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**Table A1. Predicting Coverage of Incumbents, All Districts (2017 and Early 2018 Pooled)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI |
| Proportion of DMA Covered by District | 121.700\*(9.968) | 121.901\*(10.037) | 121.509\*(9.940) | 121.505\*(9.999) | 119.923\*(9.806) | 115.157\*(10.665) |
| Large Media Corporation |  | 0.933(2.455) | 1.138(2.365) | 1.319(2.304) | 1.452(2.328) | 2.181(2.355) |
| PVI Absolute Value |  |  | -0.335(0.191) | -0.246(0.181) | -0.017(0.184) | 0.043(0.181) |
| Unchallenged in General (Baseline) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Challenged in General  |  |  |  | -1.312(5.956) |  |  |
| Viable Challenger |  |  |  |  | 7.448(6.593) | 3.971(7.966) |
| Not Viable Challenger |  |  |  |  | -4.412(5.814) | -4.267(5.863) |
| Not Running in General |  |  |  | 14.384(8.795) |  |  |
| Running for Higher Office |  |  |  |  | 23.144\*(8.102) |  |
| Not Running for Higher Office |  |  |  |  | 12.099(11.252) |  |
| Disbursements by Candidate (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | 6.730\*(2.102) |
| Disbursements by Opponent (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | -2.063(1.826) |
| Absolute Difference in Disbursements (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | 1.882(2.728) |
| Constant | 1.956(1.601) | 1.190(2.834) | 5.777(4.357) | 3.392(7.040) | -0.494(7.015) | -13.230(7.584) |
| N | 3,466 | 3,466 | 3,466 | 3,466 | 3,466 | 2,965 |
| R^2 | 0.242 | 0.242 | 0.245 | 0.254 | 0.262 | 0.317 |
| Models estimated using ordinary least squares. Unit of analysis is station-incumbent pair. DV=Number of 2.5-minute segments by a given station in an incumbent’s district that mention the incumbent. Standard Errors are clustered by incumbent. *\*=p<0.05.* |

Table A1 provides a series of ordinary least squares regressions in which we regress the total number of mentions of an incumbent by a station during 2017 and the pre-general election period in 2018. In the first model, we find that the proportion of the district that covers the media market is strongly predictive of coverage., For example, consider a district that accounts for 11% of a media market, the median value for the district coverage variable for a given district-station dyad. The model predicts that this overlap would be associated with 15.34 mentions on the relevant station. For a MC who represents 26% of a district (the 75th percentile value for the district-station coverage variable), by contrast, this level of congruence is associated with 33.60 mentions in the pre-general election period. Notably, these effects are largely consistent across the inclusion of additional covariates in columns (2) through (6).

Next, we find little evidence that station ownership is associated with the level of incumbent coverage in this pre-general election period. Per column (2), stations that are owned by larger market share firms provide slightly more coverage, but in none of our estimated models does the coefficient reach acceptable levels of precision to identify a statistically significant association.

There is also inconsistent evidence that the partisan make-up of the district is associated with discussion of the incumbent. In the less saturated model reported in columns (3), we find that those districts in which one party enjoys a large advantage in presidential elections are associated with *less* coverage of an incumbent in the pre-general election period. Incumbents get more coverage in districts that are more likely to be competitive, an effect that may arise due to differences in candidate viability and spending. In particular, the effect of presidential vote margin is greatly reduced once we account for election-specific covariates. As with the Table 1 result, the Column 5 results describe differences in coverage for incumbents by their status and their challenger’s viability. Incumbents running for higher office receive considerably more coverage, while those who are leaving office (not running for their old seat or a different office) receive more attention (not statistically significant) than unchallenged incumbents. Among challenged incumbents, those facing a viable challenger get more coverage than those facing a non-viable challenger, although neither effect is distinguishable from the coverage of unchallenged incumbents.

Finally, in Model 6 we investigate whether candidate spending is associated with incumbent coverage. In this model we include only those incumbents who ran for re-election. Incumbents who spent more money over the course of the campaign received more coverage even before the general election season. For each million dollars spent by the incumbent, the model predicts an additional 6.7 mentions. There is no evidence that the challenger’s spending was associated with coverage of the incumbent in the pre-general election period.

