Abstract

Physical attractiveness is an important social factor; one that affects our daily interactions, and may even influence the way we see the world around us. While scholars in social psychology have provided evidence that attractiveness stereotypes and the ‘halo effect’ are prominent in social interactions, affecting the traits we attribute to others (Feeley 2002; Feldman 1986; Lemay Jr. et al. 2010; Thorndike 1920), the interest in attractiveness has not directly filtered to questions of political behavior. We believe this is an important oversight. Utilizing a novel measure of physical attractiveness included in the ANES – the interviewer’s evaluation of respondent attractiveness, we examine the relationship between attractiveness and political worldview. We find that attractiveness affects partisan identity, feelings of political efficacy, and participation in the more social political acts.
Political Life in ‘The Bubble’: 
The Effects of Physical Attractiveness on Political Worldview

Are our political orientations ‘skin deep?’ Physical attractiveness is an important social factor; one that affects our daily interactions, and may even influence the way we see the world around us. While scholars in social psychology have provided evidence that attractiveness stereotypes and the ‘halo effect’ are prominent in social interactions, affecting the traits we attribute to others (Feeley 2002; Lemay Jr. et al. 2010), the interest in attractiveness has not directly filtered to questions of political behavior. Beyond work evaluating the influence on candidate attractiveness and electoral success (Hart et al. 2011; Waismel-Manor and Tsfati 2011), research examining the role of physical attractiveness in politics is sparse. We feel there is good reason to believe that individuals’ attractiveness may alter their political values and worldview, and the emphasis on candidate appearance represents a potential oversight.

Recent research examining the foundations of political orientations considers the effects of more exogenous predictors of political behavior, such as the role of genetics. Using rich datasets including longitudinal studies of identical and fraternal twins, scholars have demonstrated the heritability of political orientations such as ideology, and to a lesser extent partisanship (Alford et al. 2005; Dawes and Fowler 2009; Settle et al. 2009, but see Hatemi et al. 2009), as well as linkages between genes and the proclivity to participate in politics (Fowler et al. 2008; Fowler and Dawes 2008). More traditionally, research in genetics has considered the heritability of other characteristics, such as intelligence, and, importantly for our purposes, physical appearance (Kanazawa 2011). With an apparent role for nature in political views, and the inherently social nature of politics, we feel it is important to consider how heritable characteristics, such as physical appearance, and social context, which we argue is affected at least in part by one’s appearance, interact to shape political views. Much of the difficulty in
studying attractiveness is finding datasets that include both attractiveness and political covariates. While multiple longitudinal studies assessing physical the effects of appearance over the lifespan, these studies lack useful political variables. Here, we take advantage of a unique data artifact – the 1972-74-76 ANES panel, in which the interviewer’s subjective assessment battery included a measure of the respondents’ physical appearance. This unique data provides us with an opportunity to test a potential mechanism through which heritable traits translate into political behavior. In this paper, we explore the extent to which variation in physical attractiveness affects individual’s political beliefs.

Attractiveness, Stereotypes, and Social Interaction

Previous research on physical appearance focuses on its role in shaping social interactions. These studies typically examine the effects of spillover, or ‘halo effects’ on perceptions of others that occur automatically when interacting with others. Individuals who are seen as physically attractive also are believed to, and are treated as if they in fact, possess other positive traits. Research on these ‘attractiveness stereotypes’\(^1\) finds that people evaluate attractive individuals as more intelligent (Lemay Jr. et al. 2010; Lorenzo et al. 2010; Paunano 2006; Sheppard et al. 2011) and more successful in life (Feingold 1992; Jackson et al. 1995; Webster Jr. and Driskell Jr. 1983).

