents) are "career politicians" who are politicians by occupation or have a history of active campaigning and public visibility. Advertising is mainly restricted to posters and newspaper ads; hardly any candidates run individual campaigns on the television or radio.

By contrast, the parliamentary election can be characterized as one of high information. Parliamentary candidates are a more select group that is, for several reasons, more visible to the public. Many parliamentary candidates hold or have previously held seats at the municipal level and have a political history of which voters are aware. Candidates who spend large amounts of money on campaigning are mainly observed in the parliamentary election.

We use regression analysis in order to investigate the relationship between beauty and electoral success. We define the *Beauty* of a candidate as the mean beauty assessment of his or her photo among all respondents who evaluated it. *Beauty* is standardized: each mean assessment is divided by the standard deviation of all the mean assessments so that the variable has a standard deviation of one. In order to make a clear distinction between low-information and high-information elections we focus on non-incumbent candidates. We use list fixed effects in our regressions in order to capture how beautiful a candidate is perceived to be in relation to the other candidates on the same list. We compare the electoral success of candidates from the National Coalition Party on the right with that of

candidates from the Social Democratic Party and the Left Alliance on the left.[15]

Our dependent variable, *Relative success*, is defined in the following way for candidate *i* on list *j*:

$$Relative\ success_{i,j} = (p_i\ /\ v_j)\ *\ 100 \qquad\qquad (1)$$

where p_i is candidate *i*'s number of personal votes and v_j is the number of all votes for candidates on list *j* divided by the number of candidates on list *j*. As the main explanatory variable, we use *Beauty*. This is in keeping with results found by Berggren, Jordahl, and Poutvaara (2010) and Lutz (2010), showing that beauty evaluations have a higher explanatory power than competence evaluations, and Verhulst, Lodge, and Lavine (2010), demonstrating that beauty can be seen as a fundamental variable with halo effects on character-based inferences such as perceived competence. *Beauty* is interacted with a dummy variable for right candidates (i.e., candidates who belong to the National Coalition Party). We also include a dummy variable for male candidates, both by itself and interacted with Right.[16]

Table VII contains the regression results that allow us to compare the beauty coefficients of right and left candidates. Since our identification comes from the interaction of *Beauty* with the dummy variable Right, we include the interaction of all unreported dummy variables with Right in most specifications, but we do not report estimates for the full set of interaction terms in the Table. The unreported dummies are *Young*, which denotes an age under 30, and *Old,* which denotes an age over 60, together with dummies for education. For both the municipal and the parliamentary elections,

---

[15] The pooling of candidates from the Social Democratic Party and the Left Alliance is supported by statistical tests; there is no specification in which we can reject (at the 5% significance level) that the beauty coefficients are equal for candidates from these two parties.

[16] No definitive gender differences with regard to beauty premia could be established by Berggren, Jordahl, and Poutvaara (2010); however, other studies indicate that gender sometimes does matter for reactions to beauty. For example, Dreber, Gerdes, and Gränsmark (2010) find that male chess players choose significantly riskier strategies when playing against an attractive female opponent, although this does not improve their performances.

we report three specifications that differ in whether we control for education and whether we interact the variables with unreported coefficients (age and education) with Right.

TABLE VII

RELATIVE SUCCESS IN FINNISH ELECTIONS, NON-INCUMBENTS

	Municipal elections (2004)			Parliamentary election (2003)		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Beauty	15.40***	15.91***	16.00**	24.47***	23.90***	20.98***
	(4.33)	(4.62)	(4.82)	(5.90)	(5.86)	(5.90)
Beauty × Right	15.59*	18.64**	15.00**	-2.26	-0.54	2.54
	(7.94)	(5.67)	(5.86)	(9.75)	(9.20)	(9.24)
Male dummy	-20.66	-33.84	-31.96	13.50	11.89	13.96*
	(16.32)	(19.31)	(17.73)	(6.99)	(8.10)	(7.04)
Male dummy × Right		42.79	34.97		5.33	3.84
		(24.86)	(25.53)		(15.75)	(15.36)
Age dummies	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Education dummies	No	No	Yes	No	No	Yes
Unreported dummies interacted with Right	No	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes
List fixed effects	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Number of candidates	682	682	682	485	485	485
R-squared	0.02	0.02	0.03	0.06	0.06	0.08

