**Online Supplement A. Expert Coding of Race, Ethnicity and Gender**

Historically, the absence of candidate-level data has made it difficult to examine the supply side of minority representation in politics. Two databases – SLER and LEAP – have begun to solve this problem, but the issue of coding the race of candidates has often proven difficult. Outside of a few Southern states required by the VRA to capture racial and ethnic background of candidates (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Pennsylvania) few options exist for scholars interested in obtaining racial identifiers for candidates.

Coding the race of candidates is complicated for a number of reasons, the first of which is race is a subjective, conceptual concept, and therefore open to multiple interpretations (Omi & Winant, 1994). This often means that in practice, a person’s racial identification depends on context, who is identifying the race (respondent or “other”), and the way the question is asked (see Masuoka, 2011). Given these complications, social scientists interested in studying race are left with a number of options, none of which are perfect.

One possibility is using Census surname lists, which are generated by the Census after each iteration of their long survey (see e.g., Barreto, Segura, & Woods, 2004; Michelson, 2003). The Census is able to generate probabilities of last names mapping to specific races using their self-identified racial data, but a number of studies have shown that for each group, the probabilities are less accurate than previously assumed due to multi-racial identities and the practice of changing surnames after marriage. Another possibility is using geocoding, segregation data, and name frequencies to yield a probabilistic estimate of an individual’s area (see e.g,. Enos, 2010; Fraga, 2012). This method is particularly useful when estimating individual voters in a particular place, but more problematic for candidate race coding, because we often do not have the candidate’s home address, and they often represent a large area.

In this project, we use expert coding along with self-identification. Using candidate websites, Facebook pages, newspaper articles or videos, we code candidate race/ethnicity based on surnames, pictures and biographical information. In addition, the coding for Latinos was aided by the National Association of Latino Elected Officials (NALEO), which provides a pre-election list of Latino candidates (NALEO, 2012). If there was uncertainty about the candidate’s race or ethnicity, the authors used news accounts, background information or any other piece of information available. We did not code someone as Latino or African American unless there was clear and near certain evidence that the person belonged to that group. For example, Rick G. Perales (R) in Ohio’s 73rd House district was a candidate whose background was scrutinized because of his surname. While we are fairly confident that Mr. Perales has a Latino ethnic background, he is never described as such, nor does he self-identify as Latino in his campaign material. He does not belong to any Latino political organizations and he is not included on NALEO’s list of Latino candidates. Thus, he is coded as “White non-Latino” in order to avoid a false positive. This coding rule works against our hypothesis of finding successful minority candidates in White districts, as some candidates like Mr. Perales, who won in a district that is 87% White VAP, does not get counted as a Latino winning in a White district.

**Online Supplement B. Candidate Trait Coding Protocol and categories and Candidate Traits Dictionary**

B-1. Candidate Trait Coding Protocol

Q1. Is the target candidate mentioned/covered in the story?

\*Note: this question asks you to identify if the news article covers/mentions the target candidate that is specified in the corresponding “Candidate ID” variable. For example, if the Candidate ID is “0CA1&2012&Bosetti&Rick&1”, you’re then asked to identify if a given news story covers/mentions *Rick Bosetti*, a 2012 candidate for the state of California.

1 Yes, the target candidate is mentioned/covered in this story.

0 No, the target candidate is NOT mentioned/covered in this story.

ALL the following questions are merely about the target candidate (see “Candidate ID” for name of the target candidate).

Q2. Does the article explicitly talk about or suggest/imply some positive traits about the target candidate?

1 = Yes, at least one positive trait was mentioned/implied for the target candidate

0 = No, none positive trait was mentioned/implied for the target candidate

Q3. Does the article explicitly talk about or suggest/imply some negative traits about the target candidate?

