

# Will a Five-Minute Discussion Change Your Mind? A Countrywide Experiment on Voter Choice in France

Vincent Pons

Working Paper 16-079



# Will a Five-Minute Discussion Change Your Mind? A Countrywide Experiment on Voter Choice in France

Vincent Pons  
Harvard Business School

**Working Paper 16-079**

Copyright © 2016, 2017 by Vincent Pons

Working papers are in draft form. This working paper is distributed for purposes of comment and discussion only. It may not be reproduced without permission of the copyright holder. Copies of working papers are available from the author.

WILL A FIVE-MINUTE DISCUSSION CHANGE YOUR MIND?  
A COUNTRYWIDE EXPERIMENT ON VOTER CHOICE IN FRANCE\*

Vincent Pons

*Harvard Business School*<sup>†</sup>

March 2017

**Abstract**

This paper provides the first estimate of the effect of door-to-door canvassing on actual electoral outcomes, via a countrywide experiment embedded in François Hollande's campaign in the 2012 French presidential election. While existing experiments randomized door-to-door visits at the individual level, the scale of this campaign (five million doors knocked) enabled randomization by precinct, the level at which vote shares are recorded administratively. Visits did not affect turnout, but increased Hollande's vote share in the first round and accounted for one fourth of his victory margin in the second. Visits' impact persisted in later elections, suggesting a lasting persuasion effect.

*JEL* Codes: C93, D72, D83, O52

---

\*I am grateful to Esther Duflo, Benjamin Olken, Stephen Ansolabehere, Daniel Posner, Alan Gerber, Todd Rogers, Daniel Hidalgo, Jens Hainmueller, Daron Acemoglu, and Benjamin Marx for suggestions that have improved the paper.

<sup>†</sup>Vincent Pons, Harvard Business School, BGIE group, Soldiers Field, Boston, MA 02163; vpons@hbs.edu; +1 617 899 7593

# 1 Introduction

Consumers and voters base their economic and political decisions on preferences and beliefs shaped by their direct observations, the communication they receive, and discussions with others. Interpersonal discussions contribute to the spread of information and peer effects in technology adoption (e.g., Foster and Rosenzweig, 1995; Conley and Udry, 2010), educational choices (e.g., Bobonis and Finan, 2009), or financial decisions (e.g., Duflo and Saez, 2003; Banerjee et al., 2013), and political discussions are commonly seen as the healthy expression of a functioning democracy. To the extent that democracy revolves around the deliberation and transformation of people’s preferences, rather than the simple aggregation of their votes, discussion may actually be as important a condition of democracy as the electoral participation of all citizens (Habermas, 1996; Elster, 1998). The importance people attach to political discussions is illustrated by DellaVigna et al. (2017)’s result that many of us vote in order to later be able “to tell others”.

But discussions also affect future political behavior. In their pioneering study on the 1940 U.S. presidential election, Lazarsfeld et al. (1944) find that most voters got their information about the candidates from family members, friends, and colleagues, rather than from the media, and Nickerson (2008) and Bond et al. (2012) provide direct evidence of the diffusion of voter turnout off- and online in more recent elections. While diffusion can be driven both by discussion and direct observation of others’ actions, lab and field studies which narrow the focus to interpersonal discussions (e.g., through group deliberations and deliberative polls) do tend to confirm their influence on the opinions of participants (e.g., Myers and Bishop, 1970; Isenberg, 1986; Luskin et al., 2002; Druckman, 2004; but see Farrar et al., 2009), including on issues as resistant to change as intergroup prejudices (Broockman and Kalla, 2016).

In an effort to leverage the power of personal discussions, electoral campaigns around the globe increasingly rely on targeted appeals delivered to voters door-to-door (Bergan et al., 2005; Hillygus and Shields, 2014; Issenberg, 2012). But whether doorstep discussions between

canvassers and voters can actually increase voter support is anything but certain: partisan activists may expose voters to more precise and newer information, but their arguments, explicitly driven by electoral motives, may inspire less trust than those of regular discussion partners or even random strangers. Starting with the seminal work of Gerber and Green (2000), get-out-the-vote field experiments conducted in a wide variety of settings have found large effects of door-to-door canvassing on *voter turnout* (Gerber and Green, 2015), leaving the question of its impact on *vote shares* unanswered.

This paper provides the first estimate of the impact of door-to-door visits on actual electoral outcomes. Using administrative records, it reports the results of a precinct-level countrywide experiment embedded in François Hollande’s campaign in the 2012 French presidential election. From 1 February 2012, which was 11 weeks before the first round of the election, up until the second round on 6 May 2012, an estimated 80,000 left-wing activists knocked on five million doors to encourage people to vote for the candidate of the Parti Socialiste (PS), the mainstream center-left party in France. The author’s involvement as one of the three national directors of the field campaign provided a unique opportunity to evaluate its effect on the results of the election. Canvassers’ visits did not significantly affect turnout, but they had large and persistent effects on vote share.

Differently from the present experiment, existing studies have typically conducted randomization of door-to-door efforts at the individual or household level, with important consequences for outcome measurement. These evaluations can adequately estimate the effect of door-to-door canvassing on voter turnout, which in many countries is recorded at the individual level and made publicly available. However, they are less suited to measure the effect of the visits on voter choices which, of course, are secret. Some studies resort to polling to construct a close approximation: vote intention or, after the election took place, self-reported vote (e.g., Arceneaux, 2007; Arceneaux and Kolodny, 2009; Arceneaux and Nickerson, 2010; Bailey et al., 2016; Barton et al., 2014; Dewan et al., 2014). Unfortunately, for all its merits, randomization does not eliminate traditional survey biases. In phone surveys, response rates

to questions on self-reported vote are typically as low as 10 or 15 percent (e.g., Barton et al., 2014; Pew Research Center, 2012), and there is ample evidence that questions on political behavior are particularly prone to misreporting, including overreporting for the winner (e.g., Wright, 1993; Atkeson, 1999; Campbell, 2010). An additional concern is that these biases might differ between treatment and control individuals (e.g., Cardy, 2005; Bailey et al., 2016; Gelman et al., 2016). The present experiment overcomes these obstacles by conducting the randomization at the precinct level, at which administrative records of vote shares are available, while including a number of precincts large enough to secure sufficient statistical power. Prior to this study, neither the implied number of activists nor the campaign apparatus required to organize them had been available to researchers (Arceneaux, 2005).

An additional benefit of the large scale of this experiment is the implied external validity. Existing get-out-the-vote experiments, even when they involve political parties and nonpartisan organizations, are conducted at a much smaller scale than most actual campaigns. This allows the researchers and the hierarchy of the campaign (the principal) to carefully select activists (the agent) who will interact with voters and to closely control the content of their discussions. In large-scale campaigns, scope for control is much more limited and the principal-agent problem is more acute, which may lower the impact (Enos and Hersh, 2015). Results from framed get-out-the-vote experiments themselves show that quality matters (e.g., Nickerson, 2007), and evidence from other contexts suggests that interventions generating large effects in a small, controlled setting may become unimpactful when they are scaled up (e.g., Banerjee et al., 2008; Grossman et al., 2015). The present experiment, embedded into a large-scale presidential campaign, overcomes the external validity limitations of prior studies. One aspect of the limited control of the candidate’s central team over local activists, however, was that only a subset of territories that participated in the door-to-door campaign also participated in the experiment. I use daily reports entered by canvassers on the campaign website and their responses to a post-electoral online survey to identify which territories did indeed use the randomization lists. In these territories alone, precincts and

municipalities collectively containing 5.02 million registered citizens were randomly assigned to either a control or a treatment group.

The randomization was conducted within strata of five precincts characterized by their estimated potential to win votes. Four precincts (80 percent) of each stratum were randomly assigned to the treatment group, and one (20 percent) to the control group. A subset of the treatment precincts – those with the highest potential to win votes – were allocated to the canvassers (more details in Section 3.1). Like in a standard encouragement design, I estimate the effect of a precinct being assigned to the treatment group (the intent-to-treat effect of the campaign) by comparing electoral outcomes in control and treatment precincts, and the effect of a precinct being allocated to canvassers (a local average treatment effect) by using random treatment assignment as an instrument. This strategy allowed me to maximize the effectiveness of the campaign while preserving the validity of the experimental design.

All results are based on official election outcomes at the precinct level. Surprisingly, the door-to-door visits did not significantly affect voter turnout. Had randomization been conducted at the individual level, as in existing studies, and only voter turnout been recorded, I would have concluded – wrongly – that the campaign had no significant impact. Instead, I find that it increased François Hollande’s vote share in precincts allocated to canvassers by 3.2 and 2.8 percentage points in the first and second rounds of the presidential elections, respectively. These estimates correct for the imperfect compliance of the canvassers with their allocated lists of precincts, and are significant at the 5 percent level. Multiplying these estimates by the fraction of French doors knocked, I obtain that the canvassing campaign accounted for approximately one half of Hollande’s lead in the first round and one fourth of his victory margin at the second round.

The scale of the study also facilitated the assessment of downstream effects. While transitory shocks to voter turnout have been found to generate persistent effects due to long-lasting impact of the shocks themselves or to habit formation (Gerber et al., 2003; Meredith, 2009; Davenport et al., 2010; Garcia Bedolla and Michelson, 2012; Fujiwara et al.,

2016), the present study is the first to show that effects on vote choice can persist as well. In fact, contrasting with Gerber et al. (2011), the impact of the visits almost entirely persisted in the subsequent parliamentary elections held one month after the presidential vote. Overall, door-to-door canvassing increased the vote share obtained by Parti Socialiste candidates in these elections by 0.7 percentage points. This effect was larger than the victory margin of members of parliament from the PS elected in 2012 in 5.9 percent of the constituencies. Persistence to the 2014 European elections was smaller (about 47 percent of the original effect) and at the limit of statistical significance.

Finally, I discuss possible interpretations of the results. Although I cannot directly test them, examining the effects of the visits on the vote shares of other candidates provides suggestive evidence. The first and, to me, most likely interpretation, is that the results were driven by a persuasion effect. An alternative interpretation is that the door-to-door visits increased the participation of left-wing supporters, and that they demobilized an equal number of supporters of other parties. Of all types of voters, those who could be deemed most likely to feel cross-pressured and thus demobilized are probably the supporters of the far-right candidate Marine Le Pen, many of whom used to vote left and still maintain leftist preferences on economic issues. However, her vote share was unaffected, making the persuasion interpretation more likely than demobilization. Two different mechanisms may have driven the persuasion effect of the visits: canvassers may have persuaded voters by changing their preferences on some political issues or by changing their beliefs about the quality of the PS and of its candidate. The short average length of the visits makes the first mechanism unlikely. Instead, the fact that most voters that were canvassed had never been visited by a political activist before makes the second mechanism, a shift in the perception of the quality of candidate and party, more plausible. In addition, the increase of Hollande's vote share was a result of his taking votes away from right-wing candidates more than from other left-wing candidates.<sup>1</sup> But right-wing voters could be deemed less susceptible to align

---

<sup>1</sup>Nicolas Sarkozy, the incumbent and candidate of the right-wing Union pour la Majorité Présidentielle, was the only opponent mentioned in the toolkit distributed to canvassers and, naturally, his presidency was



their preferences with the political agenda of Hollande than voters supporting other left-wing candidates, who naturally offered a closer ideological platform. This again makes it less likely that voters' political preferences changed, and more likely that their beliefs about the PS and its candidate did.

Overall, the results suggest that in elections of very high salience, voter outreach methods will have little effect on turnout, but that interpersonal discussions can have a large and long-lasting persuasion effect.

This paper contributes to a growing literature providing causal evidence on the drivers and effects of persuasive communication (see DellaVigna and Gentzkow (2010) for an overview). While the access to and information provided by the TV (Simon and Stern, 1955; Gentzkow, 2006; DellaVigna and Kaplan, 2007; Enikolopov et al., 2011), the radio (Adena et al., 2015), newspapers (Gerber et al., 2009; Gentzkow et al., 2011; Chiang and Knight, 2011), or the internet (Falck et al., 2014; Campante et al., 2014) have the potential to profoundly shape voters' political preferences and, depending on the context and the media, substantially increase (e.g., Gentzkow et al., 2011) or decrease (e.g., Falck et al., 2014) voter turnout, the effects of political ads disseminated by electoral campaigns through the very same channels are more modest, overall. Neither Ashworth and Clinton (2007), nor Krasno and Green (2008) find substantial effects of TV campaign ads on aggregate turnout, Broockman and Green (2014) do not find that online ads have any effect on voters' evaluation of candidates, or even name recognition, and Gerber et al. (2011) only find very short-lived effects of TV and radio ads on recipients' voting preferences. Yet, Spenkuch and Toniatti (2016) find that TV ads affect the electoral results by altering the composition of the electorate, even though they leave aggregate turnout and preferences unaffected. Both Panagopoulos and Green (2008) and Larreguy et al. (2016) also report effects of radio ads on vote shares, which disproportionately benefit challengers.

Well-powered precinct-level randomized evaluations of field campaigns, including those discussed in many conversations. However, the main objective of the campaign conveyed to the canvassers was not persuading Sarkozy's voters but mobilizing left-wing non-voters (see Section 2.3 for more details).

fully embedded in a candidate’s campaign, have studied the effects on vote shares of campaign activities that require fewer human resources and are less direct and personal than door-to-door canvassing, such as direct mail (e.g., Rogers and Middleton, 2015), phone and robo calls (e.g., Shaw et al., 2012), and town hall meetings (e.g., Wantchekon, 2003). These types of contact generate relatively larger effects for weaker candidates (Gerber, 2004; Fujiwara and Wantchekon, 2013). The messages also generate larger effects when they emphasize valence rather than ideology (Kendall et al., 2015), and, in developing countries, clientelist rather than public policy platforms (Wantchekon, 2003).<sup>2</sup>

Although logistically more demanding, door-to-door visits are more direct and personal than other types of field campaign contacts and mass media advertisements. The interactive discussions to which they lead naturally adapt to respondents’ profile and questions, thus potentially affecting voter choice in a different and perhaps more dramatic way than other forms of persuasive communication. In fact, their effect on the decision to vote is itself very different (e.g., Gerber and Green, 2000).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides more background information on François Hollande’s door-to-door campaign and on the 2012 and 2014 elections in France. Section 3 describes the experimental design and its implementation. Section 4 evaluates the overall impact of the door-to-door canvassing visits on voter turnout and vote shares in the presidential elections and in the following elections. Section 5 interprets the results, and Section 6 concludes.