Notes. The dependent variable is Relative success. Right candidates belong to the National Coalition Party. Left candidates belong to the Social Democratic Party or to the Left Alliance. The education dummies are Comprehensive school or less (at most 10 years of schooling); Upper-secondary education (corresponds to 12 years of schooling); Vocational education (10–12 years of schooling); and University education (those who have completed their educations and obtained degrees). Upper-secondary education usually serves as preparation for university-level education, and many of the candidates with upper-secondary educations listed as highest education have started, but not completed, university studies. Vocational education includes, e.g., basic nurses, nurses, commercial school graduates, clerks, and artisans. Robust standard errors clustered at the list level in parentheses. * significant at 10%; ** significant at 5%; *** significant at 1%.

Columns (1)–(3) show that in the municipal elections, the beauty coefficient of right candidates is twice as large as that of left candidates (the total beauty coefficient of right candidates is obtained by

adding the coefficients for Beauty and Beauty × Right). The beauty coefficients are not much affected by the inclusion of dummies for education. The point estimates also suggest that female left candidates do better than male left candidates in municipal elections, although the coefficient for the Male dummy is not statistically significant at conventional levels. For right candidates there is, however, no visible gender difference. In accordance with McDermott (1997), our interpretation is that voters use gender as a cue in low-information elections. Since women are typically seen as kinder and more compassionate than men, they are stereotyped as caring more about social welfare issues, which could make them preferable to men on a left party list with relatively unknown candidates.

As shown in columns (4)–(6), the differences in the beauty premia between right and left candidates that were evident in the municipal elections seem to be absent in the parliamentary election. There is a beauty premium for both left and right candidates such that a beauty increase of one standard deviation attracts about 20% more votes for the average non-incumbent candidate. Similarly, the point estimates for the effects of gender in the parliamentary election are quite small compared with the municipal elections. Thus, the effects of candidate appearance and gender follow the same pattern of having noticeably larger differences between left and right candidates in municipal elections.

The fact that there is also a large beauty premium in parliamentary elections and that it is of about the same size for candidates on the left and on the right shows that beauty is valued by voters across the political spectrum. This general appreciation of beauty could be explained by a belief that good-looking candidates are more productive in politics (plausibly since beautiful people are seen as more able and are treated better in social interactions). Alternatively, it could be explained by expressive reasons, namely that voters experience satisfaction by supporting candidates that have a striking appearance.[17]

---

[17] On expressive voting, see Hamlin and Jennings (2011).

VI. BEAUTY AS A CUE FOR IDEOLOGY

One potential explanation for the larger beauty premium for candidates on the right in municipal, but not in parliamentary, elections is that voters use beauty as a cue for ideology when evaluating candidates in low-information elections. If right voters expect better-looking candidates to be closer to them ideologically, then the beauty premium should be higher on the right in elections where there is uncertainty about the ideology of candidates.[18] In fact, Rule and Ambady (2010) find that people are able to infer whether political candidates are to the left or to the right only by looking at their faces, which may be taken to support the interpretation that voters use facial appearance as a cue for non-egalitarianism or similar aspects of ideology.

It could also be that voters on the right, compared with voters on the left, consider beauty a stronger indication of candidate ability (including the value of beauty in social interactions). Both of these accounts could explain why the partisan difference is present only at the municipal level. At that level, voters have less information about candidates' true degrees of non-egalitarianism and ability, which is why they rely on appearance to guide them. In parliamentary elections, an additional piece of information becomes available about most challengers, namely their behavior in municipal office. With this information available, voters no longer need beauty as a cue for ideology or ability, pushing the beauty premia of left and right candidates towards equalization. By contrast, if the explanation were based on differences in expressive voting (e.g., right-wing voters identifying more with or cheering for "the beautiful winners"), there would be no reason for the difference in beauty premia to appear in municipal elections only.