Table A2 focuses on the pre-general election period, most variables have insignificant effects. However, district-market congruence increases coverage (across all models), less extreme districts warrant more coverage (an effect that changes sign in models accounting for candidate spending and viability, per columns 6 and 7, and reaches statistical significance), candidates who spend more attract more coverage (column 6), and open seats with viable candidates attract more coverage (columns 7 and 8). Notably, there is little evidence that competitive primaries alone increase coverage (either whether a challenger was present or if the race was decided by less than 20 points), implying that, on average, House primary elections receive relatively little coverage from local broadcasters. Perhaps surprisingly, we find marginal evidence that a viable candidate who faces weaker competition in their primary election can expect more coverage than a viable candidate who faces a competitive primary challenger, consistent with our summary statistics in Table 2. This finding suggests that challengers who may be presumptive general election nominees might receive more coverage than those in competitive primaries in the months before the general election.

**Table A2. Predicting Coverage of Challengers, All Districts (2017 and Early 2018 Pooled)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VII |
| Proportion of DMA Covered by District | 11.950\*(2.970) | 11.467\*(2.878) | 11.470\*(2.877) | 11.476\*(2.881) | 11.353\*(2.864) | 11.224\*(2.792) | 11.141\*(2.805) | 11.188\*(2.809) |
| Large Media Corporation |  | -2.225(1.469) | -2.207(1.470) | -2.205(1.472) | -2.204(1.465) | -2.198(1.461) | -2.166(1.446) | -2.163(1.460) |
| PVI Absolute Value |  |  | -0.030(0.034) | -0.029(0.044) | -0.034(0.035) | 0.055(0.032) | 0.051(0.040) | 0.045(0.039) |
| Challenged in Primary  |  |  |  | 0.130(1.238) |  |  |  |  |
| Competitive Primary |  |  |  |  | -0.979(0.865) | -1.163(0.867) | -0.018(0.977) | -1.280(0.858) |
| Disbursements by Candidate (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | 0.689\*(0.250) |  |  |
| Disbursements by Opponent (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | 0.060(0.271) |  |  |
| Absolute Difference in Disbursements (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | -0.567\*(0.262) |  |  |
| Open Seat |  |  |  |  |  | 3.072\*(1.289) | 2.430(1.325) | 1.347(2.135) |
| Viable Candidate |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.212\*(1.489) | 1.866(1.110) |
| Viable Candidate X Competitive Primary |  |  |  |  |  |  | -2.679(1.811) |  |
| Viable Candidate X Open Seat  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.437(2.713) |
| Constant | -0.005(0.438) | 1.820(1.399) | 2.202(1.464) | 2.090(2.112) | 2.636(1.758) | 0.665(1.684) | -0.378(2.051) | 0.260(2.045) |
| N | 3,601 | 3,601 | 3,601 | 3,601 | 3,601 | 3,601 | 3,601 | 3,601 |
| R^2 | 0.014 | 0.016 | 0.016 | 0.016 | 0.016 | 0.022 | 0.022 | 0.021 |
| Models estimated using ordinary least squares. Unit of analysis is station-challenger pair. DV=Number of 2.5-minute segments by a given station in a challenger’s district that mention the challenger. Standard Errors are clustered by candidate. *\*=p<0.05.* |

**Table A3. Predicting Coverage of Incumbents and Challengers, Limited to Districts with Incumbents and Challengers Running in the General Election**, **Clustering by Congressional District**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Races in which both candidates are viable |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VII |
| Proportion of DMA Covered by District | 40.075\*(6.574) | 40.786\*(6.696) | 39.033\*(6.176) | 39.043\*(6.175) | 36.895\*(5.921) | 36.393\*(5.594) | 76.611\*(12.878) | 73.466\*(12.092) |
| Large Media Corporation |  | 3.758\*(1.675) | 4.388\*(1.637) | 4.376\*(1.638) | 3.352\*(1.579) | 3.420\*(1.517) | 8.462\*(3.473) | 7.270\*(3.266) |
| PVI Absolute Value |  |  | -1.021\*(0.162) | -1.029\*(0.162) | -0.273\*(0.124) | -0.063(0.097) | -1.077\*(0.529) | -0.762(0.456) |
| Incumbent |  |  |  | 5.729\*(0.953) | 5.174(1.558) | 5.337\*(1.553) | 7.814\*(3.105) | 4.746(2.802) |
| Disbursements by Candidate (in Millions) |  |  |  |  | 5.054\*(1.067) | 6.950\*(1.225) | 3.069\*(1.234) | 6.193\*(1.654) |
| Disbursements by Opponent (in Millions) |  |  |  |  | 4.534\*(1.024) | 6.700\*(1.247) | 4.407\*(1.357) | 7.466\*(1.656) |
| Absolute Difference in Disbursements (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | -7.000\*(1.709) |  | -7.418\*(1.983) |
| Constant | 4.571\*(1.154) | 1.490(1.779) | 15.780\*(2.747) | 12.962\*(2.674) | -10.55\*(3.680) | -9.713\*(3.190) | -9.231(10.053) | -13.575(9.546) |
| N | 5,604 | 5,604 | 5,604 | 5,604 | 5,604 | 5,604 | 2,455 | 2,455 |
| R^2 | 0.058 | 0.060 | 0.114 | 0.120 | 0.242 | 0.280 | 0.187 | 0.223 |