---

<sup>2</sup>The paper also speaks to a growing literature, in developing countries, which estimates the impact of election-related field campaigns targeting issues beyond voter turnout and vote choice, such as corruption (Banerjee et al., 2011; Chong et al., 2015), electoral misbehavior and violence (Aker et al., 2011; Collier and Vicente, 2014), or trust in the institutions (Marx et al., 2016).

## 2 Setting

### 2.1 The 2012 and 2014 French elections

In 2012, France elected both a new president and a new National Assembly. Presidential elections in France have two rounds, with the two candidates achieving the highest vote shares in the first round going on to the second. Turnout in the first round of presidential elections on 22 April 2012 was 79.5 percent of registered citizens.<sup>3</sup> Nicolas Sarkozy, the incumbent and candidate of the right-wing Union pour la Majorité Présidentielle (UMP), and François Hollande, the candidate of the left-wing Parti Socialiste (PS), obtained respectively 27.2 percent and 28.6 percent of the votes and qualified for the second round (see Figure 1). Compared to the 2007 presidential election, François Bayrou, the centrist candidate, lost over half of his vote share (9.1 percent compared to 18.6 percent), and the far-left candidates' portion became marginal (1.7 percent compared to 5.8 percent). The vote share of Marine Le Pen, 17.9 percent, was the highest ever obtained by her party, the far-right Front National (FN). Voter turnout in the second round, on 6 May, was high again at 80.4 percent, and François Hollande was elected President with 51.6 percent of the votes.

French parliamentary elections use single-member constituencies. Similarly to the presidential elections, they consist of two rounds, unless one candidate obtains more than 50 percent of the votes in the first. Unlike in the presidential elections, all candidates who obtain a number of votes higher than 12.5 percent of registered citizens in the first round can compete in the second, but in most cases that is only two candidates. The 2012 parliamentary elections took place on 10 and 17 June. Turnout was 57.2, then 55.4 percent – far lower than in the presidential elections, and lower than the previous parliamentary elections. This confirms the lesser salience of parliamentary elections in the minds of voters, as well as a general declining trend of turnout (Figure 2). The PS candidates won in 49 percent of the

---

<sup>3</sup>In France, voter turnout is computed as the fraction of number of votes cast over the number of registered citizens. Turnout figures reported throughout the paper follow this convention. Since the door-to-door canvassing campaign started after the registration deadline of 31 December 2011, it could not affect the number of registered citizens.

constituencies.

In order to examine the long-run effect of the door-to-door visits, I include the 2014 European elections in the analysis.<sup>4</sup> These elections took place on 25 May. Unlike the presidential and parliamentary elections, the European elections use the proportionality rule, and France is divided into seven large European constituencies. Only 42 percent of the voters participated in these elections and the PS suffered a major defeat. Its candidates ranked third in all the constituencies, behind the lists of the UMP and of the FN.

## 2.2 Electoral campaigns in France vs. the United States

Among the many differences between French and U.S. electoral campaigns, at least three should be emphasized here: funding, distribution of media access, and field activities. François Hollande’s 2012 campaign spent 29 million dollars, 38 times less than Barack Obama’s 1.107 billion dollars. The bulk of Obama’s money was spent on radio and television advertising. Instead, all French radio and TV channels were mandated to give equal coverage to the campaign of each of the 12 candidates before the first round. Similarly, between rounds, they had to give equal coverage to Sarkozy and Hollande: in France, candidates do not compete using TV ads. As a result, one might hypothesize that French campaigns put relatively more emphasis on the recruitment of volunteers and that they select their field campaign methods with great care. On the contrary, until recently, French political parties allocated few resources to the recruitment, training, and coordination of activists. In addition, local units of the PS were largely autonomous and free to choose their own campaign methods. Although it had once been common, door-to-door canvassing had progressively been replaced by other more impersonal techniques, such as handing out flyers in public places, or dropping them in mailboxes (Liegey et al., 2013). By 2012, only few

---

<sup>4</sup>In 2014, France also held municipal elections. However, the political orientation (left, right, etc.) of the candidates is only known in 27 percent of the municipalities, those with more than 1,000 inhabitants. Moreover, in these municipalities, the vast majority of candidates run under affiliations which are not endorsed by a national party, such as PS or UMP. Given the low resulting statistical power, I do not include the municipal elections in the analysis.

areas saw frequent door-to-door canvassing (Lefebvre, 2016).

Two factors explain the emphasis the PS placed on canvassing during the 2012 presidential election. First, the 2008 campaign of Barack Obama generated unusual levels of public attention and enthusiasm across France. Prominent French politicians and think tanks called for an adoption of U.S. electoral and campaign practices, including the organization of large field campaigns (Terra Nova, 2009). The second factor, as in the United States, was academic research: the first French randomized evaluation of a door-to-door canvassing get-out-the-vote effort (Pons and Liegey, 2016) aided in convincing the PS to scale up the method for the 2012 presidential election.<sup>5</sup>

As a result of these different factors, the objective set for Hollande’s 2012 door-to-door canvassing campaign was ambitious: to knock on five million doors, or roughly 15 percent of all French dwellings.

### **2.3 François Hollande’s 2012 door-to-door canvassing campaign**

Four days after the second round of the presidential election, all 9,227 activists with an active profile on Hollande’s campaign website received an email invitation to take an online anonymous survey. 2,126 (23.0 percent) responded, of whom 1,972 (92.8 percent) had participated in the door-to-door canvassing campaign (Table 1). This survey, although likely not representative due to the low response rate, provides useful insights about the profile of the local activists. French political parties have a relatively large number of active members. On the one hand, this provided Hollande’s campaign with a large number of highly motivated volunteers: 87 percent respondents reported participating in three or more rounds of door-to-door canvassing, and 38 percent in more than ten. On the other hand, many of these volunteers were unaccustomed to welcome newer activists who were not official party members. As a result, by the end of the campaign, only 12 percent of the respondents were

---

<sup>5</sup>Liegey et al. (2013) examine at greater length the different steps through which the PS progressively adopted door-to-door canvassing as the preferred field campaigning strategy from 2010 to 2012.

sympathizers involved in a campaign for the first time, while 79 percent were official members of the PS. Relatedly, two thirds of the canvassers were over 46 years old, reflecting the skewed age pyramid of PS members.

As another consequence of the overwhelming presence of PS members among activists, the campaign could and had to rely extensively on the preexisting structure of the party. The vast majority of the field organizers coordinating the volunteers were themselves members and, often, heads of local units of the PS, and most of the départements'<sup>6</sup> coordinators had preexisting responsibilities within the party. As a result, the campaign had direct authority neither on the field organizers, nor on the départements' coordinators. Different was the status of 15 field-based regional coordinators, who were paid by the central campaign team and worked full time under its authority. They assisted in organizing door-to-door sessions and monitoring activists, whom they encouraged and helped with reporting their activity on the campaign's website. Finally, 150 highly motivated and educated national trainers were recruited. Every Saturday, they were sent to the local headquarters of the campaign across France to train field organizers. The trainings revolved around role playing and taught field organizers how to train and coordinate volunteers themselves. Of respondents to the post-electoral survey, 59 percent had attended a training session. This effort addressed a real need: only 22 percent of the respondents had frequently done door-to-door canvassing before the campaign. The trainings emphasized a simple message: the field campaign was about door-to-door canvassing, and nothing else. The emphasis placed on door-to-door canvassing was also evident in the campaign material: in addition to leaflets, canvassers received door-hangers dedicated to the door-to-door campaign (see Figure H4 in Appendix H).

To ensure that the intervention would be administered uniformly, the training course was identical everywhere, and all canvassers received a toolkit with detailed instructions and advice on how to start and lead the conversations. The full toolkit is available in Appendix H (Figure H1). As in most GOTV interventions, the instructions provided by the central

---

<sup>6</sup>Départements are one of the three levels of government below the national level, between the region and the municipality. There are a total of 101 départements.

campaign team were intended as a general canvass, which would be adapted according to each voter's type, interests, and questions.<sup>7</sup> The mobilization of left-wing voters was highlighted as the main objective, as it seemed easier and more likely to win votes than persuading undecided voters, who are the second traditional target of partisan campaigns. Reflecting this strategic choice, canvassers were instructed to provide basic information systematically about the date of the election, the location and opening times of the poll office, and the name of the PS candidate. They urged people to vote, and to vote for Hollande, using general arguments about the importance of voting and of the forthcoming elections as well as personal examples and stories. The discussions usually lasted from one to five minutes. At the end of the discussion, the canvassers typically gave their interlocutor some campaign literature: a thematic leaflet or a 23-page booklet summarizing François Hollande's platform. When no one opened, a leaflet or doorhanger was left on the door.

After each canvassing session, activists registered on the campaign's website could report the number of doors knocked and opened, the precinct covered, and provide additional comments. In total, 14,728 reports were entered over the entire course of the campaign, many of which encompassed multiple canvassing sessions, conducted by different teams or on different dates. 1,955 users (21.2 percent of all users with an active profile on the website) entered at least one report, and an additional 1,420 activists (15.4 percent of those registered on the website) were mentioned in at least one report. As a counterpart to the reporting, the website allowed activists to follow the progress of the campaign in their area. In addition, field organizers and départements' coordinators had access to a country map which color-coded the départements based on the numbers of doors knocked. Figure 3 shows snapshots of the maps for the five last weeks of the campaign, and Figure H3 in Appendix H presents the guide distributed to field organizers on how to use the website, with annotated screenshots of its different parts. In some areas, however, field organizers and activists never registered

---

<sup>7</sup>As Gerber and Green (2015) note in their seminal book on GOTV campaigns, scripts are helpful to guide canvassers, but they are not a substitute for informal and personalized discussions, which are central to the effectiveness of door-to-door canvassing.

on the campaign platform, and even when they did, they only reported a fraction of all doors knocked. With the help of the regional coordinators of the campaign, this fraction was estimated département by département to infer the total number of doors knocked. The scope of the campaign was without comparison in any previous door-to-door efforts of a French political party or organization: overall, approximately five million doors were knocked, of which slightly more than one third were reported on the website.

Figure 4 plots the number of doors knocked over time as reported on the website. As is clear from this graph, the pace of the campaign was very slow until six weeks prior to the first round. It then increased gradually and reached its peak between the two rounds. Underlying this long-term trend, short-term weekly cycles are easily identifiable. Each week, the canvassing sessions took place mostly on Fridays and Saturdays. On average, the door-opening rate was high, around 48 percent, and activists usually worked in pairs.

## 3 Experimental Design and Implementation

### 3.1 Randomization

#### Definition of territories as a set of contiguous municipalities

Before the start of the door-to-door campaign, I split the entire country into territories defined as a set of contiguous municipalities sharing a common zip code.<sup>8</sup> Any new activist registering on the campaign’s website was allocated to the territory corresponding to his zip code and put in touch with the corresponding PS local unit.

---

<sup>8</sup>There was one exception to this rule: in each département, zip codes with fewer than 5,000 registered citizens were subsumed under the same territory.



## Definition of the target number of registered citizens in each territory

The overall objective of knocking on five million doors was translated into a target number of registered citizens for each territory,  $\widetilde{TA}$ .<sup>9</sup> This variable was set proportionally to the total number of registered citizens in the territory and to a proxy for the potential to win votes,  $\widetilde{PO}$ .  $\widetilde{PO}$  was defined as the fraction of nonvoters multiplied by the left vote share among active voters, each taken from the results of the second round of the 2007 presidential elections.<sup>10</sup>

## Level of randomization

Randomization was done within each of 3,260 territories separately. In territories where the geographical boundaries of the electoral precincts were known for all or most municipalities, based on the 2011 voter rolls, randomization was done at the precinct level.<sup>11</sup> In the remaining territories, randomization was done at the municipality level. Henceforth, for conciseness, I designate the unit of randomization as “precincts”, even when the randomization was done at the municipality level.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>The objective communicated to the canvassers in each territory was expressed as a number of doors. To translate the target number of registered citizens into a target number of doors, I assumed that each door represented 1.4 registered citizens on average, a ratio obtained by dividing the total number of registered citizens in France, 46.0 million, by the total number of dwellings, 33.2 million.

<sup>10</sup>This definition of  $\widetilde{PO}$  could only be applied directly to precincts whose boundaries had not changed since 2007. In these precincts, I regressed  $\widetilde{PO}$  (computed using this definition) on characteristics constructed based on the 2011 voter rolls (average building size, this variable squared, the proportion of buildings with fewer than 5, between 5 and 15, or more than 15 registered citizens, average age, this variable squared, the proportion of citizens younger than 25, and the proportion of citizens older than 65). I then used the estimated coefficients to predict (or, technically, construct)  $\widetilde{PO}$  in precincts whose boundaries had changed since 2007.

<sup>11</sup>There does not exist any comprehensive database of the boundaries of French voter precincts, which are drawn by the municipalities. However, to organize its 2011 primary elections, the PS had collected voter registers in all sufficiently large municipalities. These voter registers indicate the address and precinct of each registered citizen and could thus be used to infer the geographical boundaries of the corresponding precincts.

<sup>12</sup>The list of 3,260 territories excludes 279 territories each counting a unique municipality of unknown precinct boundaries: in these territories, the single municipality had to be allocated to canvassers in any case (so that they could participate in the door-to-door campaign), preventing randomization.

## Randomization

The randomization rule was identical across all territories. It was designed in a way that ensured that precincts allocated to canvassers had the highest possible estimated potential to win votes  $\widetilde{PO}$  compatible with running an experiment. I proceeded in three steps, which Figure 5 illustrates using the hypothetical example of a territory with an arbitrary number (17) of precincts.