1 = Yes, at least one negative trait was mentioned/implied for the target candidate

0 = No, none negative trait was mentioned/implied for the target candidate

B-2. Examples of Positive Traits (Shah, Dunaway and Paul 2016)

+***competent\_pos***

accomplished

articulate

assertive

careful

cautious

competent

consistent

contemplative

creative

dedicated

determined

diligent

effective

experienced

focused

good speaker

good orator

hardworking

has common sense

intelligent/knowledgeable

open minded

pragmatic

proactive

rational

reasonable

reliable

responsible

savvy

thoughtful

understated

wonky

+***leadership\_pos***

active

ambitious

brave

committed

confident

consistent

courageous

decisive

direct

effective

energetic

enthusiastic

entrepreneurial

feisty

fighter

independent

independent thinker

maverick

optimistic

passionate

persistent

straight shooter

strong/strong leader

team player

tough

+***integrity\_pos***

decent

earnest

ethical

has integrity

honest

honorable

principled

reliable

sincere

trustworthy

+***empathy\_pos***

accessible

affable

caring

compassionate

concerned with needs of district

courteous

empathetic

engaging

friendly

good listener

in touch

kind

likeable

listens to constituents

nice

personable

B-3. Examples of Negative Traits

+***competent\_neg***

careless

clueless

incompetent

ineffective

inexperienced

irrational

irresponsible

not pragmatic

reactive

superficial

unfit

uninformed

unintelligent

unprofessional

+***leadership\_neg***

adversarial

afraid/ fearful

argumentative

combative

flip-flop

inconsistent

lack of confidence

lackadaisical

lacks vision

not independent

party puppet

lapdog

rigid

scared

unsure

weak

+***integrity\_neg***

dirty fighter

dishonest/disingenuous

greedy/hypocritical

immoral

lacks integrity

liar

malicious

manipulative

not trustworthy

unethical

+***empathy\_neg***

aloof

not caring

not engaged

out of touch

**Online Supplement C. Variables, Measurement, and Descriptive Statistics (N = 984)**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | ***Measurement and Source*** | ***Measure Level*** | ***Values*** |
| News coverage featuring Positive Traits | Whether a new article covers each corresponding trait, relative to “no mentions of the given trait at all.” Articles are drawn from Access World News and manually coded. | News article | 1 = 5.18%  0 = 94.82% |
| News coverage featuring Negative Traits | 1 = 1.52%  0 = 98.48% |
| Non-white Candidate | If a candidate is White. Coded expertly (see Appendix A). | Candidate | 0 = 79.78%  1 = 20.22% |
| %Minority Reporters a | Total percentage of non-white minority journalists in each newspaper; Drawn from the 2012 ASNE Newsroom Census data. | Newspaper | Range: 0-1  M = 0.40  SD = 0.44 |
| %Minority Audiences a | Total percentage of non-white minority audiences of voting ages in each newspaper’s circulating state district; Drawn from the State Legislative Election Returns (SLERs). | Legislative State District | Range: 0-0.962  M = 0.24  SD = 0.21 |
| Female Candidate | Candidate gender. Candidate Emergence in the States. | Candidate | 1 = 19.72%  0 = 80.28% |
| Opponent is Minority | Whether candidate opponent is non-White. Candidate Emergence in the States. | Candidate | 1 = 11.99%  0 = 88.01% |
| Incumbent | Whether a candidate is incumbent. Drawn from Candidate Emergence Project. | Candidate | 1 = 43.80%  0 = 56.20% |
| %Votes Received a | Percentage of votes a candidate received out of the race. Drawn from Candidate Emergence Project. | Candidate | Range: 0.01-1  M = 0.59  SD = 0.25 |
| Circulation>10K | Circulation greater than 10K. Drawn from 2012 ASNE. | Newspaper | 1 = 39.74%  0 = 60.26% |
| %Male Audiences a | Percentage of male audiences of voting ages in each newspaper’s circulating/target state; Drawn from the State Legislative Election Returns (SLERs). | Legislative State District | Range: 0.45-0.55  M = 0.49  SD = 0.01 |

Note: All variables are dichotomous except for those with an “a” subscript, which are continuous variables. Also note that the descriptive statistics reported here were about observations on the news article level, which were thus different from the descriptive statistics reported in the main text that were on the aggregated legislative candidate level.