**Table A4 Predicting Coverage of Challengers, All Districts (Fall 2018)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI | VII | VIII |
| Proportion of DMA Covered by District | 38.167\*(5.041) | 38.573\*\*(5.073) | 38.709\*(4.854) | 38.843\*(4.843) | 39.054\*(4.858) | 36.832\*(4.385) | 37.650\*(4.654) | 37.511\*(4.640) |
| Large Media Corporation |  | 1.776(1.575) | 2.376(1.521) | 2.458(3.078) | 2.376(1.527) | 2.213(1.428) | 2.561(1.502) | 2.556(1.497) |
| PVI Absolute Value |  |  | -1.003\*(0.138) | -0.954\*(0.136) | -0.992\*(0.138) | -0.090(0.082) | -0.497\*(0.113) | -0.486\*(0.114) |
| Challenged in Primary  |  |  |  | 4.631\*(2.109) |  |  |  |  |
| Competitive Primary |  |  |  |  | 3.247(2.393) | 1.356(2.077) | 0.560(0.820) | 2.366(2.287) |
| Disbursements by Candidate (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | 6.223\*(0.995) |  |  |
| Disbursements by Opponent (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | 5.905\*(1.321) |  |  |
| Absolute Difference in Disbursements (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | -6.303\*(1.294) |  |  |
| Open Seat |  |  |  |  |  | 5.620\*(2.568) | -1.644(3.165) | 0.979(1.186) |
| Viable Candidate |  |  |  |  |  |  | 17.065\*(3.028) | 19.314\*(3.349) |
| Viable Candidate X Competitive Primary |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.795(4.812) |  |
| Viable Candidate X Open Seat  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | -3.625(4.644) |
| Constant | 4.413\*(1.039) | 2.949\*(1.492) | 15.595\*(2.417) | 11.585\*(2.959) | 14.156\*(2.706) | -7.625\*(2.724) | 0.895(2.136) | -0.145(2.425) |
| N | 3,655 | 3,655 | 3,655 | 3,655 | 3,655 | 3,655 | 3,655 | 3,655 |
| R^2 | 0.060 | 0.061 | 0.115 | 0.119 | 0.117 | 0.249 | 0.166 | 0.166 |
| Models estimated using ordinary least squares. Unit of analysis is station-challenger pair. DV=Number of 2.5-minute segments by a given station in a challenger’s district that mention the challenger. Standard Errors are clustered by candidate. \*=*p<0.05.* |

Challengers receive less coverage than incumbents in both 2017 and the pre-general election period (see Table 2). Compared to incumbents, the average challenger received about one-tenth the coverage in 2017 and roughly one-eighth the coverage in the pre-election period. By the general election, differences between incumbents and challengers decrease substantively. With respect to all incumbents and challengers, the average