The first step was the stratification. I computed  $\widetilde{PO}$  in each precinct of the territory, and ranked precincts from the highest to the lowest  $\widetilde{PO}$ . I grouped precincts in strata of five: the territory's first stratum comprised the five precincts with the highest  $\widetilde{PO}$ , the second stratum the five precincts ranked immediately below, and so on until the last stratum, composed of the five or fewer remaining precincts. The first stratum of any territory was always included in the randomization. In some territories, additional strata were also included in the randomization, as will become clear from the second and third steps.

The second step was the randomization itself. Focusing first on the territory's first stratum, I randomly assigned its precincts to the treatment and control groups, using random numbers generated in Stata. When the first stratum included five precincts, exactly four (80 percent) of these precincts were randomly assigned to the treatment group, and one (20 percent) to the control group. In the small set of territories in which the first stratum included fewer than five precincts (due to the territory itself including fewer than five), each precinct was assigned with an 80 percent probability to the treatment group and with a 20 percent probability to the control group.

In the third step, I defined the list of precincts of the first stratum which canvassers would be asked to cover. This list was prepared before the start of the campaign. Precincts allocated to canvassers included only treatment precincts (and no control precincts), but not necessarily *all* treatment precincts. The treatment precinct with the largest potential  $\widetilde{PO}$  was always allocated to the canvassers. If the number of citizens registered in this precinct was larger than the target number of registered citizens for the territory  $\widetilde{TA}$ , no

other treatment precinct was allocated to the canvassers. If its number of registered citizens was lower than  $\widetilde{TA}$ , the treatment precinct with the second largest  $\widetilde{PO}$  was also allocated to the canvassers. Then again, if the combined number of registered citizens in the first and second treatment precincts was larger than  $\widetilde{TA}$ , no other treatment precinct was allocated to the canvassers. Otherwise, the treatment precinct with the third largest  $\widetilde{PO}$  was allocated to the canvassers and the same rule was used one last time to decide whether or not to also allocate the fourth (and last) treatment precinct to the canvassers.

In the vast majority of territories, the total number of registered citizens in the treatment precincts of the first stratum was higher than  $\widetilde{TA}$ , and no other stratum was included in the randomization. If (and only if) the total number of registered citizens in the treatment precincts of the first stratum remained lower than  $\widetilde{TA}$ , the second stratum was also included in the randomization. The second and third steps were then repeated on this stratum. If needed, additional strata were included until the total number of registered citizens in treatment precincts allocated to canvassers was equal or higher than  $\widetilde{TA}$ .

## Discussion of the randomization

Two aspects of this randomization are unusual, without posing any threat to the validity of the design. First, it is unusual not to allocate all treatment units to receive the intervention. However, there are other randomization designs in which only a fraction of the treatment units end up receiving the intervention. For instance, in encouragement designs, a random group of subjects is offered an intervention, and only a (non-random) subset takes it (e.g., Hirano et al., 2000; Duflo and Saez, 2003). In these designs, we typically think of take-up (conditional on treatment) as being driven by idiosyncratic (often unobservable) characteristics of individuals. For example, in a medical experiment, individuals who comply with the treatment may be unobservably different from non-compliers. In my experiment, such non-compliance is present by design. The objective in allocating only a fraction of the treatment precincts to the canvassers was to ensure that they would focus their efforts on the

treatment precincts in which the potential to win votes was deemed highest. Importantly, similarly as in an encouragement design, the fact that the assignment of units to the treatment and control groups was entirely random makes it possible to estimate the impact of the door-to-door campaign causally, despite the fact that not all treatment precincts were allocated to canvassers. As shown in the empirical strategy in the next subsection, all results rely on the randomization as the unique source of identification.

Second, randomized experiments typically select the sample in a first step, and randomly assign sample units to the treatment and control groups in a second step. These two steps were not entirely separate in the present experiment. As mentioned above, the first stratum of each territory was always included in the randomization, and in a few territories additional strata were included as well. The unusual aspect is that the decision to include an additional stratum in the randomization, in a particular territory, depended in part on which precincts had been assigned to treatment and control in strata already included. The probability that a second stratum would need to be included was slightly lower when the smallest precinct of the first stratum was assigned, by chance, to the control group, than when it was assigned to the treatment group (as being assigned to the control group increased the likelihood that the combined number of registered citizens in all treatment precincts of the first stratum would be higher than  $\widetilde{TA}$ ). The same holds for the likelihood that a third stratum would need to be included in the randomization, conditionally on having included two strata already, and so on for the subsequent strata. Importantly, this does not alter the symmetry between treatment and control precincts in the final sample.<sup>13</sup> In addition, I check the robustness of the results to restricting the analysis to subsamples defined by the first stratum of each territory (which, again, always had to be included in the randomization) or the smallest set of strata of each

---

<sup>13</sup>To convince oneself of this, first consider the set of first strata of all territories (whether a second stratum was also included or not). By construction, the assignment of the precincts to the treatment and control groups in these first strata was random. Then consider the second stratum of all territories in which a second stratum was included (whether a third stratum was also included or not). Again, by construction, the assignment to treatment and control in these second strata was random. The same holds for the group of third strata, and so on. Therefore, adding all groups of strata together, the assignment of precincts to the treatment and control groups was random.

territory which, based on the rule above, would be included in the randomization under any possible treatment assignment in lower-numbered strata.<sup>14</sup> In these two subsamples, the separation between sample selection and randomization is satisfied. The corresponding tables are included in Appendix C (tables C1 through C3 and C4 through C6, respectively). All main results are robust to both restrictions.

### 3.2 Empirical strategy

I estimate the effect of door-to-door canvassing on voter turnout and vote shares at the 2012 presidential election as well as the 2012 parliamentary elections and the 2014 European elections. To preserve the integrity of the randomization, treatment precincts not allocated to canvassers are maintained in the treatment group in all regressions. To account for the fact that not all treatment precincts were allocated to the canvassers, I estimate two parameters of interest for each electoral outcome. First, I show the effect of a precinct being *assigned to the treatment group* (the intent-to-treat effect of the campaign), using the following OLS specification:

$$Y_i = \alpha_1 + \beta_1 T_i + X_i' \lambda_1 + \sum_s \delta_{i1}^s + \epsilon_{i1} \quad (1)$$

where  $Y_i$  is the outcome in precinct  $i$ ,  $T_i$  is a dummy equal to 1 if the precinct was assigned to the treatment group and 0 if it was assigned to the control group,  $\delta_{i1}^s$  are strata fixed effects, and  $X_i$  is a vector of controls.

Secondly, I evaluate the effect of a precinct being actually *allocated to canvassers* (a local average treatment effect) with the following specification:

---

<sup>14</sup>The first stratum of each territory always falls in this set. The second stratum also falls in this set if, in the event that the smallest precinct of the first stratum was assigned by chance to the control group, the total number of registered citizens in the treatment precincts would remain lower than  $\widehat{TA}$ . And so on for the subsequent strata.

$$Y_i = \alpha_2 + \beta_2 A_i + X_i' \lambda_2 + \sum_s \delta_{i2}^s + \epsilon_{i2} \quad (2)$$

where  $A_i$  is a dummy equal to 1 if the precinct was allocated to the canvassers and 0 otherwise, and is instrumented with  $T_i$  as shown in the following first-stage equation:

$$A_i = a + bT_i + X_i' \lambda + \sum_s \delta_i^s + \nu_i \quad (3)$$

The validity of the 2SLS estimates relies on the fact that the rule used to allocate treatment precincts to canvassers did not generate any defier: of the treatment precincts that were not allocated to the canvassers, none would have been allocated to them if they had been in the control group (since no control group precinct was allocated to the canvassers in the first place).

In all tables, I present estimates of Equation [1] in Panel A, and estimates of Equation [2] in Panel B. The key coefficients of interest are  $\beta_1$  and  $\beta_2$ , which indicate respectively the effect of the door-to-door visits in precincts that were assigned to the treatment group and the effect in treatment precincts that were allocated to canvassers. These effects combine the direct impact of the visits on voters who received them with potential spillovers on other voters from the same precincts who did not receive the visit but talked to voters who did. The research design cannot distinguish between direct and indirect impacts.

All regressions use within estimators and robust standard errors.<sup>15</sup> I use three distinct specifications. The first does not control for any variable except for the strata fixed effects. The second controls for  $\widetilde{PO}$  (the proxy for the potential to win votes), which was used to

---

<sup>15</sup>The main tables do not cluster the standard errors since the unit of observation is the same as the unit of randomization (the precinct). The results are robust to using regular cluster robust standard errors at the level of the territory or département or allowing for correlation of the error terms at the level of the départements or the regions with the wild cluster bootstrap procedure (Cameron et al., 2008) and pairs cluster bootstrap procedure (Esarey and Menger, 2017). All results with clustered standard errors are shown in Appendix D (Tables D1 through D8).

construct the strata, as well as a baseline measure of the outcome at the 2007 presidential election. The third and main specification also controls for the number of registered citizens as well as the level and the five-year change of the following census variables: the size of the municipality; the share of men; the share of the population below 14, between 15 and 29, between 30 and 44, between 45 and 59, between 60 and 74, and above 75; the share of the working population; and the rate of unemployment.<sup>16</sup> Finally, regressions estimating the effect of the campaign at the parliamentary elections control for constituency fixed effects to account for differences in the number and identity of competing candidates across constituencies.

### **3.3 Identification of territories which followed the randomization plan**

In each territory, the list of allocated precincts and, when available (and when the randomization had been done at the precinct, not municipality, level), a list of voter addresses corresponding to these precincts, could be downloaded as Excel files by the field organizers from their personal account on the campaign’s website. However, a large fraction of territories which participated in the door-to-door campaign did not use the list of allocated precincts, for two main reasons: never getting access to this list, as no field organizer in the territory registered on the campaign website and downloaded the list; and local units of the PS deciding autonomously which areas to cover. In sum, the difficulties that even the most professional campaigns face to control the selection of political activists’ demographic characteristics and ideology (Enos and Hersh, 2015) extended in this election to controlling *where* activists campaigned.

---

<sup>16</sup>Until 1999, a general census was conducted in the entire country every five to ten years. Since 2006, the French national statistics agency (Insee) publishes yearly census results at the municipality level based on data collected continuously over five years. For instance, the 2006 census results are based on data collected from 2004 to 2008. The Insee emphasizes that any evolution should be observed over a span of five years or more to ensure that the comparison relies on entirely different datasets (Insee, 2014). Accordingly, I use census results for 2006 and 2011.

This resulted from the few resources available to the central team to coordinate the campaign locally, which limited efforts to encourage activists to register on the website and use the lists prepared by the central team: as mentioned in Section 2.3, the central team only directly hired and managed 15 regional coordinators. Second, the campaign website was not as advanced as technological tools used by recent U.S. campaigns. In particular, it did not provide maps of allocated precincts and did not allow activists to prepare walk lists for door-to-door sessions organized in these precincts. In U.S. campaigns, such features foster use of the website and compliance with addresses or precincts deemed priority by the campaign’s analytics team. Instead, in this campaign, many groups of activists found it easier to campaign in areas that they already knew, including their own neighborhood. Third, the fact that many local units of the PS came up with their own prioritization of areas to cover reflects the fact that these units preexisted the campaign, and it echoes their culture of relative autonomy with respect to the hierarchy of the party and, a fortiori, with respect to the presidential candidate and his central team. Local units which did not follow the list of allocated precincts instead targeted areas based on their own understanding of electoral dynamics on their turf and a set of priorities, which included of course the presidential election, but also gave weight to strategic considerations pertaining to future local races in which members of the unit would compete.

Estimates of the effects of the campaign in territories that did not use the list of allocated precincts should be null in expectation, as areas covered in these territories are orthogonal to randomization. Including these territories in the analysis will decrease precision and may add noise, due to, for instance, tiny underlying differences between treatment and control areas, or non-zero correlation between random assignment and actual coverage in these areas. In fact, estimates presented in Tables A2 and A3 in Appendix A – that include all territories, whether or not they used the list of allocated precincts – are close to zero but consistent with substantial positive or negative effects on turnout and vote shares in territories that did use the lists.



Instead, the analysis below uses data from territories that used the list of allocated precincts and thus actually participated in the experiment. I identify these territories by combining two independent sources of information: responses to a question included in the postelectoral online survey on the use of allocated precincts, and daily reports entered by activists on the campaign website. Did at least one survey respondent based in the territory mention that local activists in this territory used the list of allocated precincts? Or does the territory show at least one report indicating the precinct covered, signalling actual usage of the campaign website and accountability with respect to precincts allocated by the campaign’s central team? The main results shown below are based on all territories which verify either the first or the second criterion.<sup>17</sup> For robustness, I also show results based on sets of territories characterized using only one of the two criteria.

791 territories verify either the first or the second criterion. This corresponds to 24.3 percent of all 3,260 territories, and 42.3 percent of the corresponding population. In these 791 territories, 966 strata containing 4,674 precincts and 5.02 million registered voters were included in the randomization.<sup>18</sup> 80.2 percent (3,748) of the precincts were randomly assigned to the treatment group and 19.8 percent (926) were assigned to the control group. 57.1 percent (2,139) of the treatment precincts were allocated to canvassers.

Since the randomization was conducted on precincts defined according to the 2011 voter rolls, all results need to exclude precincts whose boundaries changed between 2011 and 2012. In addition, specifications controlling for past outcomes need to exclude precincts whose boundaries had changed between 2007 and 2011. As a result, depending on the specification, the total number of precincts used in the tables is either 3,397 (in specifications that do not

---

<sup>17</sup>The survey question used to construct the first criterion was “Did you (or your local unit) use the list of priority polling stations or municipalities that was provided by the campaign?” and the possible answers were “I never heard of this list” (1), “We did not use this list at all, or only very little” (2), “We used this list partially” (3), and “We went to almost all the priority polling stations or cities” (4). I consider that the criterion is satisfied when at least one survey respondent based in the territory provided the fourth answer. The results are robust (and nearly identical) to including territories in which at least one survey respondent provided the third or fourth answer.