Since we asked respondents in our survey to guess the party when looking at photos of politicians, we can test whether good-looking candidates are typically believed to represent parties to the right. Table VIII contains the average beauty evaluations grouped by photo-based inference of the

---

[18] An empirical analysis by Price et al. (2011) supports a link between indicators of attractiveness and measures of attitudes towards egalitarianism (typically associated with the left). For example, they find that greater self-reported attractiveness is negatively related to a preference for egalitarianism.

party of the candidates. Better-looking candidates are more often inferred to represent the right and worse-looking candidates to represent the left, thus supporting our interpretation that beauty is used as a cue for ideology.

TABLE VIII

AVERAGE EVALUATIONS IN FINNISH MUNICIPAL ELECTIONS IN 2004 (STANDARD DEVIATIONS IN PARENTHESES)

	Beauty	Number of observations
Candidates inferred as right	2.82 (1.02)	4833
p-value of difference	0.000	
Candidates inferred as left	2.69 (0.98)	6092
Right candidates inferred as right	2.96 (1.04)	1658
p-value of difference	0.000	
Right candidates inferred as left	2.82 (1.00)	1401
Left candidates inferred as right	2.67 (0.98)	2218
p-value of difference	0.001	
Left candidates inferred as left	2.58 (0.96)	3080

Notes. Right candidates belong to the National Coalition Party. Left candidates belong to the Social Democratic Party or to the Left Alliance. One observation is one assessment of one candidate by one respondent. P-values from a t-test of equal means are reported between each pair of average evaluations.

Furthermore, we find that the correlation between beauty and competence evaluations does not differ between left and right respondents (this classification being based on whether they are in favor of or against increasing income redistribution). The correlation coefficient is 0.33 for right respondents and 0.30 for left respondents and the difference is far from statistically significant. Since appearance seems to be used as a cue for competence to the same extent by right and left voters, the larger beauty premium of right candidates in low-information elections is plausibly explained by the use of beauty as a cue for ideology.

VII. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

The presented results indicate that political candidates from the right look better or more competent than political candidates from the left in Australia, Finland, France, and the United States. Since candidate appearance is related to electoral success in all of these countries, this indicates that parties on the right are favored in elections. For the United States, counterfactual calculations suggest that differences in appearance increased the Republican share of Senators by an average of 6% in the 2000–2006 Senate elections and gave the Republicans the Senate majority in the 108th and 109th Congresses. This points at a link from candidate appearance to policy outcomes: if voters reward beauty, the candidates that have the best looks and their parties have an advantage, and their political programs are more likely to be implemented.

We furthermore show that good looks attract more votes for candidates on the right in municipal, but not in parliamentary, Finnish elections. Our interpretation of the larger beauty premium for right candidates at the local level is that voters, in a setting characterized by low information, use beauty as a cue for candidate ideology. There are reasons to believe that voters perceive beautiful candidates as less egalitarian. In parliamentary elections, voters have access to more information, not least since most parliamentary candidates have been politicians at the municipal level, which reduces the weight of beauty as a cue and pushes the beauty premia of left and right candidates towards equalization. Although we established this result for a parliamentary system that operates under proportional representation, it bears noting that intra-party competition in multi-member districts has interesting similarities with U.S. primary elections. In both, politicians compete against other politicians from the same party, at the same time as they try to appeal to less partisan voters. Based on our results of a larger beauty premium on the right in low-information elections, we conjecture that candidate appearance plays a bigger role in Republican than in Democratic primaries as long as the candidates are relatively unknown to voters.