**Table A5. General Election Challengers for House Seats: Mean Number of Mentions Per Week Per Station**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 20173/10/17-12/8/17 | 2018, Pre-General Election1/10/18-5/8/18 | 2018, General Election9/7/18-10/1/18 |
| ***All General Election Challengers*** | 0.035(0.331) | 0.098(0.472) | 4.105(12.014) |
| ***Open Seats*** | 0.068(0.393) | 0.218(0.780) | 6.223(14.025) |
| *By Primary Competitiveness* |
| Competitive Primary | 0.056(0.305) | 0.169(0.524) | 6.607(13.141) |
| Uncompetitive Primary | 0.078(0.456) | 0.259(0.939) | 5.90(14.712) |
| *By Candidate Viability* |
| Candidate Viable /Opponent Not Viable | 0.152(0.562) | 0.370(1.031) | 2.554(4.642) |
| Candidate Viable /Opponent Viable | 0.056(0.384) | 0.221(0.804) | 8.936(17.070) |
| Candidate Not Viable/Opponent Viable | 0.006(0.024) | 0.046(0.153) | 1.299(3.071) |
| Candidate Not Viable/ Opponent Not Viable | 0.176(0.490) | 0.314(0.747) | 1.667(3.322) |
| ***Challengers to Incumbents*** | 0.024(0.306) | 0.057(0.295) | 3.403(11.182) |
| *By Primary Competitiveness* |
| Competitive Primary | 0.010(0.053) | 0.056(0.249) | 4.123(13.072) |
| Uncompetitive Primary | 0.031(0.379) | 0.058(0.317) | 3.006(9.975) |
| *By Candidate Viability* |
| Candidate Viable | 0.040(0.238) | 0.121(0.440) | 8.758(17.717) |
| Candidate Not Viable | 0.015(0.336) | 0.024(0.167) | 0.605(1.920) |
| Cells present the mean number of 2.5-minute segments in which a local television station’s news program mentioned a challenger whose district was included in its media market per week. Standard deviations are in parentheses. |

incumbent receives about 1.68 mentions more than the average challenger, but challengers receive about 70% of the mentions as incumbents.

In both open seats and races with an incumbent, challengers receive little coverage before the general election campaign. In open seats, those who face uncompetitive primaries are discussed slightly more than those who face competitive primaries in the pre-election period. By the general election, however, the difference in coverage reverses. Challengers facing competitive primaries are slightly more likely to be discussed than those in less competitive elections.

**Table A6. Predicting Coverage of Incumbents, All Districts (Fall 2018) with Sinclair Broadcasting Control**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V |
| Proportion of DMA Covered by District | 59.065\*(10.199) | 57.749\*(9.698) | 57.676\*(9.506) | 51.314\*(8.215) | 44.180\*(6.593) |
| Sinclair Broadcasting | -4.257(2.220) | -5.756\*(2.199) | -5.315\*(2.060) | -5.585\*(2.025) | -2.100(1.941) |
| PVI Absolute Value |  | -1.083\*(0.181) | -0.998\*(0.188) | -0.639\*(0.164) | -0.122(0.104) |
| Unchallenged in General(Baseline) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Challenged in General  |  |  | 8.387\*(3.214) |  |  |
| Viable Challenger |  |  |  | 24.777\*(4.550) | -8.591(5.391) |
| Not Viable Challenger |  |  |  | 2.268(2.270) | 0.631(1.598) |
| Not Running in General |  |  | 21.001\*(8.096) |  |  |
| Running for Higher Office |  |  |  | 68.186\*(18.593) |  |
| Not Running for Higher Office |  |  |  | -0.978(2.970) |  |
| Disbursements by Candidate (in Millions) |  |  |  |  | 7.942\*(2.725) |
| Disbursements by Opponent (in Millions) |  |  |  |  | 9.417\*(1.888) |
| Absolute Difference in Disbursements (in Millions) |  |  |  |  | -8.566\*(2.554) |
| Constant | 5.903\*(1.622) | 21.447\*(3.373) | 10.241\*(4.510) | 5.072(4.059) | -2.281(4.471) |
| N | 3,472 | 3,472 | 3,472 | 3,472 | 2,969 |
| R^2 | 0.076 | 0.114 | 0.123 | 0.219 | 0.303 |

Models estimated using ordinary least squares. Unit of analysis is station-incumbent pair. DV=Number of 2.5-minute segments by a given station in an incumbent’s district that mention the incumbent. Standard Errors are clustered by incumbent. \*=*p<0.05.*