<sup>18</sup>In most (87.6 percent) of the territories, only one stratum was included in the randomization. In 7.3 percent of the territories, two strata were included, and in the remaining 5.1 percent three or more strata were included.

control for past outcomes) or 2,665 (in specifications that do).<sup>19</sup>

### 3.4 Imperfect compliance

Even in territories that used the lists of allocated precincts, compliance with these lists remained imperfect. In some cases, the number of canvassers was too small to cover all allocated precincts, and in others, canvassers covered precincts other than those allocated. Failure to account for the imperfect compliance with the lists of allocated precincts would lead to underestimate the impact of the visits.

Therefore, in addition to the effects reported in the tables, of a precinct being assigned to the treatment group and of a precinct being allocated to the canvassers, which are estimated using Equations [1] and [2], respectively, I compute a third effect. I scale up raw regression estimates from Equation [1] by a factor inversely proportional to the differential intensity of the campaign in treatment and control precincts:  $m = \frac{1}{f_T - f_C}$ , where  $f_T$  (resp.  $f_C$ ) denotes the fraction of registered citizens that were reached by the campaign in treatment (resp. control) precincts. This accounts both for the fact that not all treatment precincts were allocated to the canvassers and for imperfect compliance on the part of canvassers, and it provides an estimate of the effect of the visits in precincts that were covered by canvassers and would not have been covered if they had not been assigned to the treatment group.<sup>20</sup>

$f_T$  and  $f_C$  can be rewritten as  $f_T = \frac{x_T N}{N_T}$  and  $f_C = \frac{x_C N}{N_C}$ , where  $N$  is the total number of registered citizens reached by the campaign,  $N_T$  (resp.  $N_C$ ) is the number of registered citizens in treatment (resp. control) precincts, and  $x_T$  (resp.  $x_C$ ) is the fraction of doors knocked that were located in treatment (resp. control) precincts. Since treatment precincts

---

<sup>19</sup>Each year, municipalities can add new precincts, merge existing precincts, or move precinct boundaries, to take into account changes in the number of registered citizens in each neighborhood. The 2011 voter rolls collected by the PS provide a precise description of precinct boundaries in that year. I further identify boundaries' changes before and after 2011 based on changes in the number of precincts in a given municipality as well as changes in the number of registered citizens contained in each precinct.

<sup>20</sup>I compute this effect (by scaling raw ITT estimates by the multiplier) instead of estimating it with an IV regression (where precinct coverage would be instrumented by treatment) since available information on the extent to which a particular precinct was covered is imperfect and missing for a large fraction of precincts.

include both precincts allocated to canvassers and precincts not allocated to them,  $f_T$  can further be rewritten as  $f_T = \frac{x_T N}{N_T} = \frac{(x_{T,A} + x_{T,\bar{A}})N}{(N_{T,A} + N_{T,\bar{A}})}$ , where the subscript  $T, A$  (resp.  $T, \bar{A}$ ) designates allocated (resp. non-allocated) treatment precincts.

Therefore,

$$m = \frac{1}{N} \times \frac{1}{\frac{(x_{T,A} + x_{T,\bar{A}})}{(N_{T,A} + N_{T,\bar{A}})} - \frac{x_C}{N_C}} \quad (4)$$

I call  $m$  the “differential intensity multiplier”. Its size is driven by two factors. The first was the decision to allocate only a fraction of the treatment precincts to the canvassers: if canvassers had fully complied with the corresponding list, then we would have  $x_{T,A} = 1$ ,  $x_{T,\bar{A}} = x_C = 0$ ,  $N = N_{T,A}$ , and the complier would be equal to  $\frac{N_{T,A} + N_{T,\bar{A}}}{N_{T,A}} = \frac{N_T}{N_{T,A}}$ , which is the ratio between the number of registered citizens in all treatment precincts and in the subset of treatment precincts allocated to canvassers. The second factor is canvassers’ imperfect compliance with the list of allocated precincts, which further increases the multiplier.

I compute the multiplier for the first and second rounds separately:  $m^1$  and  $m^2$ . From voter rolls, in territories which participated in the experiment,  $N_{T,A} = 2,486,941$ ,  $N_{T,\bar{A}} = 1,613,156$ , and  $N_C = 924,159$ . Further, using door-to-door reports indicating the precinct covered, I calculate that, by the second round, 72.5 percent of doors knocked were located in treatment precincts allocated to canvassers, 14.1 percent in treatment precincts not allocated to them, and 13.3 percent in control precincts:  $x_{T,A}^2 = 72.5\%$ ,  $x_{T,\bar{A}}^2 = 14.1\%$ , and  $x_C^2 = 13.3\%$ . Finally, based on the assessment that the door-to-door campaign knocked on the initial target number of doors overall,  $N^2 \simeq N_a$ , and I get the second round multiplier  $m^2 \simeq 6.0$ . Based on door-to-door reports, contacts which occurred before the first round account for 76.5 percent of all doors knocked:  $N^1 = 0.765 \times N^2$ . In addition,  $x_{T,A}^1 = 73.0\%$ ,  $x_{T,\bar{A}}^1 = 14.0\%$ , and  $x_C^1 = 13.0\%$ . Thus, I get the first round multiplier  $m^1 \simeq 7.3$ .

Unlike the results from Equations [1] and [2] shown in the tables, the exact magnitude of the multiplier depends on the accuracy of the canvassers’ reports and of the overall scale of

the campaign  $N$ , and it should thus be interpreted with caution. Overestimating  $N$  would mean underestimating  $m$  (which is inversely proportional to it) and, thus, underestimating the effect of the campaign in precincts that were covered by canvassers and would not have been covered if they had not been assigned to the treatment group.

## 4 Results

### 4.1 Verifying randomization

Randomization ensures that all observable and unobservable characteristics should be symmetrically distributed between treatment and control precincts. Table 2 verifies this for a series of observed characteristics. It presents summary statistics separately for the control and treatment groups. I also show the difference between the means of the two groups and report the  $p$ -value of a test of the null hypothesis that they cannot be distinguished from each other. Overall, precincts in the two groups are very similar. I regress the treatment dummy on all characteristics included in Table 2 and test for their joint significance. I fail to reject the null ( $p$ -value of 0.97). One of the differences shown in Table 2 is significantly different from zero at the 5 percent level, however: the number of registered citizens, a variable which can be particularly important for turnout. For all results shown below, I include this variable as a control in one of the specifications. This has only a minimal impact, including in regressions measuring the impact on turnout. The results are also robust to trimming the 5 or 10 percent of precincts with the largest number of registered citizens (Tables included in Appendix E).

The average precinct contained 1,110 registered citizens. All 22 metropolitan French regions were represented in the sample. The municipality of the average precinct contained 67,000 citizens. In the municipality of the average precinct, 49 percent of the inhabitants were men, 36 percent were under 30 years old, 40 percent were between 30 and 60 years old, and 24 percent were older than 60. The working population accounted for 72 percent of all

people aged 15 to 64, of which 12 percent were currently unemployed, and median income was about 19,000 euros.

Finally, baseline participation, measured at the 2007 presidential election, was 84 percent, and the vote share of the PS candidate, Ségolène Royal, was 28 percent at the first round and 52 percent at the second round of this election. Treatment precincts are slightly more to the left, and characterized by a slightly lower participation than control precincts. Given the high correlation between electoral outcomes in the past and present, most specifications in the analysis below control for baseline electoral outcomes.

## 4.2 First stage

As discussed in Section 3.1, not all treatment precincts were allocated to the canvassers. In all tables that follow, I present estimates of Equation [1], which evaluates the effect of a precinct being assigned to the treatment group, in Panel A, and estimates of Equation [2], which evaluates the effect of a precinct being allocated to canvassers, in Panel B. Equation [2] instruments the dummy “allocated to canvassers” with the treatment assignment dummy. The estimation of the corresponding first stage equation (Equation [3]) is presented in Table 3.

I control for strata fixed effects in column 1, and find a first stage of 0.565. In addition to strata fixed effects, columns 2 through 7 also control for variables included in some of the 2SLS specifications: past outcome (turnout of PS vote share at the first round, second round, or averaged over both rounds of the 2007 presidential elections), and additional controls (the number of registered citizens in the precinct or municipality, as well as the level and the five-year change of the census variables). All estimates are significant at the 1 percent level, and similar in size.

## 4.3 Effects on the 2012 presidential election

### 4.3.1 Voter turnout

The impact of the door-to-door visits on voter turnout in the 2012 presidential election is analyzed in Table 4. I use as the outcome voter turnout in the first round (columns 1 through 3), in the second round (columns 4 through 6), and averaged over the two rounds (columns 7 through 9). In the control group, 79.5 and 80.1 percent of the voters participated in the first and second rounds. Door-to-door canvassing had no significant effect on voter turnout in either the first or the second round. The point estimates are relatively small in all specifications, whether or not control variables are included. Considering the upper bound of the 95 percent confidence interval, I can reject any effect higher than 0.40 percentage points in the first round at the 5 percent level and any effect higher than 0.20 percentage points in the second round, in the specification including all controls (columns 3 and 6). I do not find any significant impact of the door-to-door visits either on subsamples of territories identified as following the list of allocated precincts based only on canvassers' reports (Table B2 in Appendix B) or their answers to the postelectoral survey (Table B5).

### 4.3.2 Vote shares obtained by François Hollande

I now examine the impact of door-to-door canvassing on the vote shares obtained by François Hollande. As shown in Table 5, François Hollande obtained 31.6 percent of the votes in the control group in the first round and 57.6 percent in the second round. In treatment precincts, the door-to-door visits increased his vote share by 0.63 percentage points in the first round (Panel A, column 1) and by 0.48 percentage point in the second round of the presidential election (column 4). These estimates are significant at the 1 and 10 percent level respectively. When I control for past outcomes,  $\widetilde{PO}$ , the number of registered citizens, and census variables, I obtain estimates of 0.44 and 0.46 percentage points at the first and second rounds, both significant at the 5 percent level (columns 3 and 6). In precincts that

were actually allocated to canvassers, the effects were 0.84 and 0.87 percentage points (Panel B, columns 3 and 6). Applying the first and second rounds differential intensity multipliers computed in Section 3.4 to Panel A's ITT estimates, I obtain effects of 3.24 percentage points and 2.75 percentage points in the first and second rounds. This measures the impact of the visits in precincts that were covered by canvassers and would not have been covered if they had not been assigned to the treatment group. Again, I check the robustness of the results to restricting the sample to territories identified as following the list of allocated precincts based only on canvassers' reports (Table B3 in Appendix B) or their answers to the postelectoral survey (Table B6). In the first subsample, the effect of the door-to-door visits was 0.29 and 0.35 percentage points in the first and second rounds, but only the latter estimate is significant (at the 10 percent level). In the second subsample, the effects were 0.76 and 0.50 percentage points, but only the former estimate is significant (at the 5 percent level).

### **4.3.3 Vote shares of other candidates**

The correlate of the positive effect of door-to-door canvassing on the vote share obtained by François Hollande in the first round is a negative effect on the vote shares of other candidates. In Table 6, I assess the extent to which the different candidates were affected.

Columns 1 and 2 are identical to columns 1 and 3 of Table 5, and they are included for reference only. The combined effect of the door-to-door visits on the vote shares of the right-wing candidates Nicolas Sarkozy and Nicolas Dupont-Aignan was negative, slightly smaller than the effect on Hollande's vote share ( $-0.43$  percentage points), and significant at the 1 percent level (Panel A, column 10). Scaled by the differential multiplier, this corresponds to an effect of  $-3.14$  percentage points. Instead, the effect on the vote shares of the candidates of the far-left (Philippe Poutou and Nathalie Arthaud) was close to 0 (column 4). The effect on vote shares of the centrist candidate, François Bayrou, and of other left-wing candidates (Eva Joly and Jean-Luc Mélenchon) was negative but not statistically significant (columns

6 and 8). The effect on the vote share of the far-right candidate, Marine Le Pen, was also small and non-significant, although positive (column 12).

## **4.4 Effects on the 2012 parliamentary elections and the 2014 European elections**

### **4.4.1 Voter turnout**

I now investigate whether the effects of the visits were short-lived or whether they persisted in the first and second rounds of the 2012 parliamentary elections, which took place one month after the presidential, and in the 2014 European elections, which took place two years later. Tables 7 and 8 examine the effects on voter turnout and on the vote shares of PS candidates, respectively.

As expected, I find a significant effect on voter turnout neither in the parliamentary (Table 7, columns 3 and 4) nor the European elections (column 5).

### **4.4.2 Vote shares of candidates of the Parti Socialiste**

I now examine the impact of the visits on vote shares of PS candidates. Columns 1 and 2 of Table 8 are identical to columns 3 and 6 of Table 5. They show the impact of the door-to-door visits on François Hollande's vote shares at the 2012 presidential election and are included for reference only. This effect translated into effects of 0.94 and 0.73 percentage points, significant at the 1 percent level, on the vote share of PS candidates in the first and second rounds of the 2012 parliamentary elections (Panel A, columns 3 and 4). Remarkably, part of the effect persisted in the 2014 European elections, although the point estimate of 0.37 percentage points is only significant at the 10 percent level (column 5).

While columns 1 through 5 use expressed votes as the denominator to compute vote shares, columns 6 through 10 use registered voters as the denominator. Differently from participation and expressed votes, the number of registered voters is stable across elections.



Thus, although a less common and intuitive outcome, vote shares defined as a fraction of registered voters – instead of expressed votes – facilitates the comparison of the effect size across elections. Most of the effect of the visits on the vote share of Hollande in the presidential election persisted in the parliamentary elections one month later: the effect at the first round of these elections was even slightly larger (0.42 percentage points against 0.35 percentage points for the first round of the presidential election), but it was smaller and non-significant at the second round. Persistence two years later at the European elections was smaller (0.17 percentage points, or about 47 percent of the original effect) – and using this definition of vote shares, the effect is no longer statistically significant.