**Online Supplement D-1. Rare Event Logistic Regression Models Predicting News Coverage featuring Positive Traits (versus no mentions of Positive Traits at all)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Baseline Model** | **H1a** | **H2a** | **H3** |
| Non-white Candidate | -0.08(0.32) | 0.65(0.47) | -2.50(0.82)\*\* | -1.44(1.09) |
| %Minority Reporter a | 0.74(0.63) | 1.24(0.67) | 0.77(0.63) | 1.31(0.86) |
| %Minority Audience a | 1.72(0.83) | 1.71(0.85)\* | -0.12(1.10) | 0.11(1.43) |
| Non-white Candidate X  %Minority Reporter | ‒‒ | **-2.26**(1.32)\* | ‒‒ | -3.05(2.23) |
| Non-white Candidate X  %Minority Audiences | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | **6.95**(2.05)\*\* | 6.10(2.75)\* |
| %Minority Reporter X  %Minority Audience | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | -0.44(3.42) |
| Non-white Candidate X  %Minority Reporter X  %Minority Audience | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | 2.07(5.48) |
| Minority Opponent | -0.21(0.48) | -0.11(0.48) | -0.27(0.51) | -0.12(0.52) |
| Incumbent | 0.26(0.40) | 0.23(0.40) | 0.15(0.41) | 0.12(0.41) |
| Female Candidate | 0.75(0.32)\* | 0.78(0.32)\* | 0.76(0.32)\* | 0.78(0.32)\* |
| Circulation > 10K | -0.33(0.40) | -0.31(0.40) | -0.24(0.40) | -0.24(0.39) |
| %Male Audience a | 7.04(5.97) | 6.44(6.17) | 8.43(5.68) | 7.09(6.21) |
| %Votes Received a | -0.27(0.60) | -0.23(0.62) | -0.63(0.63) | -0.54(0.67) |
| Constant | 1.54(4.23) | 0.89(4.43) | 3.08(4.04) | 1.86(4.54) |

Note: N = 984. All variables are dichotomous except for those with an “a” subscript, which are continuous variables and were logged to account for skewness. All models are clustered by group (newspaper, candidate, and legislative state district). Entries are coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. # *p* < .10, \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, and \*\*\* *p* < .001 two-tailed tests.

**Online Supplement D-2. Rare Event Logistic Regression Models Predicting News Coverage featuring Negative Traits (versus no mentions of Negative Traits at all)**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Baseline Model** | **H1b** | **H2b** | **H3** |
| Non-white Candidate | 0.25(0.77) | 1.56(0.81)# | 0.03(0.82) | 5.87(0.88)\*\*\* |
| %Minority Reporter a | 0.99(1.14) | 0.60(1.22) | 0.99(1.14) | 0.18(1.48) |
| %Minority Audience a | -3.46(2.18) | -3.25(2.15) | -4.04(3.65) | -4.39(4.14) |
| Non-white Candidate X  %Minority Reporter | ‒‒ | -0.99(1.04) | ‒‒ | -7.67(1.83)\*\*\* |
| Non-white Candidate X  %Minority Audiences | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | 1.74(3.83) | -1.58(3.77) |
| %Minority Reporter X  %Minority Audience | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | 3.58(11.67) |
| Non-white Candidate X  %Minority Reporter X  %Minority Audience | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | 2.76(11.72) |
| Minority Opponent | 0.96(0.75) | 0.86(0.77) | 1.00(0.74) | 0.87(0.79) |
| Incumbent | -0.05(0.50) | -0.07(0.52) | -0.08(0.53) | -0.09(0.56) |
| Circulation > 10K | 0.20(0.74) | 0.17(0.74) | 0.19(0.74) | 0.15(0.74) |
| %Male Audience a | 22.11(8.26)\*\* | 21.69(8.11)\*\* | 21.84(8.12)\*\* | 22.81(8.31)\*\* |
| % Votes Received a | 1.38(1.13) | 1.39(1.09) | 1.38(1.18) | 1.42(1.14) |
| Constant | 10.88(5.87)# | 10.73(5.64)# | 10.80(5.78)# | 11.68(5.91)\* |