**Table A7. Predicting Coverage of Incumbents, All Districts (Fall 2018) with Indicator for Publicly Traded Company**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V |
| Proportion of DMA Covered by District | 59.255\*(10.148) | 58.089\*(9.698) | 58.025\*(9.680) | 51.936\*(8.215) | 44.299\*(6.603) |
| Public Company | 1.978(2.163) | 2.984(2.095) | 2.898(2.075) | 4.178(2.140) | 1.312(1.633) |
| PVI Absolute Value |  | -1.078\*(0.181) | -0.993\*(0.188) | -0.636\*(0.163) | -0.120(0.105) |
| Unchallenged in General(Baseline) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Challenged in General  |  |  | 8.040\*(3.272) |  |  |
| Viable Challenger |  |  |  | 24.304\*(4.592) | -8.748(5.406) |
| Not Viable Challenger |  |  |  | 1.827(2.388) | 0.488(1.659) |
| Not Running in General |  |  | 20.857\*(8.084) |  |  |
| Running for Higher Office |  |  |  | 68.168\*(18.582) |  |
| Not Running for Higher Office |  |  |  | -1.337(3.090) |  |
| Disbursements by Candidate (in Millions) |  |  |  |  | 7.937\*(2.724) |
| Disbursements by Opponent (in Millions) |  |  |  |  | 9.419\*(1.886) |
| Absolute Difference in Disbursements (in Millions) |  |  |  |  | -8.541\*(2.556) |
| Constant | 3.735(2.543) | 18.172\*(3.677) | 7.398(4.946) | 1.265(4.148) | -3.549(4.150) |
| N | 3,472 | 3,472 | 3,472 | 3,472 | 2,969 |
| R^2 | 0.076 | 0.113 | 0.122 | 0.219 | 0.302 |

Models estimated using ordinary least squares. Unit of analysis is station-incumbent pair. DV=Number of 2.5-minute segments by a given station in an incumbent’s district that mention the incumbent. Standard Errors are clustered by incumbent. \*=*p<0.05.*

**Table A8. Marginal Evidence that Extremism is associated with Coverage**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V |
| Proportion of DMA Covered by District | 59.690\*(10.119) | 58.379\*(9.930) | 58.383\*(9.740) | 52.142\*(8.449) | 44.639\*(6.690) |
| Large Media Corporation | 3.910(2.094) | 4.652\*(2.047) | 4.669\*(2.045) | 5.555\*(2.068) | 3.701\*(1.652) |
| Ideological Extremism | -26.829\*(11.267) | -2.716(11.614) | -6.775(11.948) | -3.376(10.907) | 2.891(8.181) |
| PVI Absolute Value |  | -1.063\*(0.187) | -0.952\*(0.199) | -0.613\*(0.173) | -0.144(0.101) |
| Unchallenged in General(Baseline) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Challenged in General  |  |  | 8.346\*(3.392) |  |  |
| Viable Challenger |  |  |  | 24.505\*(4.743) | -9.107(5.463) |
| Not Viable Challenger |  |  |  | 1.951(2.499) | 0.208(1.729) |
| Not Running in General |  |  | 21.459\*(8.269) |  |  |
| Running for Higher Office |  |  |  | 68.374\*(18.613) |  |
| Not Running for Higher Office |  |  |  | -0.915(3.340) |  |
| Disbursements by Candidate (in Millions) |  |  |  |  | 7.985\*(2.753) |
| Disbursements by Opponent (in Millions) |  |  |  |  | 9.378\*(1.884) |
| Absolute Difference in Disbursements (in Millions) |  |  |  |  | -8.564\*(2.549) |
| Constant | 14.392\*(5.031) | 17.892\*(5.039) | 8.172(5.607) | 1.262(4.958) | -6.147(5.415) |
| N | 3,472 | 3,472 | 3,472 | 3,472 | 2,969 |
| R^2 | 0.083 | 0.114 | 0.123 | 0.220 | 0.304 |

Models estimated using ordinary least squares. Unit of analysis is station-incumbent pair. DV=Number of 2.5-minute segments by a given station in an incumbent’s district that mention the incumbent. Standard Errors are clustered by incumbent. \*=*p<0.05.*

