

Appearance of Candidates, Election of Presidents

Gordon Patzer, Roosevelt University

ABSTRACT

Appearance matters, to be elected U.S. President. And among the dimensions of appearance that matters is physical attractiveness. Election outcomes the past 200 years, including the most recent 2016 presidential election outcome, show it and scholarly research data explain it.

History shows that every four years (after each lengthy, expensive, arduous, American presidential campaign race) the candidate elected U.S. President consistently exhibits physical attractiveness to be a significantly more causal variable than only a correlational or coincidental variable. Many in the electorate likely vote entirely (or mostly) in consideration of the candidates' issues and characters. However, many individuals likely vote mostly (and maybe entirely) in consideration of the candidates' physical attractiveness rather than the candidates' issues and characters—whether they realize it or not, acknowledge it or not, deny it or not.

No one wants to admit this discomfoting reality—past, present, and expectedly future. Nevertheless, mass media pollsters and comedian late-night television talk show hosts rather routinely demonstrate this fact in their non-scientific survey reports, consistent with pertinent scientific research data and theory. Relevant here, former United Kingdom Prime Minister, Winston Churchill, once said, “the best argument against democracy is a five-minute conversation with the average voter” (Brainy Quote, 2011).

Questions arise quickly from the above introductory text. Is it true, that substantial numbers of the American electorate cast their votes in U.S. presidential elections due to matters other than issues of generally accepted importance? If yes, then what factors determine these votes? If multiple factors determine these votes, what are those factors and their relative importance?

Of course, many factors determine presidential election outcomes. The purpose of this research paper abstract is to propose and to explore research to identify with data-and-theory justification the role that candidates' physical attractiveness exerts in election results of past and future U.S. presidential campaigns.

.....Significant lengthy pertinent research summaries (e.g., Hamermesh, 2011; Patzer, 2008; Hatfield and Sprecher, 1986) detail robust published research conducted by scholars that span diverse fields and methodologies. Overwhelmingly, despite reality, the data document that people generally are not aware, refuse to admit, and/or deny that physical attractiveness influences their perceptions, assumptions, or actions. Additional research focused directly on physical attractiveness of the 2016 U.S. Presidential primary candidates and on physical attractiveness of the two major 2016 general election candidates (Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump) offers support for hypotheses that the respective robust research findings apply comparably to physical appearance of U.S. presidential election outcomes (McComb, 2017; McLaughlin, 2016).