#### **4.5 Placebo checks on the 2007 presidential elections**

I conduct a placebo exercise using results from the 2007 presidential elections. I run the three exact same specifications as for the main results. For sociodemographic controls, I use 2006 data (instead of the 2011 controls used in the main regressions). For past outcomes, I control for the results of the 2002 presidential elections. All regressions exclude precincts whose boundaries were changed between 2007 and 2011. Regressions controlling for the 2002 outcomes also exclude precincts whose boundaries were changed between 2002 and 2007. Table 9 shows the impact on turnout and Table 10 the impact on Ségolène Royal's vote share (the candidate of the Parti Socialiste at the 2007 presidential elections).

In the second round of the 2007 elections, turnout and Royal's vote share were very close in treatment and control precincts. The difference is close to 0 and not statistically significant across all three specifications shown in columns 4 through 6 of Tables 9 and 10. The stratification of the randomization on the potential to win votes, itself estimated based on the 2007 second round results, ensured symmetry of the treatment and control groups on these outcomes.

In the first round of the 2007 elections, instead, turnout was lower and Royal's vote share

higher in treatment precincts. These differences are significant at the 10 percent level in the specification controlling only for strata fixed effects (column 1). They are no longer statistically significant when controlling for past outcome and additional controls (column 3). In particular, controlling for past outcome, the difference in Royal’s vote share in the first round is close to 0 (Table 10, columns 2 and 3), showing that first round voting behavior was not on differential trends in the treatment and control precincts. Thus, the 2012 and 2014 first round results shown above, which control for the 2007 outcomes, should not be driven by underlying differences.

Averaging over both rounds, neither turnout nor Royal’s vote share are significant in any of the specifications (columns 7 through 9). Controlling for past outcomes and additional controls, the difference between treatment and control precincts is very close to zero.

## 5 Interpretation of the results

### 5.1 Effect on the overall election outcome

Point estimates of the effects of the door-to-door visits on the vote shares of François Hollande and Nicolas Sarkozy at the first round of the presidential elections are 3.24 and -3.14 percentage points respectively in precincts that were covered by canvassers and would not have been covered had they not been assigned to the treatment group.<sup>21</sup> Assuming that the impact was of same magnitude in all precincts covered, and since the canvassers covered approximately 11 percent of all French households before the first round and 15 percent before the second round, I obtain that the door-to-door canvassing campaign increased François Hollande’s national vote share by 0.37 percentage points in the first round of the presidential elections and that it decreased Nicolas Sarkozy’s vote share by 0.36 percentage points. Overall, it thus accounted for about one half of Hollande’s 1.45 percentage point lead in the first round.

---

<sup>21</sup>As discussed in Section 4.3.2, these effects are computed by applying the first and second rounds differential intensity multipliers to ITT estimates.

The effect on Hollande’s vote share in the second round was 2.75 percentage points, implying an increase of his national vote share by 0.41 percentage points. Since there were only two candidates in the second round, it was automatically mirrored by a negative effect of the same size on the vote share of Sarkozy: in total, the visits increased Hollande’s victory margin by 0.83 percentage points. Since Hollande won with 51.6 percent of the votes, against 48.4 for Sarkozy, the effect of door-to-door canvassing accounted for about one fourth of the victory margin.

Finally, taking into account the imperfect compliance and the fraction of addresses covered, I estimate that door-to-door canvassing increased PS candidates’ vote shares by 0.66 percentage points, on average, in the second round of the parliamentary elections. This is by no means negligible: PS candidates won by an even lower margin in 5.9 percent of the constituencies (15 out of 254) in which they won in the second round.

## 5.2 Persuasion vs. mobilization

Two mechanisms could explain the impact on the vote share of François Hollande: the persuasion of undecided active voters (who would have voted for another candidate absent the visits) and the mobilization of left-wing non-voters (who would have stayed home). To assess the importance of the second mechanism, I use a seemingly unrelated regressions (SUR) framework, compare the impact on turnout and on vote shares, and test the hypothesis that they are equal. I use the number of registered citizens as the denominator for both outcomes, to ensure their comparability. The results are shown in Table G1 in Appendix G. The effect on voter turnout was negative in the second round but positive in the first round, where it corresponds to 30.5 percent of the effect on vote share (column 3). Imprecision in the point estimates implies that the real contribution of the mobilization channel may of course have been larger. However, it is unlikely to explain all the vote share increase: I reject (at the 5 or 10 percent level) the null hypothesis that the effects on turnout and vote

shares were equal, in all but one specification. These results suggest that the increase in Hollande’s vote share was driven by persuasion more than by the mobilization of left-wing non-voters.<sup>22</sup>

An alternative interpretation is possible. The door-to-door visits may have demobilized right-wing voters at the same time as they increased participation on the left, translating into small net effects on turnout but large effects on vote shares. By improving the short-term opinions of François Hollande, visits from canvassers may have contradicted the partisan predispositions of supporters of other candidates and generated psychological tension (Fiorina, 1976). One response to cognitive dissonance is to avoid situations likely to increase it (Festinger, 1957, 1962) – which in this context would be to forego voting in the election. It is difficult to disentangle these two interpretations using aggregate data, but for a few reasons demobilization of other candidates’ supporters, while not entirely implausible, seems less likely than persuasion. First, existing experiments find that partisan field campaigns increase turnout among supporters of other parties or leave it unaffected, not that they decrease it (Nickerson, 2005; Arceneaux and Kolodny, 2009; Foos and de Rooij, 2017). Second, while negative political ads can decrease voter turnout in certain contexts (Ansolabehere et al. 1994; Krupnikov 2011; but see Wattenberg and Briens, 1999; Goldstein and Freedman, 2002), the campaign relied on positive rather than negative arguments, as can be seen in the toolkit and field organizers’ guide included in Appendix H (Figures H1 and H2), consistent with the emphasis put on the mobilization of left-wing supporters. Third, of all types of voters, those that could have been deemed most likely to feel cross-pressured after the visit of François Hollande’s canvassers are probably the supporters of Marine Le Pen. Indeed, many voters of the Front National are former voters of the left, and many maintain leftist prefer-

---

<sup>22</sup>This interpretation may seem at odds with the fact that the campaign gave priority to the mobilization of left-wing supporters. However, any precinct allocated to canvassers represents several hundreds of registered citizens. As a consequence, in each precinct, these citizens display a wide array of profiles. In particular, even in precincts with a large number of left-wing nonvoters, a majority of voters participate in the presidential elections, and many of them vote for right-wing candidates. In sum, although the main target of the campaign were left-wing nonvoters, only a minority of the people with whom the canvassers interacted corresponded to this type.

ences on economic issues (Perrineau, 2005; Mayer, 2011).<sup>23</sup> The visits could have awakened this past loyalty and created a tension with the voters' new allegiance to the far-right. But as shown in Section 4.3.3, the visits did not decrease the vote share of the far-right candidate.

If indeed the effects were obtained by persuading swing voters to vote left, what fraction were persuaded? Since 48 percent of the doors knocked by canvassers opened, I scale the point estimates by  $\frac{1}{0.48}$  and find that 6.7 percent and 5.7 percent of the voters living in households that opened their door were persuaded to vote for François Hollande in the first and second rounds of the presidential elections.<sup>24</sup> Applying the definition of persuasion rate proposed by DellaVigna and Kaplan (2007), I compare these fractions to the fractions of control group voters who supported candidates other than François Hollande in the first and second rounds (respectively 70.1 percent and 44.0 percent). I compute that the fraction of voters who changed their behavior in response to the visits were 9.6 percent and 13.0 percent respectively. These persuasion rates are of the same order of magnitude as those measured by studies that examine the impact of door-to-door canvassing on the decision to vote or not (see DellaVigna and Gentzkow, 2010). For instance, using turnout as their outcome, Gerber and Green (2000) and Green et al. (2003) find persuasion rates of door-to-door canvassing of 15.6 percent and 11.5 percent respectively. The persuasion rates obtained in the present

---

<sup>23</sup>In the one-dimensional representation of the political spectrum, the localization of the FN on the far right makes it the party most distant from the PS. But in France as in most Western European countries and the U.S., the left-right split has not one, but at least two dimensions, sociocultural and economic, which overlap only imperfectly (e.g., Lipset, 1959; Fleishman, 1988; Knutsen, 1995). On the sociocultural dimension, the platforms of the FN and the PS are diametrically opposed: vehement anti-immigrant positions and a model of authoritarian and closed society on one side; a pro-immigration stance and a model of open and libertarian society on the other (e.g., Pettigrew, 1998; Arzheimer, 2009; Mayer, 2013). On the economic dimension, however, the distance between the FN and the PS, which traditionally promotes state interventionism against economic liberalism, is much smaller. It has further decreased since Marine Le Pen succeeded her father as the leader of the FN in 2011. Her program for the 2012 election asked for a more protective state and more public services – two points that closely echoed the program of the PS. Together with anti-elite stances directed against the corrupt political establishment and the privileged few, this economic platform was designed to attract blue-collar workers, mid-level employees, and other groups exposed to unemployment and precariousness, which until recently largely supported the left.

<sup>24</sup>This scaling assumes, first, that on average households that opened their doors contained as many registered citizens as those that did not, and it considers as “treated” all citizens living in a household that opened its door, regardless of whether or not they interacted personally with the canvasser. Second, I assume that the precinct-level effects of the visits were driven by voters (and household members) who received them, and not by spillovers on voters who did not interact with canvassers but were persuaded by talking with voters who did.

experiment also compare with those associated with new exposure to media – 4.4, 11.6, and 7.7 percent for TV (Gentzkow, 2006; DellaVigna and Kaplan, 2007; Enikolopov et al., 2011), 19.5 and 12.9 percent for newspaper (Gerber et al., 2009; Gentzkow et al., 2011) – and they are substantially higher than the persuasion rates of all of a candidates’ combined TV advertising (an average 0.7 percent in Spenkuch and Toniatti (2016)) or political endorsement by a newspaper (an average 4.3 percent in Chiang and Knight (2011)).

### 5.3 Beliefs vs. preferences

Persuasion can affect behavior through different mechanisms (DellaVigna and Gentzkow, 2010). Canvassers may have persuaded voters by changing their preferences on some political issues or by changing their beliefs about the quality of Hollande. The short average length of the visits makes the first mechanism unlikely. The fact that most voters that were canvassed had never been visited by a political activist before (Lefebvre, 2016) makes the second mechanism more plausible: these novel and surprising visits sent a strong signal about the quality of the PS and its candidate. According to this interpretation, the voters were persuaded by the signal sent by the canvassers’ presence more than by their specific arguments. Door-to-door canvassing contrasted with the idea that the political world is solely populated by politicians who do not care about what voters think.<sup>25</sup> It showed that Hollande and his supporters were willing to bridge the gap with voters and it put forth the image of the PS as a modern and innovative party.

This interpretation is in line with theories of costly signalling such as laid out by Coate and Conlin (2004), where voters do not know whether candidates are qualified and candidates use campaign resources to convey information about their qualifications. Although I cannot directly test this interpretation, the effects of the visits on the vote shares of other candidates of different political affiliations provide some (granted, limited) empirical support. As shown

---

<sup>25</sup>According to a survey conducted after the 2012 presidential elections, 71 percent of French people feel that politicians care little or not at all about what they think and 66 percent do not trust political parties (Cevipof, 2012).

in Section 4.3.3 and Table 6, the visits decreased the vote shares of right-wing candidates by 0.43 percentage points, which is almost as large as the effect on Hollande's vote share (0.44 percentage points) and much larger than the effect on the vote shares of other left-wing candidates (- 0.11 percentage points). The effect, compared to vote shares in the control group, is more than twice as large for right-wing candidates than other left-wing candidates. Again using the SUR framework, I cannot reject that the effects were the same ( $p$ -value of 0.21, as shown in Table G2, column 4). It remains that, taken at face value, the estimates suggest the increase of Hollande's vote share was obtained by taking votes from right-wing candidates more than from other left-wing candidates. But right-wing voters were ideologically more distant from Hollande. They could thus be deemed less susceptible to align their preferences with his political agenda than voters supporting other left-wing candidates, who offered a closer ideological platform. This again makes it less likely that voters' political preferences changed, and more likely that their beliefs about the PS and its candidate did.

## 5.4 Mechanisms underlying effect persistence

I finally discuss the persistence of the effect of the visits on vote shares obtained by left-wing candidates. Nearly all the original effect carried over to the 2012 parliamentary elections which took place one month later. This suggests that most voters persuaded by the visits were active voters, who participated not only in the presidential election but also in these lower salience elections, and that they were consistent in who they voted for. In addition, around 40 percent of the original effect carried over to the 2014 European elections. Although at the margin of statistical significance, this finding is perhaps all the more striking as the PS suffered an important defeat in the latter elections.

The persistence of the effect in the parliamentary and European elections can come from two main channels, direct and indirect. First, the direct effect of the visits may have been

long-lived: it is possible that the canvassers durably changed voters' beliefs about the quality of the PS (or changed voters' preferences). Second, voting for a PS candidate today may in itself increase the likelihood to vote for a PS candidate in the future. Multiple mechanisms may explain this habit formation, including cognitive dissonance (Festinger, 1957, 1962), or increased expressive utility of voting for this particular party.<sup>26</sup> Existing evidence that documents persistence of electoral behavior has mostly focused on voter turnout (Gerber et al., 2003; Meredith, 2009; Davenport et al., 2010; Garcia Bedolla and Michelson, 2012; Fujiwara et al., 2016). While estimates of the magnitude of persistence differ, Fujiwara et al. (2016) find that habit formation alone can generate near-to-full persistence of the impact of rainfall shocks on participation four years later. Beyond voter turnout, Mullainathan and Washington (2009) and Kaplan and Mukand (2014) find, respectively, long-lasting effects of participation in U.S. presidential elections on presidential opinion ratings, and persistence of the effect of 9/11/01 attacks on party of registration. Our study complements this literature by showing that transitory shocks to vote choice can generate persistent effects as well.