Note: N = 984. All variables are dichotomous except for those with an “a” subscript, which are continuous variables and were logged to account for skewness. All models are clustered by group (newspaper, candidate, and legislative state district). Entries are coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. # *p* < .10, \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, and \*\*\* *p* < .001 two-tailed tests.

**Online Supplement E. Split Models testing Three-way Interaction Effects**

To allow a more intuitive interpretation of the three-way interaction effects as well as to minimize the possible multicollinearity involved with three-way interaction tests, we split the data by candidates’ ethnicity and re-run the analyses to explore the two-way interaction between the demographic make-up of the newsroom and that of the media market.

As displayed in Table E.1 below, the direction of the two-way interaction was oppositional in the two subset models, which indicates a varied impact depending on the candidates’ ethnicity; however, this interaction effect was statistically insignificant in both the “white candidates only” model and the “non-white candidates only” model, which thus failed to reject the null hypothesis that this interaction effect may not differ in the two subsets. This finding is also consistent with the results we reported in Table 1 (see model 1.4) in the main text, where the three-way interaction effect was statistically insignificant.

Similar patterns were also found in the tests of negative trait coverage, as displayed in Table E.2 below.

E.1 Split Models Predicting News Coverage featuring Positive Traits (versus no mentions of Positive Traits at all)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **White Candidates Only** | **Non-white Candidates Only** |
| %Minority Reporter a | 1.46(0.98) | -1.98(4.85) |
| %Minority Audience a | 0.12(2.08) | 6.65(3.51)# |
| %Minority Reporter X  %Minority Audience | -0.29(4.10) | 0.21(9.84) |
| Minority Opponent | -0.22(0.60) | -0.04(0.79) |
| Incumbent | 0.20(0.43) | -0.55(0.85) |
| Female Candidate | 0.60(0.37) | 1.51(0.68)\* |
| Circulation > 10K | -0.07(0.51) | -0.78(0.75) |
| %Male Audience a | 13.57(7.03)# | -7.32(10.09) |
| %Votes Received a | -0.40(0.95) | -0.29(1.64) |
| Constant | 6.26(4.96) | -9.63(7.20) |
| Wald χ2 | 14.68# | 10.06 |
| N | 785 | 199 |

Note: All variables are dichotomous except for those with an “a” subscript, which are continuous variables and were logged to curve for skewness. All models are clustered by group (newspaper, candidate, and legislative state district). Entries are coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. # *p* < .10, \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, and \*\*\* *p* < .001 two-tailed tests.

E.2 Split Models Predicting News Coverage featuring Negative Traits (versus no mentions of Negative Traits at all)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **White Candidates Only** | **Non-white Candidates Only** |
| %Minority Reporter a | 0.51(1.47) | 1.11(3.76) |
| %Minority Audience a | -4.56(3.67) | 1.16(6.07) |
| %Minority Reporter X  %Minority Audience | 2.82(7.45) | -1.65(11.52) |
| Minority Opponent | 1.27(0.80) | -0.52(1.74) |
| Incumbent | -0.05(0.80) | -0.47(1.66) |
| Female Candidate | -2.26(1.49) | -0.24(1.56) |
| Circulation > 10K | 0.34(0.75) | -1.38(1.78) |
| %Male Audience a | 35.26(13.81)\* | 6.80(32.36) |
| %Votes Received a | 2.09(1.63) | -0.22(2.71) |
| Constant | 19.94(9.48)\* | 1.63(23.05) |
| Wald χ2 | 11.11 | 1.78 |
| N | 785 | 199 |

Note: All variables are dichotomous except for those with an “a” subscript, which are continuous variables and were logged to curve for skewness. All models are clustered by group (newspaper, candidate, and legislative state district). Entries are coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. # *p* < .10, \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, and \*\*\* *p* < .001 two-tailed tests.