Despite the social nature of politics, the effects of physical appearance have been understudied in political science. What research has been done has been limited to experimental studies of how citizens perceive candidates based upon their appearance, and the extent to which physical characteristics influence citizen vote decisions. Experimental evidence has shown that physically attractive candidates are perceived as more competent (Samochowiec et al. 2010;\(^1\) A term coined by Dion et al. (1972).
Surawski and Ossof 2006). Lacking additional information, voters have been shown to prefer more attractive candidates, and also predict the outcomes of elections between two candidates based upon variation in appearance at rates better than chance (Olivola and Todorov 2010; Spezio et al. 2012). Candidate’s appearance even serves as a deciding factor in casting ballots for some (Atkinson et al. 2009; Lenz and Lawson 2011; Tigue et al. 2012).

While physical appearance influences how individuals are perceived, and likely shapes social interactions beyond the simple attribution of characteristics, this outward focus is only part of the story. From extant research, we know little about how one’s appearance affects how they perceive the world around them and, more specifically for our purposes, how they view the political realm. With the effect one’s appearance has on how they are treated by, and interact with others, it seems natural that these patterns of pre-adult interactions should influence one’s worldview. While nature may play a role, as noted by scholarship in behavioral genetics, a role remains for ‘nurture’—socializing experiences individuals have over the years prior to reaching adulthood have been shown to affect a number of choices adults make: the decision to obtain an education (Kam and Palmer 2008, 2010), the political views they hold as adults (Jennings and Niemi 1968; Jennings et al. 2009) and adult political behavior (Alwin and Krosnick 1991; Beck and Jennings 1982; Jennings and Markus 1984). While the primary agent of socialization is thought to be the family (Jennings and Niemi 1974), children’s schools, relationships with teachers, their social networks, and social and political contexts have also been shown to be potent forces in shaping adult beliefs (Hughes et al. 2006; Spencer 1983; Thorton et al. 1990). We posit that attractiveness is an important, yet unconsidered moderating factor affecting individual’s socialization into politics.
Research on the effects of physical appearance over a lifespan finds that attractive children are treated more warmly by their own parents as well as by perfect strangers (Berscheid and Walster 1974; Bull and Rumsey 1988; Langlois 1986; Zebrowitz et al. 1997). Over time, this appears to have a pronounced effect on the personality traits more attractive individuals exhibit in social situations, with attractive people appearing to be more confident, extroverted, happier, and healthier as they reach adulthood (Eagly et al. 1991; Feingold 1992; Langlois et al. 2000). While generally equivalent across gender, the effects are somewhat more pronounced among men (Zebrowitz et al. 1998).

The mechanism for this process is a simple one. By virtue of the treatment they receive due to their appearance, individuals become more likely to internalize positive or negative behavioral characteristics (Adams 1977; Lerner and Karabenick 1974; Lerner et al. 1973; Lerner et al. 1976), altering their behavior in social interactions. This effect is potentially exacerbated by behavioral expectations as posited by expectancy theory. Work in this vein asserts that individuals alter their behavior in social situations based upon what they perceive to be expectations regarding their behavior (Rosenthal and Jacobson 1968). Physically attractive individuals are thought to possess social abilities such as intelligence and extraversion, and are treated accordingly, leading to modified behavior on the part of the attractive individual. Thus, the cumulative effects of social interactions for physically attractive individuals may alter their political attitudes. The effect of physical appearance on social life, with its implications for adult personality characteristics and even success, suggests that physical appearance may be an important factor for understanding political behavior. Though we lack a global theory connecting appearance to political behavior, and, therefore remain somewhat agnostic as to the direct effects of physical appearance, the framework of expectancy theory and implications of
repeated social interactions for individual behavior leads us to expect a relationship between physical appearance and political views.

With the guiding notion that the cumulative social interactions for attractive individuals will alter their political outlook, we derive the following expectations for the relationship of physical appearance and political beliefs:

**Hypotheses**

H1: More attractive individuals should be more likely to identify with the Republican Party.