This result contrasts with Gerber et al. (2011) who find rapid decay of the effects of TV and radio ads on voting preferences, with two possible interpretations. The first is that the personal and interactive aspects of the door-to-door visits generate direct effects of a different nature than TV ads: while the latter only prime evaluative criteria, as hypothesized by the authors, the former actually change voters' views, with consequences lasting after the contact

---

<sup>26</sup>Two additional mechanisms may have contributed to the large effects at the parliamentary elections, even though they are unlikely to account for the bulk of them. The first is that the impact of the campaign may have interacted with Hollande's victory: while some voters were directly persuaded by the visits, others may have only been persuaded to vote on the left after they witnessed Hollande's victory, for instance because after the canvassers' visit they remained reluctant to vote left out of disbelief that the left had any chance to win the elections. The second is that some canvassers engaged in door-to-door canvassing between the presidential and parliamentary elections and that they disproportionately covered treatment precincts. While the list of precincts and addresses allocated to canvassers remained available only until the presidential election, some activists who had canvassed these areas before the presidential election may have returned there and canvassed them again before the parliamentary elections. Note however that the opposite may have happened too (canvassers going to areas which they had not been allocated during the presidential campaign, in an effort to cover their entire territory) and that the campaign for the parliamentary elections was of a much lower intensity than the presidential campaign. Additional canvassing is even less likely to explain the (lower) persistence at the European elections, where the intensity of the field campaign was much lower still.



was forgotten. The second interpretation is that direct effects of both types of campaigning on voter preferences are short lived, and that persistence mostly comes from the indirect vote choice channel. While the campaign studied in this paper continued until the day before the election and did affect vote choice in that election, the advertisement campaign evaluated by Gerber et al. (2011) stopped nine months before and likely failed to affect decisions, preventing persistence through vote choice.

## 6 Conclusion

This paper reports the results of a countrywide field experiment conducted during François Hollande’s door-to-door campaign in the 2012 French presidential election. The campaign spanned all French regions, encompassed very different types of areas, from Paris to rural villages, and reached an estimated five million households. The study contributes to a large literature on the drivers and effects of persuasive communication, and extends it in three important directions.

First, while targeted appeals transmitted in one-on-one discussions have been repeatedly found effective in increasing voter participation, the existing evidence comes from framed field experiments which can carefully select the agents carrying out these interventions, and control the content of their conversations. Results obtained in these settings may not fully extend to large-scale campaigns like the one studied here, which typically lack such control, even when they are managed very professionally (Enos and Hersh, 2015). Second, and more important, the large scale of the experiment enabled, for the first time, randomization to be conducted at the precinct level while maintaining high statistical power. Unlike in prior studies randomized at the individual or household level, I can thus measure the impact of the door-to-door visits both on voter turnout and on actual vote shares, using official precinct-level election results. This provides the first hard evidence that door-to-door campaigns actually affect electoral outcomes, and constitutes perhaps the main contribution of this

paper. Third, I discuss important challenges inherent to embedding an experiment in a large campaign and ways to address them effectively. For the implementing organization, the cost of giving up on covering areas deemed strategic but allocated to the control group may be particularly dissuasive when stakes are as high as during a presidential electoral campaign. The randomization rule was thus designed to ensure that precincts allocated to canvassers had the highest possible expected potential to win votes compatible with running an experiment. In addition, resources to ensure that all local units of the Parti Socialiste and the estimated 80,000 activists who took part in the campaign downloaded the lists of allocated precincts and followed these lists were scarce, creating a threat for the implementation of the randomization plan. I combine two independent data sources – reports entered by local activists on the campaign website and answers to a postelectoral survey – to identify which territories used the list of allocated precincts. Estimates of the impact of the campaign are comparable in the sets of territories identified based on either of these datasets.

In the combined sample of 791 territories that participated in the experiment, accounting for 5.02 million registered voters, I find that door-to-door canvassing did not significantly affect voter turnout but increased François Hollande’s vote share by 3.24 percentage points in the first round of the election and 2.75 percentage points in the second in precincts that were covered by canvassers and would not have been covered if they had not been assigned to the treatment group. Assuming that the effect was of similar magnitude in all areas covered by the campaign, this accounted for approximately one half of Hollande’s lead in the first round and one fourth of his victory margin at the second round. At the same time, the intervention decreased the vote share obtained by the right-wing candidates, with no significant effects on the vote shares of other candidates in the center, on the left, or on the far-right. Although several interpretations for this are possible, the most plausible is that the effects were obtained by persuading swing voters to vote left, rather than by mobilizing left-wing nonvoters or demobilizing opponents. The effect of the doorstep discussions persisted

in the 2012 parliamentary elections, which took place one month later – and even to the 2014 European elections, though the effect is far weaker.

These results are surprising, given that the campaign material and instructions, though mentioning the right-wing incumbent Nicolas Sarkozy, focused on the mobilization of left-wing nonvoters. The lack of mobilizing impact of door-to-door canvassing also stands in contrast to the findings of most previous field experiments conducted in a variety of contexts and countries, including during a partisan door-to-door campaign in France (Pons and Liegey, 2016). It may be explained by the very high salience that characterizes French presidential elections. A review of U.S. experimental results conducted by Arceneaux and Nickerson (2009) finds that the effectiveness of door-to-door outreach is conditioned by voters’ baseline propensity to vote. In the context of high-turnout elections, campaigns can mobilize low-propensity voters. But even in presidential elections, voter turnout is much lower in the U.S. than in the context of this study. The level of political awareness is high in French presidential elections, and encouragement to vote by friends and family members at its peak. As a result, there may simply have been no one left to mobilize.

On the other hand, the large persuasion impact of the campaign suggests that one-on-one discussions have a strong potential to shift people’s decisions even when the principal’s control on the campaign’s agents is limited. This finding may have implications that reach beyond political campaigns to persuasive communication directed at consumers, donors, or investors. Further research should test systematically the generalizability of these findings by identifying the conditions under which one-on-one discussions and other modes of persuasion are most effective. In the current context, two dimensions may have contributed to the large persuasion impact of door-to-door canvassing. First, the signal of quality sent by the visits may have mattered more than the actual content of the discussions, and it may have been all the stronger, as most voters contacted by the campaign had never been canvassed before. Conversely, the effect of persuasive communication may dampen as a larger number of political parties or companies engage in one-on-one discussions with voters or consumers.

Second, the diversity of political parties and platforms in France results in weaker partisan affiliations and more frequent changes in vote choice than in bipartisan contexts, such as in the U.S. Further research could test whether the persuasion effect varies negatively with the intensity of preexisting voters' partisan affiliations or preexisting consumers' attachment to specific brands.

## References

- Adena, Maja, Ruben Enikolopov, Maria Petrova, Veronica Santarosa, and Ekaterina Zhuravskaya**, “Radio and the Rise of the Nazis in Prewar Germany,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2015, 130 (4), 1885–1939.
- Aker, Jenny C., Paul Collier, and Pedro Vicente**, “Is Information Power? Using Cell Phones during an Election in Mozambique,” *World Development*, 2011, (May), 1–53.
- Ansolabehere, Stephen, Shanto Iyengar, Adam Simon, and Nicholas Valentino**, “Does Attack Advertising Demobilize the Electorate?,” *The American Political Science Review*, 1994, 88 (4), 829–838.
- Arceneaux, Kevin**, “Using Cluster Randomized Field Experiments to Study Voting Behavior,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, sep 2005, 601 (1), 169–179.
- , “I’m Asking for Your Support: The Effects of Personally Delivered Campaign Messages on Voting Decisions and Opinion Formation,” *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 2007, 2 (1), 43–65.
- **and David W. Nickerson**, “Who is Mobilized to Vote? A Re-Analysis of Eleven Randomized Field Experiments,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 2009, 53 (1), 1–16.
- **and** —, “Comparing Negative and Positive Campaign Messages: Evidence From Two Field Experiments,” *American Politics Research*, 2010, 38 (1), 54–83.
- **and Robin Kolodny**, “Educating the least informed: Group endorsements in a grassroots campaign,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 2009, 53 (4), 43–65.
- Arzheimer, Kai**, “Contextual factors and the extreme right vote in Western Europe, 1980–2002,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 2009, 53 (2), 259–275.
- Ashworth, Scott and Joshua D. Clinton**, “Does Advertising Exposure Affect Turnout?,” *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 2007, 2 (August 2005), 27–41.

- Atkeson, Lonna Rae**, “Sure, I Voted for the Winner! Overreport of the Primary Vote for the Party Nominee in the National Election Studies,” *Political Behavior*, 1999, *21* (3), 197–215.
- Bailey, Michael, Daniel J. Hopkins, and Todd Rogers**, “Unresponsive and Unpersuaded: The Unintended Consequences of Voter Persuasion Efforts,” *Political Behavior*, may 2016, *38*, 1–34.
- Banerjee, Abhijit V., Arun G. Chandrasekhar, Esther Duflo, and Matthew O. Jackson**, “The diffusion of microfinance,” *Science*, 2013, *341* (6144), 1236498.
- , **Esther Duflo, and Rachel Glennerster**, “Putting a Band-Aid on a Corpse: Incentives for Nurses in the Indian Public Health Care System,” *Journal of the European Economic Association*, jan 2008, *6* (2-3), 487–500.
- , **Selvan Kumar, Rohini Pande, and Felix Su**, “Do informed voters make better choices? Experimental evidence from urban India,” *Working paper*, 2011.
- Barton, Jared, Marco Castillo, and Ragan Petrie**, “What Persuades Voters? A Field Experiment on Political Campaigning,” *Economic Journal*, 2014, *124* (574), 293–326.
- Bergan, Daniel E., Alan S. Gerber, and Donald P. Green**, “Grassroots mobilization and voter turnout in 2004,” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 2005, *69* (5), 760–777.
- Bobonis, Gustavo J. and Frederico Finan**, “Neighborhood Peer Effects in Secondary School Enrollment Decisions,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2009, *91* (4), 695–716.
- Bond, Robert M., Christopher J. Fariss, Jason J. Jones, Adam D. I. Kramer, Cameron Marlow, Jaime E. Settle, and James H. Fowler**, “A 61-million-person experiment in social influence and political mobilization,” *Nature*, 2012, *489* (7415), 295–298.
- Broockman, David E. and Donald P. Green**, “Do Online Advertisements Increase Political Candidates’ Name Recognition or Favorability? Evidence from Randomized Field Experiments,” *Political Behavior*, 2014, *36* (2), 263–289.
- **and Joshua Kalla**, “Durably reducing transphobia: A field experiment on door-to-door canvassing,” *Science*, 2016, *352* (6282), 220–224.

- Cameron, A. Colin, Jonah B. Gelbach, and Douglas L. Miller**, “Bootstrap-Based Improvements for Inference with Clustered Errors,” *Review of Economics and Statistics*, 2008, *90* (3), 414–427.
- Campante, Filipe, Ruben Durante, and Francesco Sobbrío**, “Politics 2.0: the Multifaceted Effect of Broadband Internet on Political Participation,” *NBER Working Paper 19029*, 2014, (April).
- Campbell, James E.**, “Explaining Politics, Not Polls: Reexamining Macropartisanship with Recalibrated NES Data,” *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 2010, *74* (4), 616–642.
- Cardy, Emily Arthur**, “An Experimental Field Study of the GOTV and Persuasion Effects of Partisan Direct Mail and Phone Calls,” *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, sep 2005, *601* (1), 28–40.
- Cevipof**, “Enquête post-électorale de l’élection présidentielle 2012 CEVIPOF,” 2012, (<http://www.cevipof.com/fr/2012/recherche/postelect>).
- Chiang, Chun Fang and Brian Knight**, “Media bias and influence: Evidence from newspaper endorsements,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 2011, *78* (3), 795–820.
- Chong, Alberto, Ana L. De La O, Dean Karlan, and Leonard Wantchekon**, “Does Corruption Information Inspire the Fight or Quash the Hope? A Field Experiment in Mexico on Voter Turnout, Choice, and Party Identification,” *Journal of Politics*, 2015, *77* (1), 55–71.
- Coate, Stephen and Michael Conlin**, “A Group Rule: Utilitarian Approach to Voter Turnout: Theory and Evidence,” *American Economic Review*, 2004, *94* (5), 1476–1504.
- Collier, Paul and Pedro C. Vicente**, “Votes and Violence: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Nigeria,” *Economic Journal*, 2014, *124* (574), 327–355.
- Conley, Timothy G. and Christopher R. Udry**, “Learning about a New Technology: Pineapple in Ghana,” *American Economic Review*, 2010, *100* (1), 35–69.
- Davenport, Tiffany C., Alan S. Gerber, Donald P. Green, Christopher W. Larimer, Christopher B. Mann, and Costas Panagopoulos**, “The enduring effects

- of social pressure: Tracking campaign experiments over a series of elections,” *Political Behavior*, 2010, *32* (3), 423–430.
- DellaVigna, Stefano and Ethan Kaplan**, “The Fox News Effect: Media Bias and Voting,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2007, *122* (3), 1187–1234.
- **and Matthew Gentzkow**, “Persuasion: Empirical Evidence,” *Annual Review of Economics*, 2010, *2*, 643–649.
- , **John A. List, Ulrike Malmendier, and Gautam Rao**, “Voting to Tell Others,” *Review of Economic Studies*, 2017, *84*, 143–181.
- Dewan, Torun, Macartan Humphreys, and Daniel Rubenson**, “The elements of political persuasion: Content, Charisma and Cue,” *Economic Journal*, 2014, *124* (574), 257–292.
- Druckman, James N.**, “Political Preference Formation: Competition, Deliberation, and the (Ir)relevance of Framing Effects,” *The American Political Science Review*, 2004, *98* (4), 671–686.
- Duflo, Esther and Emmanuel Saez**, “The role of information and social interactions in retirement plan decisions: Evidence from a randomized experiment,” *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2003, *118* (3), 815–842.
- Elster, Jon**, *Deliberative Democracy*, Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- Enikolopov, Ruben, Maria Petrova, and Ekaterina Zhuravskaya**, “Media and Political Persuasion: Evidence from Russia,” *American Economic Review*, 2011, *101* (7), 3253–3285.
- Enos, Ryan D. and Eitan D. Hersh**, “Party Activists as Campaign Advertisers: The Ground Campaign as a Principal-Agent Problem,” *American Political Science Review*, 2015, *109* (2), 252–278.
- Esarey, Justin and Andrew Menger**, “Practical and Effective Approaches to Dealing with Clustered Data,” *Political Science Research and Methods*, 2017.