**Table A9. Controlling for Viewership**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI |
| Proportion of DMA Covered by District | 58.150\*(9.096) | 58.864\*(9.930) | 57.044\*(8.851) | 57.093\*(8.741) | 51.237\*(7.761) | 44.650\*(6.534) |
| Station Viewership per Capita | -43.355(33.892) | -41.796(33.926) | -14.559(32.585) | -17.230(32.292) | -30.536(32.453) | 14.059(23.476) |
| Large Media Corporation |  | 3.695(2.092) | 4.505\*(2.042) | 4.534\*(2.027) | 5.150\*(1.987) | 3.642\*(1.730) |
| PVI Absolute Value |  |  | -1.112\*(0.186) | -1.029\*(0.192) | -0.663\*(0.168) | -0.118(0.107) |
| Unchallenged in General(Baseline) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Challenged in General  |  |  |  | 8.564\*(3.337) |  |  |
| Viable Challenger |  |  |  |  | 24.796\*(4.656) | -9.321(5.637) |
| Not Viable Challenger |  |  |  |  | 2.297(2.467) | 0.464(1.737) |
| Not Running in General |  |  |  | 21.043\*(7.961) |  |  |
| Running for Higher Office |  |  |  |  | 68.815\*(18.516) |  |
| Not Running for Higher Office |  |  |  |  | -0.991(3.128) |  |
| Disbursements by Candidate (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | 8.196\*(2.726) |
| Disbursements by Opponent (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | 9.705\*(1.927) |
| Absolute Difference in Disbursements (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | -8.467\*(2.626) |
| Constant | 6.656\*(1.805) | 3.591(2.806) | 18.142\*(3.635) | 6.900(4.580) | 1.460(3.966) | -6.120(3.994) |
| N | 3,342 | 3,342 | 3,342 | 3,342 | 3,342 | 2,862 |
| R^2 | 0.073 | 0.074 | 0.113 | 0.122 | 0.220 | 0.310 |

Models estimated using ordinary least squares. Unit of analysis is station-incumbent pair. DV=Number of 2.5-minute segments by a given station in an incumbent’s district that mention the incumbent. Standard Errors are clustered by incumbent. \*=*p<0.05.*

**Table A10. Incumbent Governors: Mean Number of Mentions Per Week Per Station**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 20173/10/17-12/8/17 | 2018, Pre-General Election1/10/18-5/8/18 | 2018, General Election9/7/18-10/1/18 |
| *All Incumbents* | 10.328(15.632) | 10.935(13.883) | 15.350(33.545) |
| *Running for Re-Election* | 11.663(12.195) | 14.632(17.374) | 26.123(33.545) |
| *Term Not Up* | 9.551(17.282) | 8.783(10.813) | 9.079(11.309) |
| *Retiring* | 5.773(7.035) | 6.854(7.976) | 7.204(8.445) |
| Cells present the mean number of 2.5-minute segments in which a local television station’s news program mentioned an incumbent governor whose state was included in its media market per week. Standard deviations are in parentheses. We omit Rick Scott (R-FL) since he was the one incumbent governor running for Senate in 2018. |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |

**Table A11. Controlling for the Number of Segments Possible**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI |
| Proportion of DMA Covered by District | 66.845\*(10.458) | 67.270\*(10.656) | 65.744\*(10.394) | 65.659\*(10.187) | 59.417\*(8.807) | 51.239\*(7.126) |
| Station’s Total Number of News Programs | 3.440\*(0.441) | 3.401\*(0.432) | 3.276\*(0.431) | 3.253\*(0.414) | 3.244\*(0.420) | 2.765\*(0.367) |
| Large Media Corporation |  | 2.328(2.049) | 3.147(2.007) | 3.208(1.997) | 4.120\*(1.998) | 2.294(1.576) |
| PVI Absolute Value |  |  | -1.057\*(0.180) | -0.974\*(0.188) | -0.614\*(0.163) | -0.091(0.105) |
| Unchallenged in General(Baseline) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Challenged in General  |  |  |  | 10.703\*(3.506) |  |  |
| Viable Challenger |  |  |  |  | 27.057\*(4.801) | -6.240(5.376) |
| Not Viable Challenger |  |  |  |  | 4.389(2.563) | 2.542(1.697) |
| Not Running in General |  |  |  | 22.823\*(8.244) |  |  |
| Running for Higher Office |  |  |  |  | 70.349\*(18.590) |  |
| Not Running for Higher Office |  |  |  |  | 0.640(3.156) |  |
| Disbursements by Candidate (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | 7.954\*(2.684) |
| Disbursements by Opponent (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | 9.331\*(1.863) |
| Absolute Difference in Disbursements (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | -8.411\*(2.527) |
| Constant | -25.288\*(3.871) | -26.867\*(4.660) | -11.459\*(4.492) | -24.619\*(6.458) | -30.360\*(6.282) | -31.679\*(5.353) |
| N | 3,452 | 3,452 | 3,452 | 3,452 | 3,452 | 2,950 |
| R^2 | 0.097 | 0.098 | 0.133 | 0.142 | 0.240 | 0.323 |