Because attractive individuals benefit from social interactions and are generally given more attention and granted more expertise, their passage through life may be ‘easier’ (compared to less attractive individuals), and therefore, they may not empathize with the others who face more challenges in life. In a sense, attractive individuals may not see the need for more government support and aid in society. Given that this is one of the tenets of the Democratic Party and the domestic agenda of the 1960s, we expect that attractive individuals will be more likely to identify with the Republican Party. Though it is tempting to hypothesize that ideology will have a similar relationship with attractiveness, we have reason to believe the effects may not be parallel. While the salient policy issues and social experiences may influence partisan identification, self-reported ideology may be less directly related to attractiveness. In today’s parlance, we often consider ideology and partisanship to be sorted or align together. In the 1970s however, partisanship and ideology are not synonymous, and an effect on partisanship may not translate to attractiveness effects on ideology.

In addition to our expectations about the political worldview fostered by physical attractiveness, we would expect that attractive individuals should participate at different rates,
and experience different levels of political efficacy, as part of their socializing experiences. More attractive individuals are treated differently than less attractive individuals, are given greater assistance during social interactions, and have greater propensities toward life success. Subsequently, we would expect that more attractive individuals would feel a greater sense of general efficacy, and more specifically, political efficacy.

H2: More attractive individuals should have higher levels of political efficacy

Finally, we consider the relationship between physical appearance and participation. Stemming from the expectations regarding efficacy, and the tendency for attractive individuals to have more life success, we would expect attractive individuals to see greater value in participation. Subsequently, we expect that more attractive individuals should participate at greater rates than less attractive individuals. Indeed, attractive people may have a larger influence on political life, especially given the potential presence of halo effects (Palmer and Peterson 2012). In other words, feelings of greater efficacy may reflect the real impact attractive individuals can have on politics, while spurring participation.

H3: More attractive individuals should participate at greater rates than less attractive individuals across both easy and hard political acts.

To test these expectations, we take advantage of a unique artifact of the 1972-74-76 ANES panel: interviewer’s subjective evaluations of respondents’ physical appearance.

Research Design

Though most students of political behavior would acknowledge that attractiveness matters in social life, there is a paucity of work in the discipline which focuses the influence of physical attractiveness. To test the extent to which the physical attractiveness matters for evaluations of their political knowledge, we take advantage of a unique component of the
American National Election Study. In the pre-election wave of the 1972 ANES, interviewers were, in addition to the other assessments, asked to evaluate respondents’ appearance. Much like the other assessments, these were made on a five-point scale, from 1 (homely) to 5 (strikingly handsome or beautiful).²

Because the 1972 wave was the start of a panel, we are able to examine not only whether a relationship exists between interviewers’ perceptions of respondents’ physical attractiveness and knowledge, but also the extent to which that relationship persists over time. The 1972 ANES consisted of pre and post-election waves, with 2,191 completing both waves. Follow-ups were conducted following the election in 1974, and finally, a pre and post-election survey was fielded in 1976. We focus our analyses initially on those respondents who completed the pre-election wave in 1972 (when key interviewer assessments were completed), and subsequent analyses on the 1,624 respondents completing the 1974 re-interview and the 1,320 respondents who completed all three waves of the panel.

To test the above hypotheses, we examine the effects of attractiveness on political worldview³, efficacy⁴, and participation.⁵ Each of the variables are regressed on the interviewer’s assessment of the respondents’ attractiveness, as well as controls for respondents’

² Specifically, the battery asked respondents to evaluate the respondents’ physical appearance. The attractiveness-rating item came at the end of the interviewer evaluation battery.
³ Political worldview measures consist of partisanship, coded from 1 (strong Democrat) to 7 (strong Republican) and ideology, coded from 1 (extremely liberal) to 7 (extremely conservative).
⁴ Efficacy items include whether the respondent feels they have any say in government, whether voting is the only way to have a say, whether politics is too complicated, whether officials care about citizens, whether Congressmen lose touch, and whether parties are only interested in votes. All items are recoded to 0 (low efficacy) or 1 (high efficacy).
⁵ The participation items include voting, attempts to influence others, attending political meetings, working for a campaign, wearing a political button or posting a sign, donating money, and writing to an elected official. All items are coded as 0 (no) or 1 (yes, R did engage in the act).
age, gender, education, and race. Taking advantage of the panel nature of the data, we estimate separate models (when the data is available) for each of the three waves.\footnote{As attractiveness is only measured in the first wave, we are assuming that individuals’ physical attractiveness has remained constant over the course of the panel, and they have not experienced particular life events that could alter their worldview.}