**Online Supplement F. Expanded Models for Robustness Check**

Expanded models are conducted and reported below, where we also controlled for a dummy variable capturing whether the gubernational race occurs in the South (denoted as “South”), as well as two dummy variable representing candidate’s partisanship (denoted as “Candidate is Republican” and “Candidate is Democrat,” relative to the other parties that left out of the models). Meanwhile, we also employed a quadratic % minority audience measure to see if there’s a tipping point effect. As displayed below, our results remained largely unchanged in these expanded models.

F.1 Expanded Penalized Maximum Likelihood Estimation Models Predicting News Coverage featuring Positive Traits (versus no mentions of Positive Traits at all)[[1]](#footnote-1)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Baseline Model** | **H1a**  **(Model 1.2)** | **H2a**  **(Model 1.3)** | **Three-way**  **(Model 1.4)** |
| Non-white Candidate | 0.001(0.43) | 0.73(0.53) | -0.99(0.65) | -0.23(0.85) |
| %Minority Reporter a | 0.97(0.61) | 1.51(0.68)\* | 0.94(0.61) | 1.31(0.75)# |
| %Minority Audience squared a | 1.82(1.12) | 1.86(1.12)# | -1.67(2.09) | -2.28(3.29) |
| Non-white Candidate X  %Minority Reporter | ‒‒ | **-2.29(1.19)**\* | ‒‒ | -2.59(2.27) |
| Non-white Candidate X  %Minority Audiences squared | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | **5.88(2.56)**\* | 6.34(3.84)# |
| %Minority Reporter X  %Minority Audience squared | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | 2.65(6.26) |
| Non-white Candidate X  %Minority Reporter X  %Minority Audience squared | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | -1.60(7.75) |
| Minority Opponent | -0.31(0.49) | -0.19(0.48) | -0.20(0.49) | -0.04(0.49) |
| Incumbent | 0.33(0.38) | 0.30(0.38) | 0.19(0.39) | 0.17(0.39) |
| Candidate is Republican | 1.40(0.90) | 1.32(0.90) | 1.59(0.91)# | 1.54(0.92)# |
| Candidate is Democrat | 1.12(0.90) | 1.01(0.90) | 1.30(0.90) | 1.23(0.91) |
| Female Candidate | 0.89(0.32)\*\* | 0.93(0.32)\*\* | 0.89(0.32)\*\* | 0.93(0.32)\*\* |
| Circulation > 10K | -0.32(0.42) | -0.28(0.42) | -0.24(0.42) | -0.19(0.42) |
| %Male Audience a | 8.28(5.83) | 7.59(5.86) | 10.50(5.79)# | 9.48(5.90) |
| %Votes Received a | -1.36(0.90) | -1.31(0.91) | -1.67(0.93)# | -1.63(0.95)# |
| South | 0.70(0.31)\* | 0.71(0.31)\* | 0.72(0.31)\* | 0.71(0.31)\* |
| Constant | 1.57(4.11) | 0.90(4.16) | 3.40(4.11) | 2.53(4.25) |
| Wald χ2 | 21.95\* | 25.40\* | 28.24\*\* | 31.63\* |

Note: N = 984. All variables are dichotomous except for those with an “a” subscript, which are continuous variables and were logged to account for skewness. Entries are coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. # *p* < .10, \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, and \*\*\* *p* < .001.