- Falck, Oliver, Robert Gold, and Stephan Heblich**, “E-Lectons: Voting Behavior and the Internet E-Lectons: Voting Behavior and the Internet,” *American Economic Review*, 2014, *104* (7), 2238–2265.
- Farrar, Cynthia, Donald P. Green, Jennifer E. Green, David W. Nickerson, and Steven Shewfelt**, “Does Discussion Group Composition Affect Policy Preferences? Results from Three Randomized Experiments,” *Political Psychology*, 2009, *30* (4), 615–647.
- Festinger, Leon**, *A Theory of Cognitive Dissonance*, California: Stanford University Press, 1957.
- , “Cognitive dissonance,” *Scientific American*, 1962, *207* (4), 93–107.
- Fiorina, Morris P.**, “The Voting Decision: Instrumental and Expressive Aspects,” *Journal of Politics*, 1976, *38* (2), 390–413.
- Fleishman, John A.**, “Attitude organization in the general public: Evidence for a bidimensional structure,” *Social Forces*, 1988, *67* (1), 159–184.
- Foos, Florian and Eline A. de Rooij**, “The role of partisan cues in voter mobilization campaigns: Evidence from a randomized field experiment,” *Electoral Studies*, 2017, *45*, 63–74.
- Foster, Andrew D. and Mark R. Rosenzweig**, “Learning by Doing and Learning from Others: Human Capital and Technical Change in Agriculture,” *Journal of Political Economy*, 1995, *103* (6), 1176–1209.
- Fujiwara, Thomas and Leonard Wantchekon**, “Can informed public deliberation overcome clientelism? Experimental evidence from Benin,” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2013, *5* (4), 241–255.
- , **Kyle Meng, and Tom Vogl**, “Habit formation in voting: Evidence from rainy elections,” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2016, *8* (4), 160–188.
- Garcia Bedolla, Lisa and Melissa R. Michelson**, *Mobilizing inclusion: Transforming the electorate through get-out-the-vote campaigns*, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012.

- Gelman, Andrew, Sharad Goel, Douglas Rivers, and David Rothschild**, “The Mythical Swing Voter,” *Forthcoming in Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 2016.
- Gentzkow, Matthew**, “Television and Voter Turnout,” *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 2006, *121* (3), 931–972.
- , **Jesse M. Shapiro, and Michael Sinkinson**, “The Effect of Newspaper Entry and Exit on Electoral Politics,” *American Economic Review*, 2011, *101* (7), 2980–3018.
- Gerber, Alan S.**, “Does campaign spending work? Field experiments provide evidence and suggest new theory,” *American Behavioral Scientist*, 2004, *47* (5), 541–574.
- **and Donald P. Green**, “The Effects of Canvassing, Telephone Calls, and Direct Mail on Voter Turnout: A field experiment,” *American Political Science Review*, 2000, *94* (3), 653–663.
- **and** – , *Get out the vote*, Brookings Institution Press, 2015.
- , **Dean Karlan, and Daniel Bergan**, “Does the Media Matter? A Field Experiment Measuring the Effect of Newspapers on Voting Behavior and Political Opinion,” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2009, *1* (2), 35–52.
- , **Donald P. Green, and Matthew Green**, “Partisan mail and voter turnout: results from randomized field experiments,” *Electoral Studies*, dec 2003, *22* (4), 563–579.
- , **James G. Gimpel, Donald P. Green, and Daron R. Shaw**, “How Large and Long-lasting Are the Persuasive Effects of Televised Campaign Ads? Results from a Randomized Field Experiment,” *American Political Science Review*, 2011, *105* (1), 135–150.
- Goldstein, Ken and Paul Freedman**, “Campaign Advertising and Voter Turnout: New Evidence for a Stimulation Effect,” *The Journal of Politics*, 2002, *64* (3), 721–740.
- Green, Donald P., Alan S. Gerber, and David W. Nickerson**, “Getting Out the Vote in Local Elections: Results from Six Door-to-Door Canvassing Experiments,” *Journal of Politics*, 2003, *65* (4), 1083–1096.
- Grossman, Guy, Macartan Humphreys, and Gabriella Sacramone-Luz**, “Information Technology and Political Engagement: Mixed Evidence from Uganda,” 2015, ([http://www.columbia.edu/~mh2245/papers1/GHS\\_Scale.pdf](http://www.columbia.edu/~mh2245/papers1/GHS_Scale.pdf)).

- Habermas, Jürgen**, *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996.
- Hillygus, D. Sunshine and Todd G. Shields**, *The Persuadable Voter: Wedge Issues in Presidential Campaigns*, Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2014.
- Hirano, Keisuke, Guido W. Imbens, Donald B. Rubin, and Xiao-Hua Zhou**, “Assessing the effect of an influenza vaccine in an encouragement design,” *Biostatistics*, 2000, 1 (1), 69–88.
- Isenberg, Daniel J.**, “Group Polarization: A Critical Review and Meta-Analysis,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1986, 50 (6), 1141–1151.
- Issenberg, Sasha**, *The Victory Lab: The Secret Science of Winning Campaigns*, New York, NY: Crown, 2012.
- Kaplan, Ethan and Sharun Mukand**, “The Persistence of Political Partisanship: Evidence from 9/11,” *Mimeo, University of Maryland*, 2014.
- Kendall, Chad, Tommaso Nannicini, and Francesco Trebbi**, “How Do Voters Respond to Information? Evidence from a Randomized Campaign,” *American Economic Review*, 2015, 105 (1), 322–353.
- Knutsen, Oddbjørn**, “The impact of old politics and new politics value orientations on party choice a comparative study,” *Journal of Public Policy*, 1995, 15 (1), 1–63.
- Krasno, Jonathan S. and Donald P. Green**, “Do Televised Presidential Ads Increase Voter Turnout? Evidence from a Natural Experiment,” *The Journal of Politics*, 2008, 70 (1), 245–261.
- Krupnikov, Yanna**, “When does negativity demobilize? Tracing the conditional effect of negative campaigning on voter turnout,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 2011, 55 (4), 797–813.
- Larreguy, Horacio A., John Marshall, and James M. Snyder Jr**, “Leveling the Playing Field: How Campaign Advertising Can Help Non-Dominant Parties,” *No. w22949. National Bureau of Economic Research*, 2016.

- Lazarsfeld, Paul Felix, Bernard Berelson, and Hazel Gaudet**, *The People's Choice: How the Voter Makes Up His Mind in a Presidential Campaign*, New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1944.
- Lefebvre, Rémi**, “La modernisation du porte-à-porte au Parti socialiste. Réinvention d’un répertoire de campagne et inerties militantes,” *Politix*, 2016, *113* (1), 91.
- Liegey, Guillaume, Arthur Muller, and Vincent Pons**, *Porte-à-Porte: Reconquérir la démocratie sur le terrain*, Calmann-Lévy, 2013.
- Lipset, Seymour Martin**, “Democracy and working-class authoritarianism,” *American Sociological Review*, 1959, *24* (1), 482–501.
- Luskin, Robert C., James S. Fishkin, and Roger Jowell**, “Considered Opinions: Deliberative Polling in Britain,” *British Journal of Political Science*, 2002, *32* (03), 455–487.
- Marx, Benjamin, Vincent Pons, and Tavneet Suri**, “Voter Mobilization Can Backfire: Evidence from Kenya,” *Working paper*, 2016.
- Mayer, Nonna**, “Why Extremes Don’t Meet: Le Pen and Besancenot Voters in the 2007 French Presidential Election,” *French Politics, Culture & Society*, dec 2011, *29* (3), 101–120.
- , “From Jean-Marie to Marine Le Pen: Electoral Change on the Far Right,” *Parliamentary Affairs*, dec 2013, *66* (1), 160–178.
- Meredith, Marc**, “Persistence in political participation,” *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 2009, *4* (3), 187–209.
- Mullainathan, Sendhil and Ebonya Washington**, “Sticking with Your Vote: Cognitive Dissonance and Political Attitudes,” *American Economic Journal: Applied Economics*, 2009, *1* (1), 86–111.
- Myers, David G. and George D. Bishop**, “Discussion effects on racial attitudes,” *Science*, 1970, *169*, 778–779.


- Nickerson, David W.**, “Partisan Mobilization Using Volunteer Phone Banks and Door Hangers,” *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 2005, 601 (1), 10–27.
- , “Quality is job one: Professional and volunteer voter mobilization calls,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 2007, 51 (2), 269–282.
- , “Is Voting Contagious? Evidence from Two Field Experiments,” *American Political Science Review*, 2008, 102 (1), 49–57.
- Panagopoulos, Costas and Donald P. Green**, “Field Experiments Testing the Impact of Radio Advertisements on Electoral Competition,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 2008, 52 (1), 156–168.
- Perrineau, Pascal**, “La dynamique du vote Le Pen. Le poids du gauchisme,” in Pascal Perrineau and Colette Ysmal, eds., *Le vote de crise. L’élection présidentielle de 1995*, Paris: Presses de Sciences Po, 2005.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F.**, “Reactions toward the new minorities of Western Europe,” *Annual review of sociology*, 1998, 24, 77–103.
- Pew Research Center**, “Assessing the representativeness of public opinion surveys,” 2012.
- Pons, Vincent and Guillaume Liegey**, “Increasing the Electoral Participation of Immigrants - Experiment Evidence from France,” *Harvard Business School Working Paper, No. 16-094*, 2016.
- Rogers, Todd and Joel A. Middleton**, “Are Ballot Initiative Outcomes Influenced by the Campaigns of Independent Groups? A Precinct-Randomized Field Experiment Showing That They Are,” *Political Behavior*, 2015, 37 (3), 567–593.
- Shaw, Daron R., Donald P. Green, James G. Gimpel, and Alan S. Gerber**, “Do robotic calls from credible sources influence voter turnout or vote choice? Evidence from a randomized field experiment,” *Journal of Political Marketing*, 2012, 11 (4), 231–245.
- Simon, Herbert A. and Frederick Stern**, “The Effect of Television upon Voting Behavior in Iowa in the 1952 Presidential Election.,” *American political science review*, 1955, 49 (2), 470–477.

- Spenkuch, Jorg L. and David Toniatti**, “Political Advertising and Election Outcomes,” *Working paper*, 2016.
- Terra Nova**, “Moderniser la Vie Politique: Innovations Américaines, Leçons pour la France,” *Rapport de la mission d’étude de Terra Nova sur les techniques de campagne américaines*, 2009, (<http://www.acteurspublics.com/files/nominations/rapportus.pdf>).
- Wantchekon, Leonard**, “Clientelism and Voting Behavior: Evidence from a Field Experiment in Benin,” *World Politics*, 2003, 55 (03), 399–422.
- Wattenberg, Martin P. and Craig Leonard Brians**, “Negative Campaign Advertising: Demobilizer or Mobilizer?,” *The American Political Science Review*, 1999, 93 (4), 891–899.
- Wright, Gerald C**, “Errors in Measuring Vote Choice in the National Election Studies, 1952-88,” *American Journal of Political Science*, 1993, 37, 291–316.


# Figures and Tables

## Figure 1. Results of the 2012 and 2014 elections


### Presidential election, 2012



### Parliamentary elections, 2012




### European elections, 2014



Source: French Ministry of the Interior

Notes: In the first round of the presidential election, the far-left candidates were Philippe Poutou (Nouveau Parti Anticapitaliste) and Nathalie Arthaud (Lutte Ouvrière). The left candidates other than François Hollande were Jean-Luc Mélenchon (Front de Gauche) and Eva Joly (Europe Ecologie les Verts). The center candidate was François Bayrou (Mouvement démocrate). The right candidate other than Nicolas Sarkozy was Nicolas Dupont-Aignan (Debout la République).

**Figure 2. Turnout at French presidential, parliamentary, and European elections, 1958-2014**



Source: French Ministry of the Interior


Notes: French turnout rates are computed using the number of registered citizens (rather than the number of eligible citizens) as the denominator. Turnout shown for the presidential and parliamentary elections is the average between the turnout at the first and second rounds.



### Figure 3. Weekly progress of the campaign, by département


April 6<sup>th</sup>

Progress of the campaign




April 13<sup>th</sup>

Progress of the campaign




April 20<sup>th</sup>

Progress of the campaign




April 27<sup>th</sup>

Progress of the campaign




May 4<sup>th</sup>

Progress of the campaign



Notes: These maps show the advancement of the campaign against the initial objectives set in terms of number of doors to knock.

**Figure 4. Daily number of doors knocked in the entire country**



Notes: I plot the number of doors knocked by canvassers as reported by them on the campaign's website.

## Figure 5. Randomization rule, and allocation of treatment precincts to canvassers

### Example:

\* A hypothetical territory with a total of 17 precincts

\* TA, the target number of registered citizens to be covered by the campaign in the territory, was determined (before the randomization) to be 3174

### Step 1: Stratification

Compute the potential to win votes PO in each precinct.

Rank precincts from highest to lowest PO and build strata of 5 precincts:

\* the 5 precincts with the highest PO are allocated to the 1st stratum

\* the next 5 precincts are allocated to the 2nd stratum, and so on.