### Results

Before presenting the analysis of political variables, inquiring readers may wonder whether there is evidence for the influence of attractiveness on social variables in our data. If our measure of attractiveness has value, we would expect to see effects on social variables. As noted above, attractiveness is linked to a number of life outcomes, and the post-election wave of the 1972 ANES instrument provides us with an opportunity to present how our measure of attractiveness is related to questions of life satisfaction and individual accomplishments. For example, respondents were asked how they feel about their lives “as a whole,” the “good parts of their life,” and the “bad parts of their life.” Following our basic research design in modeling and data, we regress these three items on attractiveness with control variables of race, education, gender, and income. The results of the life satisfaction dependent variables are show in Table 1.

| Table 1 here |

In each case, we would expect that physically attractive people are more satisfied with their lives and, therefore, feel better about their whole lives. Physical attractiveness has a significant effect in two of three models; the more attractive the individual, the more positively they view their whole life and the good parts of their lives. The income control variable is significant in each model and in the expected (positive) direction with higher reported income corresponding to higher ratings.
We pair the analysis of life satisfaction with a battery of questions on respondents’ perception of their accomplishments. The 1972 ANES asked how respondents viewed their accomplishments relative to various aspects of their lives (Given the respondent’s age, needs, etc.)\(^7\). In each item, the 7-category variables run from “terrible” to “delighted” about what the respondents’ is accomplishing. Table 2 shows the results of physical attractiveness on the respondent’s view of their accomplishments. Though the effects are not significant in all models, attractiveness is significant and in the expected positive direction five of the seven questions on accomplishments. Moreover, the control variables of Education and Income are positive and significant in each model, with more educated and higher income respondents viewing their accomplishments in higher regard. We are only briefly analyzing the social variables in the 1972 study, and we believe these results are interesting theoretically and empirically for our use of the physical attractiveness measure in the data.

<Table 2 Here>

Having probed the effectiveness of the measure on social variables, we now turn to the analysis of political variables. Our first political analysis seeks to test the role of physical appearance in political worldview. For our purposes, we consider political worldview to be primarily ideology and partisanship. Regressing partisanship and ideology on the measure of attractiveness and control variables, results are shown in Table 3. Attractiveness does appear to influence partisanship (but not ideology) in the expected direction. More attractive individuals are more likely to identify as Republicans, rather than Democrats, as predicted by H1. This effect holds across all three waves of the panel. Conversely, the effect of attractiveness on ideology is only significant in the final wave of the panel, where more attractive individuals are

\(^7\) For example, one item asks “How do you feel about what you are accomplishing in life considering the resources of money, time, and energy you’re putting into it,” and another questions asks “Considering just yourself and your own needs, how do you feel about what you are accomplishing in life.”
more likely to identify as conservatives. Of the controls, we generally see the expected effects—
older, wealthier individuals are more likely to identify as Republicans and conservatives, while
nonwhite respondents are more likely to respond as liberals or Democrats.

These results would seem to lend evidence to the socializing experiences expected in our
first hypothesis. We are cautious in making any great claims due to the inchoate state of our
theory of attractiveness. However, the results lend evidence to the possibility that physical
attractiveness alter our basic political attitudes of partisanship.