**Online Supplement G. Follow-up Analyses**

Table G. Penalized Maximum Likelihood Estimation Models Predicting News Coverage featuring Positive Traits (versus no mentions of positive Traits at all)[[2]](#footnote-2)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** |
| Non-white Candidate | 0.37(0.65) | 1.06(0.61)# | 0.91(1.26) |
| %Minority Reporter a | 1.23(0.68)# | 1.52(0.84) | 0.43(1.51) |
| %Minority Supervisors a | 1.28(2.86) | -0.50(0.72) | -0.43(0.72) |
| Non-white Candidate X %Minority Reporter | -1.42(1.39) | -3.16(1.68)# | -3.83(3.50) |
| Non-white Candidate  X %Minority Supervisors | 2.21(3.86) | ‒‒ | ‒‒ |
| %Minority Reporter X  %Minority Supervisors | -2.99(4.84) | ‒‒ | ‒‒ |
| **Non-white Candidate X**  **%Minority Reporter X**  **%Minority Supervisors** | -4.91(7.11) | ‒‒ | ‒‒ |
| Incumbent X %Minority Reporter | ‒‒ | -0.41(1.05) | ‒‒ |
| Non-white Candidate X Incumbent | ‒‒ | -0.92(0.97) | ‒‒ |
| **Non-white Candidate**  **X %Minority Reporter**  **X Incumbent** | ‒‒ | 2.17(2.31) | ‒‒ |
| %Minority Reporter  X %Votes Received | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | 1.60(2.41) |
| Non-white Candidate X %Votes received | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | -0.28(2.05) |
| **Non-white Candidate**  **X %Minority Reporter**  **X %Votes Received** | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | 2.37(4.90) |
| %Minority Audience a | 1.75(1.08) | 1.88(1.10)# | 1.56(1.10) |
| Female Candidate | 0.79(0.31)\* | 0.79(0.32)\* | 0.74(0.31)\* |
| Minority Opponent | -0.14(0.47) | -0.18(0.47) | -0.16(0.47) |
| Incumbent | 0.22(0.38) | 0.49(0.62) | 0.23(0.37) |
| Circulation > 10K | -0.62(0.57) | -0.30(0.42) | -0.27(0.42) |
| %Male Audience a | 6.40(5.79) | 6.56(5.87) | 6.85(5.95) |
| %Votes Received a | -0.24(0.81) | -0.27(0.82) | -0.90(1.34) |
| Constant | 1.00(4.07) | 0.90(4.13) | 1.64(4.21) |

Note: N = 984. All variables are dichotomous except for those with an “a” subscript, which are continuous variables and were logged to account for skewness. All models are clustered by group (newspaper, candidate, and legislative state district). Entries are coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. # *p* < .10, \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, and \*\*\* *p* < .001 two-tailed tests.

**Online Supplement H. Additional Comparisons between Non-trait Stories with Stories that Have Positive (or Negative) Traits Only**

In order to incorporate the cognitions under which newsroom diversity and media market diversity may affect non-trait-related stories, we conducted the following analyses displayed in Table H.1 and Table H.2.

The outcome variable for all models in Table H.1 was a dichotomy where 1 represents “at least one positive trait was mentioned” and 0 represents “neither positive nor negative traits were mentioned at all;” and for all models in Table H.2, the dependent variable was another dichotomy where 1 represents “at least one negative trait was mentioned” and 0 represents “neither positive nor negative traits were mentioned at all.” These thus allowed us to compare non-trait stories with stories that have positive (or negative) traits only, respectively. These analyses yielded almost the same findings as reported in the main manuscript.