From a broader perspective, the increased importance of television and the Internet, as well as the increased political mobility of voters over recent decades, may have advanced the electoral

chances of the political right. In fact, Lenz and Lawson (2011) demonstrate that television leads less informed citizens to vote based on candidate appearance. This suggests that Republicans have a particular advantage among less-informed voters.

APPENDIX

TABLE A.I

AVERAGE EVALUATIONS ACCORDING TO RESPONDENT IDEOLOGY (STANDARD DEVIATIONS IN PARENTHESES)

Candidates	Respondents	Beauty	Competence	Number of candidates
Right	Right	2.94 (0.72)	3.41 (0.51)	225
p-value of difference		0.000	0.000	
Left	Right	2.63 (0.71)	3.24 (0.57)	451
Right	Left	2.85 (0.78)	3.47 (0.54)	204
p-value of difference		0.006	0.001	
Left	Left	2.66 (0.77)	3.29 (0.65)	365
Right female	Right	3.04 (0.79)	3.38 (0.49)	122
p-value of difference		0.0000	0.000	
Left female	Right	2.65 (0.80)	3.16 (0.50)	222
Right female	Left	3.09 (0.81)	3.48 (0.53)	109
p-value of difference		0.005	0.001	
Left female	Left	2.82 (0.77)	3.27 (0.56)	175
Right male	Right	2.83 (0.60)	3.44 (0.53)	103
p-value of difference		0.003	0.077	
Left male	Right	2.61 (0.62)	3.32 (0.63)	229
Right male	Left	2.57 (0.55)	3.45 (0.54)	95
p-value of difference		0.549	0.094	
Left male	Left	2.52 (0.66)	3.31 (0.68)	190

Notes. The table contains candidates both from the municipal and from the parliamentary elections. Right candidates belong to the National Coalition Party. Left candidates belong to the Social Democratic Party or to the Left Alliance. One observation is the average evaluation of one candidate. Right respondents "strongly disagree" or "somewhat disagree" with the suggestion "to increase taxes on those with that have high incomes in your country, and distribute the money to those with that have low incomes". Left respondents "strongly agree" or "somewhat agree" with the same suggestion. P-values from a t-test of equal means are reported between each pair of average evaluations for right and left candidates.

28

TABLE A.II

FACTORS THAT INFLUENCED VOTERS IN CHOOSING PARLIAMENTARY CANDIDATES

Influence	Share of right voters being significantly or somewhat influenced	Share of left voters being significantly or somewhat influenced
Candidate's gender	32%	38%
Candidate's age	28%	31%
Candidate's educational background	56%	31%
Candidate's previous experience in politics	62%	63%
Candidate's presence and style	39%	34%
Candidate's fame	37%	33%
Candidate's views and comments	87%	80%
Candidate represents the party supported by the voter	85%	73%
Candidate's election campaign and advertisements	25%	21%
Recommendations of a friend, acquaintance, or relative	10%	9%
Comments and support of a non-governmental organization	6%	5%

Notes. Right candidates belong to the National Coalition Party. Left candidates belong to the Social Democratic Party or to the Left Alliance. The numbers presented in the table and in the paper refer to voters for these three parties.

Source: Karvonen and Paloheimo (2003).

References

Antonakis, John, and Olaf Dalgas, "Predicting Elections: Child's Play!" *Science*, 323 (2009), 1183.

Ballew II, Charles C., and Alexander Todorov, "Predicting Political Elections from Rapid and Unreflective Face Judgments," *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 104 (2007), 17948–17953.

Benjamin, Daniel J., and Jesse M. Shapiro, "Thin-Slice Forecasts of Gubernatorial Elections," *Review of Economics and Statistics,* 91 (2009), 523–536.

Berggren, Niclas, Henrik Jordahl, and Panu Poutvaara, "The Looks of a Winner: Beauty and Electoral Success," *Journal of Public Economics*, 94 (2010), 8–15.

