

Table 1: Tone of Advertising in Top Races by Year

| Year | Attack | Contrast | Promote |
|-------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|
| 2008 | 32.8% | 20.7% | 46.5% |
| 2010* | 32.2% | 18.3% | 49.0% |
| % change | -0.6% | -2.4% | 2.5% |

*Based on Wesleyan Media Project analysis of nearly 900,000 airings of gubernatorial, senatorial and congressional ads from Kantar Media/CMAG.

Table 2: Distribution of Tone by Type of Ad

| Year | | Personal | Policy | Personal and Policy |
|-------------|------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------------------|
| 2008 | Attack % | 14.04 | 57.72 | 27.57 |
| | Contrast % | 13.71 | 54.56 | 31.5 |
| | Promote % | 15.91 | 50.27 | 32.93 |
| 2010* | Attack % | 20.25 | 49.77 | 28.94 |
| | Contrast % | 12.72 | 50.31 | 36.39 |
| | Promote % | 13.79 | 47.15 | 38.08 |

* Based on Wesleyan Media Project analysis of nearly 900,000 airings of gubernatorial, senatorial and congressional ad data from Kantar Media/CMAG.

Table 3: Advertising Tone by Office and Sponsor

| Office | Year | | Candidate | Party | Interest Group | Coordinated |
|---------------|-------------|------------|------------------|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| House | 2008 | Attack % | 50.9 | 29.9 | 16.6 | 2.7 |
| | | Contrast % | 86.9 | 5.2 | 4.4 | 3.5 |
| | | Promote % | 94.8 | 0.5 | 3.3 | 1.5 |
| | 2010* | Attack % | 52.0 | 20.4 | 22.9 | 3.7 |
| | | Contrast % | 86.1 | 3.1 | 6.1 | 4.6 |
| | | Promote % | 95.2 | 0 | 1.7 | 2.3 |
| Senate | 2008 | Attack % | 37.0 | 35.1 | 27.2 | 0.7 |
| | | Contrast % | 80.6 | 12.3 | 3.8 | 3.4 |
| | | Promote % | 89.1 | 1.4 | 9.5 | 0 |
| | 2010* | Attack % | 55.3 | 7.8 | 33.9 | 2.9 |
| | | Contrast % | 94.7 | 0 | 5.3 | 0 |
| | | Promote % | 90.6 | 2.3 | 4.5 | 2.6 |

* Based on Wesleyan Media Project analysis of nearly 900,000 airings of gubernatorial, senatorial and congressional ad data from Kantar Media/CMAG.

Table 4: Distribution of Approval Placement by Tone

| Year | | Beginning | Middle | End |
|-------------|------------|------------------|---------------|------------|
| 2008 | Attack % | 40.1 | 0.2 | 59.7 |
| | Contrast % | 19.9 | 1.1 | 79.0 |
| | Promote % | 9.4 | 3.5 | 87.2 |
| 2010* | Attack % | 52.9 | 0.3 | 46.8 |
| | Contrast % | 23.3 | 3.4 | 73.3 |
| | Promote % | 7.2 | 2.9 | 89.9 |

* Based on Wesleyan Media Project analysis of nearly 900,000 airings of gubernatorial, senatorial and congressional ad data from Kantar Media/CMAG.

Table 5: Distribution of Approval Type by Tone

| Year | | Candidate Voiceover | Candidate Speaking On Screen |
|-------------|------------|--------------------------------|---|
| 2008 | Attack % | 92.57 | 7.43 |
| | Contrast % | 59.74 | 40.26 |
| | Promote % | 54.42 | 45.58 |
| 2010* | Attack % | 87.46 | 12.54 |
| | Contrast % | 53.20 | 46.80 |
| | Promote % | 49.75 | 50.25 |

* Based on Wesleyan Media Project analysis of nearly 900,000 airings of gubernatorial, senatorial and congressional ad data from Kantar Media/CMAG.

CITE SOURCE OF DATA IN ALL TABLES AS:
Kantar Media/CMAG with analysis by the Wesleyan Media Project