Table H.1 Penalized Maximum Likelihood Estimation Models Predicting News Coverage featuring Positive Traits (versus no mentions of either positive or negative traits at all)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** |
| Non-white Candidate | -0.05(0.39) | 0.71(0.51) | -2.52(1.29)# | -1.46(1.62) |
| %Minority Reporter a | 0.95(0.62) | 1.49(0.69)\* | 0.99(0.63) | 1.49(0.96) |
| %Minority Audience a | 1.79(1.06)# | 1.77(1.07)# | -0.16(1.36) | -0.08(2.16) |
| Non-white Candidate X  %Minority Reporter | ‒‒ | **-2.34(1.20)**# | ‒‒ | -3.10(4.84) |
| Non-white Candidate X  %Minority Audience | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | **7.15(3.05)**\* | 6.43(4.06) |
| %Minority Reporter X  %Minority Audience | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | -0.04(4.27) |
| Non-white Candidate X  %Minority Reporter X  %Minority Audience | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | 1.66(10.59) |
| Minority Opponent | -0.40(0.49) | -0.29(0.49) | -0.48(0.51) | -0.31(0.51) |
| Incumbent | 0.31(0.37) | 0.29(0.37) | 0.20(0.38) | 0.17(0.38) |
| Female Candidate | 0.75(0.31)\* | 0.78(0.32)\* | 0.76(0.32)\* | 0.78(0.32)\* |
| Circulation > 10K | -0.22(0.43) | -0.19(0.43) | -0.13(0.43) | -0.12(0.44) |
| %Male Audience a | 7.54(5.88) | 6.94(5.97) | 8.94(5.74) | 7.63(5.88) |
| %Votes Received a | -0.32(0.80) | -0.29(0.82) | -0.70(0.83) | -0.61(0.84) |
| Constant | 1.77(4.11) | 1.10(4.19) | 3.34(4.04) | 2.16(4.20) |
| Wald χ2 | 17.25\* | 20.87\* | 22.49\* | 25.00\* |

Note: N = 969. All variables are dichotomous except for those with an “a” subscript, which are continuous variables and were logged to account for skewness. Entries are coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. # *p* < .10, \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, and \*\*\* *p* < .001.

Table H.2 Penalized Maximum Likelihood Estimation Models Predicting News Coverage featuring Negative Traits (versus no mentions of either positive or negative traits at all)

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Model 1** | **Model 2** | **Model 3** | **Model 4** |
| Non-white Candidate | 0.27(0.72) | -0.53(1.45) | -0.12(1.10) | -0.42(1.86) |
| %Minority Reporter a | 1.81(1.29) | 1.44(1.32) | 1.78(1.28) | 0.79(1.63) |
| %Minority Audience a | -3.22(2.22) | -2.96(2.22) | -4.16(2.98) | -5.29(4.34) |
| Non-white Candidate X  %Minority Reporter | ‒‒ | 2.02(2.49) | ‒‒ | 1.54(3.39) |
| Non-white Candidate X  %Minority Audience | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | 2.39(4.20) | 2.74(6.89) |
| %Minority Reporter X  %Minority Audience | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | 5.25(8.56) |
| Non-white Candidate X  %Minority Reporter X  %Minority Audience | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | ‒‒ | -3.30(12.76) |
| Minority Opponent | 0.25(0.94) | 0.18(0.95) | 0.28(0.93) | 0.23(0.95) |
| Incumbent | 0.18(0.76) | 0.16(0.77) | 0.13(0.77) | 0.13(0.77) |
| Female Candidate | -2.19(1.46) | -2.18(1.46) | -2.19(1.46) | -2.13(1.46) |
| Circulation > 10K | 0.64(0.83) | 0.62(0.84) | 0.60(0.84) | 0.56(0.84) |
| %Male Audience a | 31.18(12.79)\* | 30.17(12.65)\* | 30.55(12.71)\* | 30.74(12.60)\* |
| %Votes Received a | 1.41(1.40) | 1.42(1.39) | 1.34(1.42) | 1.31(1.42) |
| Constant | 16.87(8.81)# | 16.29(8.66)# | 16.65(8.77)# | 17.08(8.72)# |
| Wald χ2 | 11.69 | 12.67 | 11.93 | 12.82 |

Note: N = 933. All variables are dichotomous except for those with an “a” subscript, which are continuous variables and were logged to account for skewness. Entries are coefficients with robust standard errors in parentheses. # *p* < .10, \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, and \*\*\* *p* < .001.

1. Expanded models predicting negative trait coverage are available per request. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Given the lack of significant candidate-reporter effects on news coverage featuring negative traits, estimation models predicting negative trait coverage were not reported here; however, they are available per request. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)