Besley, Timothy, and Stephen Coate, "An Economic Model of Representative Democracy," *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112 (1997), 85–114.

Bobbio, Norberto, *Left & Right: The Significance of a Political Distinction* (Cambridge, UK: Polity Press, 1996).

Brennan, Jason, *The Ethics of Voting* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2011).

Buckley, Fiona, Neil Collins, and Theresa Reidy, "Ballot Paper Photographs and Low-Information Elections in Ireland," *Politics*, 27 (2007), 174–181.

Budge, Ian, and David Robertson, "Do Parties Differ, and How? Comparative Discriminant and Factor Analysis," in *Ideology, Strategy and Party Change: Spatial Analyses of Post-War Election Programmes in Nineteen Democracies,* Ian Budge, Derek Hearl and David Robertson, eds. (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1987).

Bull, Ray, and Caroline Hawkes, "Judging Politicians By Their Faces," *Political Studies*, 30 (1982), 95–101.

Bull, Ray, Marion Jenkins, and Julia Stevens, "Evaluation of Politicians' Faces," *Political Psychology*, 4 (1983), 713–716.

Caplan, Bryan, *The Myth of the Rational Voter: Why Democracies Choose Bad Policies* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2007).

Darwin, Charles, *The Descent of Man and Selection in Relation to Sex* (London, UK: John Murray, 1871).

Dreber, Anna, Christer Gerdes, and Patrik Gränsmark, "Beauty Queens and Battling Knights: Risk Taking and Attractiveness in Chess," IZA Discussion Paper No. 5314, 2010.

Gigerenzer, Gerd, and Wolfgang Gaissmaier, "Heuristic Decision Making," *Annual Review of Psychology*, 62 (2011), 451–482.

Grammer, Karl, Bernhard Fink, Anders P. Møller, and Randy Thornhill, "Darwinian Aesthetics Sexual Selection and the Biology of Beauty," *Biological Reviews,* 78 (2003), 385–407.

Hamermesh, Daniel S., and Jason Abrevaya, "Beauty Is the Promise of Happiness?" IZA Discussion Paper No. 5600, 2011.

Hamermesh, Daniel S., and Jeff E. Biddle, "Beauty and the Labor Market," *American Economic Review,* 84 (1994), 1174–1194.

Hamlin, Alan, and Colin Jennings, "Expressive Political Behaviour: Foundations, Scope and Implications," *British Journal of*

Political Science, forthcoming, 2011.

Jahoda, Gustav, "Political Attitudes and Judgments of Other People," *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 49 (1954), 331–334.

Karvonen, Lauri, and Heikki Paloheimo, *Finnish National Election Study 2003*. Computer file FSD1260, version 1.0 (October 9, 2003). Data collected by TNS Gallup Finland, Espoo. Producer: Elections and Representative Democracy in Finland research group. (Tampere: Finnish Social Science Data Archive, 2003).

King, Amy, and Andrew Leigh, "Beautiful Politicians," *Kyklos,* 62 (2009), 579–593.

Kurland, Philip B., and Ralph Lerner, *The Founders' Constitution* (Indianapolis, IN: Liberty Fund, 2000).

Langlois, Judith H., Lisa Kalakanis, Adam J. Rubenstein, Andrea Larson, Monica Hallamm, and Monica Smoot, "Maxims or Myths of Beauty? A Meta-Analytic and Theoretical Review," *Psychological Bulletin,* 126 (2000), 390–423.

Lau, Richard. R., and David P. Redlawsk, "Advantages and Disadvantages of Cognitive Heuristics in Political Decision Making," *American Journal of Political Science* 45 (2001), 951–971.

Lawson, Chappell, Gabriel S. Lenz, Andy Baker, and Michael Myers, "Looking Like a Winner: Candidate Appearance and Electoral Success in New Democracies," *World Politics*, 62 (2010), 561–593.