<Table 3 Here>

We next turn to the relationship between physical appearance and political efficacy. The
results of these models appear in Table 4. Overall, there are only a few positive effects of
attractiveness on political efficacy when controlling for age, gender, education, income, and race.
The most consistent effect is for the belief that they as individuals have any say in what
government does, and whether public officials care about what people like the respondent think.
Across the waves, more attractive individuals are more likely to hold efficacious beliefs, when it
comes to say in government and whether officials care. We also find that more attractive
individuals are also more likely to believe that parties care about peoples’ opinions rather than
their vote, but only in the first wave of the panel. In contrast to our hypothesis, rather than being
a consistent predictor of efficacy across the board, attractiveness only predicts a few forms of
efficacious thinking. When considering the controls, we see that more educated, wealthier
individuals are more consistently more likely to feel efficacious, while nonwhite respondents are
significantly less likely to feel so. Neither gender nor age appears to be a consistent predictor of
efficacy.

---

8 In bivariate models, attractiveness is significant in all models. Including education into the models leads to the
patterns of results observed in Table 3. Attractiveness and education are modestly correlated (0.22), suggesting that
collinearity may be somewhat obscuring the effects of attractiveness.
The final test of the effects of attractiveness on political behavior is an examination of political participation. Across the waves of the study, as shown in Table 5, attractiveness has significant effects on some forms of participation and no effects on others. On one hand, attractiveness is not significant in wearing a button or donating money in any wave of the panel. On the other hand, we see a consistent pattern on the type of participation that attractiveness is related to: more attractive individuals are significantly more likely to participate in social political acts such as attempting to persuade others how to vote, and volunteering for a campaign, as well as being significantly more likely to vote.

In 1972, attractiveness has a positive influence on reported turnout and influencing others. In 1974, it is significantly related to the social activities of working for a campaign and attending meetings. And finally in 1976, attractiveness is positive in working for a campaign and voting. Of the controls, we see that age, education, and income are consistently related to increased participation. These social participation effects would add further evidence to the argument that attractive individuals should have more developed social skills and derive greater enjoyment from social activities due to their past life experiences and treatment at the hands of others. These findings are preliminary and the questions need more investigating, but there is interesting evidence to build upon.

Conclusion

Politics is at its heart a social endeavor, where individuals act together as a collective. At their foundation, individuals’ views regarding the proper means to and ends of politics is a
combination of inherited characteristics contained in their genes, and learned behaviors that are a product of their social environment. Over the years, we have learned much about the separate effects of these influences, with genetic explanations for political behavior being privileged in some situations, and socialization in others (Alford et al. 2005). In this paper, we consider the political implications of a factor that encompasses both of these processes – physical appearance. Arguably, appearance is a product of genetics, inherited from one’s parents, but also affects how individuals are treated, and thus experience the world around them.

Considering the effects of physical appearance on individual’s worldview, we find perhaps unsurprisingly, that physically attractive individuals hold a more positive view of their lives, noting that life is easier, and they have greater life satisfaction. Politically, we find that attractive individuals are also moderately more politically efficacious, and participate at greater rates in not only casting ballots, but more social political acts such as persuading others and volunteering for political campaigns.

While an interesting set of findings, we should say more about the larger implications of these results. Why might it matter that attractive individuals are more politically efficacious, and even more likely to participate politically? With the demonstrated importance of political activists and opinion leaders in mobilizing citizens (Rosenstone and Hansen 1993), and influencing the views less-engaged citizens hold (Ahn et al. 2010; McClurg 2006; Richey 2009), and the greater social influence more attractive individuals are thought to have, we may surmise that more attractive individuals may hold political sway over others in their social networks, regardless of their actual levels of effective political knowledge. Research in a similar vein has demonstrated that more attractive individuals are subjectively perceived as more intelligent and politically knowledgeable, even after accounting for their objective levels of political
information (Palmer and Peterson 2012). If attractive individuals are also more efficacious, and more likely to persuade others, we may have further concerns for the quality of opinion leadership and participation.