Models estimated using ordinary least squares. Unit of analysis is station-incumbent pair. DV=Number of 2.5-minute segments by a given station in an incumbent’s district that mention the incumbent. Standard Errors are clustered by incumbent. \*=*p<0.05.*

**Table A12. Controlling for Number of Ads**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI |
| Proportion of DMA Covered by District | 47.583\*(7.679) | 47.868\*(7.889) | 47.733\*(7.842) | 47.717\*(7.647) | 44.508\*(6.787) | 38.120\*(4.545) |
| Number of Ads | 0.716\*(0.094) | 0.716\*(0.094) | 0.696\*(0.094) | 0.695\*(0.095) | 0.638\*(0.095) | 0.576\*(0.094) |
| Large Media Corporation |  | 1.288(1.684) | 1.614(1.661) | 1.695(1.653) | 2.553(1.667) | 1.790(1.271) |
| PVI Absolute Value |  |  | -0.395\*(0.118) | -0.314\*(0.135) | -0.212(0.113) | -0.033(0.092) |
| Unchallenged in General(Baseline) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Challenged in General  |  |  |  | 4.818\*(1.912) |  |  |
| Viable Challenger |  |  |  |  | 13.216\*(3.477) | -1.610(4.371) |
| Not Viable Challenger |  |  |  |  | 1.880(1.597) | 1.204(1.317) |
| Not Running in General |  |  |  | 17.937\*(6.726) |  |  |
| Running for Higher Office |  |  |  |  | 51.054\*(15.908) |  |
| Not Running for Higher Office |  |  |  |  | 1.796(2.351) |  |
| Disbursements by Candidate (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | 4.074\*(1.948) |
| Disbursements by Opponent (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | 4.318\*(1.340) |
| Absolute Difference in Disbursements (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | -3.794(1.978) |
| Constant | 1.500(1.378) | 0.445(2.375) | 5.896(3.023) | -1.884(3.794) | -3.693(3.326) | -5.509\*(2.710) |
| N | 3,472 | 3,472 | 3,472 | 3,472 | 3,342 | 2,969 |
| R^2 | 0.391 | 0.392 | 0.396 | 0.405 | 0.444 | 0.488 |

Models estimated using ordinary least squares. Unit of analysis is station-incumbent pair. DV=Number of 2.5-minute segments by a given station in an incumbent’s district that mention the incumbent. Standard Errors are clustered by incumbent. \*=*p<0.05.*

**Table A13. Predicting Coverage of Incumbents, All Districts, Logged Outcome (Fall 2018)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | I | II | III | IV | V | VI |
| Proportion of DMA Covered by District | 3.202\*(0.174) | 3.231\*(0.176) | 3.184\*(0.166) | 3.183\*(0.166) | 3.026\*(0.160) | 2.980\*(0.171) |
| Large Media Corporation |  | 0.137\*(0.063) | 0.162\*(0.058) | 0.160\*(0.058) | 0.179\*(0.057) | 0.150\*(0.058) |
| PVI Absolute Value |  |  | -0.040\*(0.005) | -0.039\*(0.005) | -0.025\*(0.005) | -0.013\*(0.005) |
| Unchallenged in General(Baseline) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Challenged in General  |  |  |  | 0.290(0.164) |  |  |
| Viable Challenger |  |  |  |  | 0.877\*(0.192) | 0.048(0.813) |
| Not Viable Challenger |  |  |  |  | 0.075(0.157) | 0.047(0.148) |
| Not Running in General |  |  |  | 0.373(0.233) |  |  |
| Running for Higher Office |  |  |  |  | 1.450\*(0.358) |  |
| Not Running for Higher Office |  |  |  |  | -0.063(0.194) |  |
| Disbursements by Candidate (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | 0.162(0.085) |
| Disbursements by Opponent (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | 0.241\*(0.039) |
| Absolute Difference in Disbursements (in Millions) |  |  |  |  |  | -0.091(0.069) |
| Constant | 0.721\*(0.052) | 0.609\*(0.073) | 1.157\*(0.106) | 0.853\*(0.185) | 0.613\*(0.178) | 0.338(0.217) |
| N | 3,472 | 3,472 | 3,472 | 3,472 | 3,472 | 2,969 |
| R^2 | 0.231 | 0.232 | 0.284 | 0.286 | 0.359 | 0.417 |
| Models estimated using ordinary least squares. Unit of analysis is station-incumbent pair. DV=Number of 2.5-minute segments by a given station in an incumbent’s district that mention the incumbent. Number of mentions are logged. Standard Errors are clustered by incumbent. \*=*p<0.05.* |

