

Online Appendix

Bhatti, Yosef, Jens Olav Dahlgaard, Jonas Hedegaard Hansen and Kasper M. Hansen (2016) Is Door-to-Door Canvassing Effective in Europe? Evidence from a Meta-study across Six European Countries. *British Journal of Political Science*.

Supporting information: Detailed results from two Danish experiments

Table S.1: Turnout for eligible citizens targeted by “We Vote Together” in Copenhagen.

	Turnout %	ITT effect (SE in brackets)	CACE (SE in brackets)	N
Control group	61.8			2,345
Attempted contact (Contact rate = 36 %)	61.0	-0.8 (1.7)	-2.1 (4.6)	2,167

Note: The estimates are difference in means while we use randomization inference assuming constant treatment effects to find the standard errors. The randomization inference follows the design with cluster random assignment on the household level and blocks by routes with 100,000 iterations. The CACE is simply found by dividing both standard errors and estimate with the contact rate. An alternative estimation strategy for the design with randomization within blocks would be to include block-specific fixed effects in a regression. This approach yield substantively identical effects to the above: ITT=-0.9, se=1.7 and CACE=-2.3, se=4.6.

Table S.1 displays the results from the first Danish experiment. The design assigned treatment to clusters of households in blocks of routes. The effect estimate for the ITT is simply the difference in means between the treatment and control group. The standard errors are found with randomization inference.¹ The treatment assignment is clustered by household and blocked by route just as in the design. Our point estimate of the ITT effect is -0.8 percentage points. However, the 95%-confidence interval is (-4.0, 2.5). We also calculated the CACE by dividing with the contact rate.² The

¹ Gerber and Green 2012, 64.

² Gerber and Green 2012, 149.

CACE was -2.1 percentage points with a standard error of 4.6, giving us a 95% CI of (-11.1, 6.9). Thus, the effect estimates are negative, but not statistically different from zero. Perhaps not the norm, negative effect estimates are relatively common in the existing literature. About 20 percent of the 71 experiments reported in the recent meta-analysis by Green, McGrath and Aronow (2013) find negative CACEs. If we believe that the true effect is small but positive we will see negative effects from time to time in small to moderate sized studies such as those reported here.

Table S.2: Turnout for eligible citizens targeted by 3F’s youth campaign in Randers.

	Turnout %	ITT effect (SE in brackets)	CACE (SE in brackets)	N
Control group	53.6			453
Attempted contact (Contact rate = 24 %)	49.9	-3.8 (3.4)	-15.4 (13.9)	451

Note: The estimates are difference in means while we use randomization inference assuming constant treatment effects to find the standard errors. The randomization inference follows the design with cluster random assignment on the household level and blocks by routes with 100,000 iterations. The CACE is simply found by dividing both standard errors and estimate with the contact rate.

Results for the second Danish experiment are presented in table S.2. Again, we use randomization inference because of the cluster assigned treatment. As in study 1 our best estimate is a negative effect, the point estimate for the ITT effect being -3.8 percentage points with a 95% CI of (-10.4, 2.9). The confidence interval is wide because of the small sample size and low contact rate. Since the contact rate was only 24% the CACE is about four times as large at the ITT effect. The estimate is -15.4 percentage points with a standard error of 13.9, giving an extremely wide 95% CI of (-42.6, 11.8).³

³ Preliminary results of the two experiments presented here was published in a Danish working paper (see Bhatti et al. 2014).

References

- Bhatti, Yosef, Jens Olav Dahlgaard, Jonas Hedegaard Hansen, and Kasper Møller Hansen. 2014. Kan man øge valgdeltagelsen? - Analyse af mobiliseringstiltag ved kommunalvalget den 19. november 2013. Working Paper 3/2014. Center for Voting and Parties, Department of Political Science, University of Copenhagen.
- Gerber, Alan S. and Donald P. Green. 2012. *Field experiments: Design, analysis, and interpretation*. New York: WW Norton.
- Green, Donald. P., Mary C. McGrath, and Peter M. Aronow. 2013. Field experiments and the study of voter turnout. *Journal of Elections, Public Opinion and Parties* 23(1): 27-48.