Lenz, Gabriel S., and Chappell Lawson, "Looking the Part: Television Leads Less Informed Citizens to Vote Based on Candidates' Appearance," *American Journal of Political Science,* forthcoming, 2011.

Lindbeck, Assar, and Jörgen W. Weibull, "Balanced-budget Redistribution as the Outcome of Political Competition," *Public Choice*, 52 (1987), 273−297.

Lindbeck, Assar, and Jörgen W. Weibull, "A Model of Political Equilibrium in a Representative Democracy," *Journal of Public Economics,* 51 (1993), 195–209.

Lutz, Georg, "The Electoral Success of Beauties and Beasts," *Swiss Political Science Review* 16 (2010), 457–480.

Mair, Peter, "Left-Right Orientations," in *The Oxford Handbook of Political Behavior,* Russel J. Dalton and Hans-Dieter Klingemann, eds. (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2007).

McDermott, Monica L., "Voting Cues in Low-Information Elections," *American Journal of Political Science*, 41 (1997), 270–283.

Napier, Jaime L., and John T. Jost, "Why Are Conservatives Happier than Liberals?" *Psychological Science*, 19 (2008), 565–572.

Nyhan, Brendan and Jason Reifler, "When Corrections Fail: The Persistence of Political Misconceptions," *Political Behavior*, 32 (2010), 303–330.

Olivola, Christopher Y., and Alexander Todorov, "Elected in 100 Milliseconds: Appearance-Based Trait Inferences and Voting," *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 34 (2010), 83–110.

Poutvaara, Panu, Henrik Jordahl, and Niclas Berggren, "Faces of Politicians: Babyfacedness Predicts Inferred Competence but Not Electoral Success," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology,* 45 (2009), 1132–1135.

Price, Michael E., Jinsheng Kang, James Dunn, and Sian Hopkins, "Muscularity and Attractiveness as Predictors of Human

Egalitarianism," *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50 (2011), 636–640.

Rhodes, Gillian, "The Evolutionary Psychology of Facial Beauty," *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57 (2006), 199–226.

Rosar, Ulrich, Markus Klein, and Tilo Beckers, "The Frog Pond Beauty Contest: Physical Attractiveness and Electoral Success of the Constituency Candidates at the North Rhine-Westphalia State Election 2005," *European Journal of Political Research* 47 (2008), 64–79.

Rule, Nicholas O., and Nalini Ambady, "Democrats and Republicans Can Be Differentiated from Their Faces," *PLoS ONE*, 5 (2010), e8733.

Rule, Nicholas O., Nalini Ambady, Reginald B. Adams Jr., Hiroki Ozono, Sakiko Nakashima, Satoshi Yoshikawa, and Motoki Watabe, "Polling the Face: Prediction and Consensus Across Cultures," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 98 (2010), 1–15.

Scholz, John Karl, and Kamil Sicinski, "Facial Attractiveness and Lifetime Earnings: Evidence from a Cohort Study," Mimeo, University of Wisconsin – Madison Department of Economics, 2011.

Somin, Ilya, "Knowledge about Ignorance: New Directions in the Study of Political Information," *Critical Review*, 18 (2006), 255–278.

Todorov, Alexander, Anesu N. Mandisodza, Amir Goren, and Crystal C. Hall, "Inferences of Competence from Faces Predict Election Outcomes," *Science*, 308 (2005), 1623–1626.

Verhulst, Brad, Milton Lodge, and Howard Lavine, "The Attractiveness Halo: Why Some Candidates Are Perceived More Favorably than Others," *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, 34 (2010), 111–117.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL TO

THE RIGHT LOOK: CONSERVATIVE POLITICIANS LOOK

BETTER AND VOTERS REWARD IT

TABLE S.I

NUMBER OF RESPONDENTS PER COUNTRY

Country	Number of respondents	Percentage
United States	803	32.0
Sweden	766	30.5
France	225	9.0
Germany	199	7.9
Denmark	135	5.4
Other country	385	15.3
Total	2513	100

Notes. 65% of respondents were men and 35% were women. 32% were undergraduate students and 14% were graduate students. The average age was 31 (32 for men and 29 for women).