**Table A14. Predicting Coverage of Incumbents, All Districts, District Fixed Effects (Fall 2018)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | I | II |
| Proportion of DMA Covered by District | 13.246\*(2.188) | 13.421\*(2.215) |
| Large Media Corporation |  | 1.056(0.654) |
| Unchallenged in General(Baseline) |  |  |
| Challenged in General  |  |  |
| Viable Challenger |  |  |
| Not Viable Challenger |  |  |
| Not Running in General |  |  |
| Running for Higher Office |  |  |
| Not Running for Higher Office |  |  |
| Disbursements by Candidate (in Millions) |  |  |
| Disbursements by Opponent (in Millions) |  |  |
| Absolute Difference in Disbursements (in Millions) |  |  |
| Constant | 5.363\*(1.083) | 4.484\*(1.322) |
| N | 3,472 | 3,472 |
| R^2 | 0.712 | 0.713 |

**Table A15. Incumbent House Members: Mean Number of Mentions Per Week Per Station, Including Leadership**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | 20173/10/17-12/8/17 | 2018, Pre-General Election1/10/18-5/8/18 | 2018, General Election9/7/18-10/1/18 |
| *All Incumbents* | 0.382(0.823) | 0.786(1.746) | 5.780(16.581) |
| *Party Leadership* | 0.837(1.717) | 1.383(2.910) | 4.768(8.386) |
| *Committee Chair* | 0.295(0.545) | 0.897(1.798) | 3.925(9.986) |
| *Ranking Member* | 0.373(0.732) | 0.587(0.918) | 3.756(7.977) |
| Cells present the mean number of 2.5-minute segments in which a local television station’s news program mentioned an incumbent MC whose district was included in its media market per week. Standard deviations are in parentheses.  |

**Table A16. Predicting Coverage of Incumbents, All Districts, Logged Spending (Fall 2018)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | No Constant Added | Constant Added | Constant Added |
| Proportion of DMA Covered by District | 46.663\*(7.686) | 44.572\*(6.812) | 45.059\*(6.753) |
| Large Media Corporation | 4.552\*(2.088) | 4.043\*(1.749) | 3.748\*(1.671) |
| PVI | -0.391\*(0.166) | 0.177(0.110) | 0.009(0.110) |
| Disbursements by Candidate (in Millions) | 15.281\*(4.154) | 21.812\*(7.601) | 27.408\*(8.245) |
| Disbursements by Opponent (in Millions) | 2.585\*(0.957) | 22.536\*(3.654) | 37.813\*(6.629) |
| Absolute Difference in Disbursements (in Millions) | -2.023(2.554) | -12.712(6.819) | -20.787\*(7.772) |
| Viable Challenger |  |  | -28.073\*(7.606) |
| Non-Viable Challenger | -5.862(4.432) |  | -2.432(1.686) |
| Constant | 8.887\*(4.317) | -18.778\*(5.359) | -13.912\*(5.067) |
| N | 2531 | 2969 | 2969 |
| R^2 | 0.217 | 0.279 | 0.299 |

Dependent variable is the logged number of mentions for incumbents in Fall 2018. Column 1 includes no adjustments to the logged outcome. That is, those incumbents not mentioned on a station are coded as missing. Columns 2 and 3 add 1 to the dependent variable.

**Figure A1. Distribution of Campaign Season Mentions by Incumbent Type**

****

Figure A1 displays the density plots of incumbent-station mentions in the general election campaign season. We also include the density plots for those incumbents running opposed for re-election, those who are unopposed for re-election, and those incumbents who are not running for re-election.
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