We must acknowledge some limitations to these results. It may be that these results are limited in their generalizability based upon the nature of the measure of attractiveness they rely upon. We rely on a single, subjective assessment of an individual’s physical appearance taken at a particular moment in time, rather than a measure that is more reliable stemming from multiple ratings from multiple coders. It is possible that the subjective assessment is somehow contaminated by other factors that are a part of the interview process, including respondents’ responses to the survey. We are somewhat comforted by existing work that suggests that evaluations of attractiveness are unaffected by characteristics of the interviewer and the respondent (Webster Jr. and Driskell Jr. 1983), and that evaluations of attractiveness, while variable across cultures remain relatively consistent within cultures over time. Additionally, we see the effects of attractiveness, where significant, persist across waves of the panel, suggesting that the subjective measure is in fact a proxy for the underlying mechanism we are positing.

In this paper, we attempt to bring forth a new and novel factor that affects citizens’ socialization into adulthood, and by proximity, into the political world. While somewhat limited, we feel that these findings are informative in furthering our understanding of the motivations of political behavior. Further work would do well to build upon these findings, considering and attempting to measure directly the processes through which physical appearance alters how individuals are perceived and treated politically, and capturing directly through the use of experimental methods how these processes are altered by subtle variations in measures of attractiveness.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1972 Wave</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about life as a whole</td>
<td>0.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about good parts of life</td>
<td>0.73**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about bad parts of life</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.22)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

 Estimates are OLS coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses; + significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%. DV: Opinion toward life, from 1 (negative) to 7 (positive). Models include controls for Age, Education, Income, Gender, and Race.
Table 2. Relationships Between Attractiveness and Respondent Accomplishment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1972 Wave</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feelings about life accomplishments</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on needs, feelings about life accomplishments</td>
<td>0.51*</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Based on fairness, feelings about life accomplishments</td>
<td>0.38+</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In terms of time and energy required, feelings about life accomplishments</td>
<td>0.57**</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In terms of costs to change, feelings about life accomplishments</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How do others feel about life accomplishments</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In terms of age and position, feelings about life accomplishments</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimates are OLS coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses; + significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%. DV: Opinion toward life, from 1 (negative) to 7 (positive). Models include controls for Age, Education, Income, Gender, and Race.
Table 3. Relationships Between Attractiveness and Political Worldview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1972 ANES</th>
<th>1974 ANES</th>
<th>1976 ANES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partisanship</td>
<td>0.52*</td>
<td>0.72*</td>
<td>0.77*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.22)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td>(0.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideology</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.36+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.14)</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimates are OLS coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses; + significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%. DV: Opinion toward life, from 1 (strong Democrat/Liberal) to 7 (strong Republican/Conservative). Models include controls for Age, Education, Income, Gender, and Race.
Table 4. Relationships Between Attractiveness and Efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have Any Say in Government</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.51*</td>
<td>0.44*</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.15)</td>
<td><strong>0.25</strong></td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Voting the Only Way To Have a Say</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is Politics Too Complicated</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.38+</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
<td>(0.26)</td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Officials Care</td>
<td>0.37*</td>
<td><strong>0.25</strong></td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.15</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.25</strong></td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do Congressmen Lose Touch</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.16)</td>
<td>(0.25)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are Parties only Interested in Votes</td>
<td>0.31*</td>
<td>0.44+</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>0.15</strong></td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td>(0.20)</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimates are probit coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses; + significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%. DV: Opinion toward life, from 0 (low efficacy) to 1 (high efficacy). Models include controls for Age, Education, Income, Gender, and Race.
Table 5. Relationships Between Attractiveness and Political Participation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1972 ANES</th>
<th>1974 ANES</th>
<th>1976 ANES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vote</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.97**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.19)</td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influenced Others</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
<td>0.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.17)</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attended Meetings</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.23)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worked for Campaign</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.80*</td>
<td>0.79*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.27)</td>
<td>(0.35)</td>
<td>(0.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wore a Button</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.21)</td>
<td>(0.30)</td>
<td>(0.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donated Money</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.24)</td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
<td>(0.28)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimates are probit coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses; + significant at 10%; * significant at 5%; ** significant at 1%. DV: Opinion toward life, from 0 (R did not participate) to 1 (R did participate). Models include controls for Age, Education, Income, Gender, and Race.
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