AVERAGE EVALUATIONS ACCORDING TO RESPONDENT COUNTRY (STANDARD DEVIATIONS IN PARENTHESES)

Candidates	Respondent country	Beauty	Competence	Number of candidates
Right	Sweden	2.91 (0.75)	3.47 (0.50)	123
p-value of difference		0.001	0.009	
Left	Sweden	2.63 (0.78)	3.29 (0.65)	244
Right	United States	2.97 (0.81)	3.37 (0.57)	180
p-value of difference		0.000	0.005	
Left	United States	2.63 (0.79)	3.21 (0.63)	346
Right female	Sweden	3.19 (0.78)	3.51 (0.48)	60
p-value of difference		0.002	0.035	
Left female	Sweden	2.80 (0.81)	3.31 (0.64)	121
Right female	United States	3.08 (0.83)	3.33 (0.50)	104
p-value of difference		0.0006	0.012	
Left female	United States	2.68 (0.87)	3.16 (0.56)	168
Right male	Sweden	2.63 (0.61)	3.43 (0.53)	63
p-value of difference		0.107	0.108	
Left male	Sweden	2.46 (0.72)	3.28 (0.65)	123
Right male	United States	2.80 (0.75)	3.41 (0.65)	76
p-value of difference		0.034	0.082	
Left male	United States	2.59 (0.71)	3.25 (0.68)	178

Notes. The table contains candidates both from the municipal and from the parliamentary elections. Right candidates belong to the National Coalition Party. Left candidates belong to the Social Democratic Party or to the Left Alliance. One observation is the average evaluation of one candidate. P-values from a t-test of equal means are reported between each pair of average evaluations for right and left candidates.

TABLE S.III

AVERAGE EVALUATIONS ACCORDING TO CANDIDATE ATTIRE (STANDARD DEVIATIONS IN PARENTHESES)

Respondents	Candidates	Tie or blouse and/or suit	Beauty	Competence	Number of candidates
All	All	Yes	2.75 (0.67)	3.41 (0.46)	822
p-value of difference			0.173	0.000	
All	All	No	2.70 (0.64)	3.16 (0.45)	534
Right	All	Yes	2.78 (0.75)	3.40 (0.54)	404
p-value of difference			0.068	0.000	
Right	All	No	2.67 (0.69)	3.14 (0.54)	272
Left	All	Yes	2.71 (0.80)	3.45 (0.60)	355
p-value of difference			0.538	0.000	
Left	All	No	2.76 (0.75)	3.19 (0.61)	214
Right	Female	Yes	2.82 (0.83)	3.30 (0.50)	218
p-value of difference			0.298	0.002	
Right	Female	No	2.73 (0.78)	3.12 (0.50)	126
Right	Male	Yes	2.72 (0.63)	3.52 (0.57)	186
p-value of difference			0.157	0.000	
Right	Male	No	2.62 (0.60)	3.15 (0.58)	146
Left	Female	Yes	2.89 (0.84)	3.39 (0.55)	187
p-value of difference			0.329	0.128	
Left	Female	No	2.99 (0.70)	3.28 (0.57)	97
Left	Male	Yes	2.52 (0.70)	3.52 (0.64)	168
p-value of difference			0.894	0.000	
Left	Male	No	2.56 (0.73)	3.12 (0.63)	117

Notes. The table contains candidates both from the municipal and from the parliamentary elections. Right candidates belong to the National Coalition Party. Left candidates belong to the Social Democratic Party or to the Left Alliance. One observation is the average evaluation of one candidate. P-values from a t-test of equal means are reported between each pair of average evaluations for candidates who wear a tie (for men) or blouse and/or suit (for women) and candidates who do not.