Precinct ID	# reg. citizens	PO	Precinct ID	# reg. citizens	PO	Stratum
1	1033	0.103	10	961	0.121	1
2	918	0.083	15	1246	0.120	1
3	1175	0.093	5	1158	0.119	1
4	1184	0.103	9	962	0.117	1
5	1158	0.119	17	1021	0.104	1
6	854	0.082	1	1033	0.103	2
7	963	0.092	4	1184	0.103	2
8	876	0.097	8	876	0.097	2
9	962	0.117	16	1098	0.096	2
10	961	0.121	3	1175	0.093	2
11	997	0.067	7	963	0.092	3
13	907	0.087	13	907	0.087	3
14	971	0.067	2	918	0.083	3
15	1246	0.120	6	854	0.082	3
16	1098	0.096	18	1218	0.076	3
17	1021	0.104	14	971	0.067	4
18	1218	0.076	11	997	0.067	4

### Step 2: Randomization

First stratum (always included in the randomization):

Randomly assign the precincts in the 1st stratum to the Treatment and Control groups:

\* 4 precincts are assigned to Treatment

\* 1 precinct is assigned to Control.

*In this example:*

The total number of reg. citizens in the 2 first Treatment precincts (10, 5) is 2119, which is lower than TA (3174). The total number of reg. citizens in the 3 first Treatment precincts (10, 5, 9) is 3081, which is higher than TA. Thus, the 3 first Treatment precincts are allocated to the canvassers, but the 4th (17) is not.

Precinct ID	# reg. citizens	PO	Stratum	Treatment
10	961	0.121	1	1
15	1246	0.120	1	0
5	1158	0.119	1	1
9	962	0.117	1	1
17	1021	0.104	1	1

Precinct ID	# reg. citizens	PO	Stratum	Treatment	Allocated
10	961	0.121	1	1	1
15	1246	0.120	1	0	0
5	1158	0.119	1	1	1
9	962	0.117	1	1	1
17	1021	0.104	1	1	0

Second stratum and higher-numbered strata:

If the total number of reg. citizens in the 4 Treatment precincts of the 1st stratum is higher than TA, the 1st stratum is the single stratum of the territory included in the randomization.

If, on the other hand, the total number of reg. citizens in the 4 Treatment precincts of the 1st stratum is lower than TA, the 2nd stratum of the territory is also included in the randomization (step 2) and all or a subset of its Treatment precincts are allocated to the canvassers (step 3).

Then again, if (and only if) the total number of reg. citizens in the 8 Treatment precincts of the 1st and 2nd strata is lower than TA, the 3rd stratum is also included in the randomization. And so on.

*In this example:*

The total number of reg. citizens in the 4 Treatment precincts of the 1st stratum is 4103, which is higher than TA (3174). Thus, no other stratum is included in the randomization. If instead TA had been set to 5174 (for instance), the 2nd stratum would have been included in the randomization and one at least of its Treatment precincts allocated to the canvassers.

**Table 1: Canvassers' profile and feedback on the campaign (post-electoral survey)**

<i>Panel A. Canvassers' profile</i>	
Age	
29 or less	11.1%
30 - 45	23.0%
46 - 59	36.1%
60 and beyond	29.4%
Non-response	0.5%
Responsibilities within the campaign	
Volunteer	58.8%
Field organizer or head of local unit	37.1%
Département coordinator	4.2%
Non-response	0.0%
Relationship to Parti Socialiste	
Member for five years or more	52.0%
Member for less than five years	27.3%
Sympathiser and had previously been involved in a campaign	8.3%
Sympathiser and is involved in a campaign for the first time	12.4%
Non-response	
Previous field campaigning experience	
Had never done door-to-door canvassing	43.2%
Had done door-to-door canvassing a few times	34.5%
Had often done door-to-door canvassing	22.2%
Non-response	0.1%
<i>Panel B. Involvement in the campaign</i>	
Attended a training session on door-to-door canvassing?	
Yes	59.0%
No	41.0%
Non-response	
Number of door-to-door sessions taken part to	
1 to 2	13.3%
3 to 10	48.4%
More than 10	38.2%
Non-response	0.1%
Type of areas canvassed	
Big cities (more than 100 000 inhabitants)	25.4%
Middle-size cities (10 000 - 100 000)	47.2%
Rural areas (<10 000)	27.4%
Non-response	0.1%
Did you (or your local unit) use the list of priority polling stations or municipalities that was provided by the campaign?	
I never heard of this list	29.1%
We did not use this list at all, or only very little	16.3%
We used this list partially	11.2%
We went to almost all the priority polling stations or cities	43.5%
Non-response	0.0%

Notes: I report the responses of canvassers to an online voluntary postelectoral survey administered during the week following the second round of the 2012 presidential election. N = 1,972.

**Table 1 (cont.): Canvassers' profile and feedback on the campaign (post-electoral survey)**

<i>Panel B. Involvement in the campaign (cont.)</i>	
Did you use the toolkits provided by the campaign?	
No	33.8%
Sometimes	43.7%
Yes, most of the time	22.5%
Non-response	0.0%
How much door-to-door canvassing did you do, compared with other campaign activities?	
I did some door-to-door canvassing, but mostly other activities	24.0%
I did as much door-to-door canvassing as other campaign activities	48.4%
I mostly did door-to-door canvassing	27.6%
Non-response	0.0%
Were there sympathisers in your local canvassers' team?	
Yes	70.7%
No	29.3%
Non-response	0.0%
Did your team try to recruit sympathisers for door-to-door canvassing?	
Yes	65.1%
No	34.9%
Non-response	0.0%
<i>Panel C. Canvassers' feedback on the campaign</i>	
Overall, what do you think of door-to-door canvassing?	
I will not do it again	0.8%
One should do some, but not more than other campaign activities	38.5%
It is a really good technique and should be of the main campaign activities	60.8%
Non-response	0.0%
If you like door-to-door canvassing, why so?	
It is good to take part in a large and countrywide campaign activity	6.9%
It is effective	31.0%
It is fun	2.5%
It is a good way to spread the ideas and values of the left	31.3%
It is an enriching experience	27.2%
Non-response	1.0%
Overall, how helpful was the support provided by the national team and the département's team?	
It was very helpful	49.3%
It was sometime helpful	48.0%
The less we see them, the better we are	2.7%
Non-response	
Overall, on a scale from 1 to 5 (where 1 means useless and 5 excellent) how did you like the web platform "Toushollande Terrain"?	
1	1.6%
2	7.6%
3	28.3%
4	41.4%
5	21.1%
Non-response	0.0%

Notes : I report the responses of canvassers to an online voluntary postelectoral survey administered during the week following the second round of the 2012 presidential election. N = 1,972.

**Table 2: Summary statistics**

	Control group		Treatment group		<i>P-value</i> Treatment = Control	Number of obs.
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
<i>Panel A. Electoral outcomes</i>						
Randomization at precinct level	0.504	0.500	0.504	0.500	0.992	3397
Number of registered citizens	1014.3	1097.6	1133.8	1605.3	0.022	3397
Potential to win votes, PO	0.089	0.035	0.089	0.033	0.970	3397
Voter turnout, 2007 pres. election, first round	0.843	0.050	0.840	0.048	0.231	2665
Voter turnout, 2007 pres. election, second round	0.837	0.045	0.836	0.045	0.675	2665
PS vote share, 2007 pres. election, first round	0.274	0.081	0.279	0.081	0.172	2665
PS vote share, 2007 pres. election, second round	0.515	0.103	0.516	0.101	0.743	2665
<i>Panel B. Location</i>						
Population of the municipality	68310.9	277136.8	66254.4	273841.2	0.863	3397
Region						
Ile-de-France	0.160	0.367	0.160	0.367	0.994	3397
Champagne-Ardenne	0.028	0.166	0.028	0.164	0.927	3397
Picardie	0.053	0.225	0.054	0.226	0.953	3397
Haute-Normandie	0.043	0.203	0.041	0.199	0.861	3397
Centre-Val de Loire	0.058	0.234	0.058	0.235	0.958	3397
Basse-Normandie	0.024	0.152	0.025	0.156	0.851	3397
Bourgogne	0.039	0.193	0.039	0.193	0.999	3397
Nord-Pas-de-Calais	0.016	0.127	0.019	0.136	0.663	3397
Lorraine	0.043	0.203	0.045	0.207	0.839	3397
Alsace	0.016	0.127	0.019	0.137	0.616	3397
Franche-Comté	0.024	0.152	0.024	0.153	0.984	3397
Pays-de-la-Loire	0.067	0.250	0.064	0.245	0.815	3397
Bretagne	0.058	0.234	0.061	0.240	0.731	3397
Poitou-Charentes	0.024	0.152	0.024	0.154	0.939	3397
Aquitaine	0.045	0.206	0.044	0.204	0.927	3397
Midi-Pyrénées	0.040	0.196	0.040	0.196	0.997	3397
Limousin	0.034	0.182	0.030	0.172	0.637	3397
Rhône-Alpes	0.113	0.317	0.109	0.312	0.786	3397
Auvergne	0.040	0.196	0.040	0.195	0.962	3397
Languedoc-Roussillon	0.046	0.210	0.046	0.209	0.992	3397
Provence-Alpes-Côte-d'Azur	0.028	0.166	0.028	0.166	0.990	3397
Corse	0.001	0.039	0.001	0.038	0.993	3397
<i>Panel C. Sociodemographic characteristics of the population of the municipality</i>						
Share of men	0.488	0.023	0.487	0.024	0.273	3397
Share of the population with age						
0 - 14	0.182	0.038	0.181	0.037	0.541	3397
15 - 29	0.175	0.052	0.175	0.053	0.923	3397
30 - 44	0.196	0.034	0.195	0.032	0.810	3397
45 - 59	0.207	0.033	0.205	0.033	0.222	3397
60 - 74	0.148	0.042	0.149	0.043	0.325	3397
75 and older	0.093	0.038	0.094	0.040	0.521	3397
Within population of 15 - 64						
Share of working population	0.726	0.052	0.723	0.054	0.185	3397
Share of unemployed (among working populatio	0.123	0.050	0.124	0.051	0.575	3397
Median income	19234.3	3850.1	19262.1	3911.2	0.870	3246

*Notes* : For each variable, I report the means and standard deviations in both the control group and the treatment group and indicate the *p*-value of the difference. The unit of observation is the unit of randomization (precinct or municipality).

**Table 3. First stage**

	No control		With controls				
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Treatment	0.5652 (0.0137)	0.5233 (0.0173)	0.5247 (0.0172)	0.5238 (0.0172)	0.5241 (0.0173)	0.5245 (0.0172)	0.5240 (0.0172)
Strata fixed effects	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Control for past outcome and PO		x	x	x	x	x	x
Additional controls		x	x	x	x	x	x
2007 outcome controlled for		Voter turnout, round 1	Voter turnout, round 2	Voter turnout, average	Vote share Royal, round 1	Vote share Royal, round 2	Vote share Royal, average
Observations	3390	2660	2660	2660	2660	2660	2660
R-squared	0.258	0.424	0.423	0.424	0.423	0.424	0.424
Mean in Control Group	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000	0.0000

*Notes* : The table shows first stage results from Equation [3]. The unit of observation is the unit of randomization (precinct, or municipality). Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

All regressions include strata fixed effects. Regressions in columns 2 through 7 control for PO (proxy for the potential to win votes) and for past outcomes, measured at the level of randomization: voter turnout or vote share obtained by Ségolène Royal in the first round, in the second round, or averaged over both rounds of the 2007 presidential election. Additional controls include the number of registered citizens in the precinct or municipality as well as the level and the five-year change of the following census variables: the municipality's population, the share of men, the share of different age groups (from 0 to 14; from 15 to 29; from 30 to 44; from 45 to 59; from 60 to 74; above 75), the share of working population, and the share of unemployed population among the working population.

Regressions controlling for past outcomes need to exclude precincts whose boundaries had changed after 2007, which explains the lower number of observations.

**Table 4: Impact on voter turnout**

	Voter turnout								
	First round			Second round			Average of first and second rounds		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
<i>Panel A. ITT Estimation</i>									
Treatment	0.0001 (0.0016)	0.0008 (0.0015)	0.0011 (0.0015)	-0.0005 (0.0015)	-0.0011 (0.0015)	-0.0008 (0.0014)	-0.0002 (0.0015)	-0.0001 (0.0014)	0.0002 (0.0014)
Strata fixed effects	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Control for past outcome and PO		x	x		x	x		x	x
Additional controls			x			x			x
Observations	3390	2660	2660	3390	2660	2660	3390	2660	2660
R-squared	0.000	0.328	0.410	0.000	0.255	0.326	0.000	0.328	0.405
Mean in Control Group	0.7951	0.8081	0.8081	0.8014	0.8122	0.8122	0.7983	0.8101	0.8101
<i>Panel B. Instrumental variable estimation: "allocated to canvassers" instrumented with "treatment"</i>									
Allocated to canvassers	0.0001 (0.0029)	0.0015 (0.0029)	0.0021 (0.0028)	-0.0009 (0.0027)	-0.0021 (0.0028)	-0.0015 (0.0028)	-0.0004 (0.0027)	-0.0001 (0.0027)	0.0004 (0.0026)
Strata fixed effects	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Control for past outcome and PO		x	x		x	x		x	x
Additional controls			x			x			x
Observations	3390	2660	2660	3390	2660	2660	3390	2660	2660

*Notes* : Panel A shows the effect of a precinct being assigned to the treatment group (ITT results from Equation [1]). Panel B shows the effect of a precinct being allocated to canvassers (2SLS results from Equation [2]). The unit of observation is the unit of randomization (precinct, or municipality). Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

All regressions include strata fixed effects. Regressions in columns (2), (5), and (8) also control for PO (proxy for the potential to win votes) and for past outcomes, measured at the level of randomization. Additional controls in columns (3), (6), and (9) include the number of registered citizens in the precinct or municipality as well as the level and the five-year change of the following census variables: the municipality's population, the share of men, the share of different age groups (from 0 to 14; from 15 to 29; from 30 to 44; from 45 to 59; from 60 to 74; above 75), the share of working population, and the share of unemployed population among the working population.

Regressions controlling for past outcomes need to exclude precincts whose boundaries had changed after 2007, which explains the lower number of observations.



**Table 5: Impact on Hollande's vote share**

	Hollande's vote share								
	First round			Second round			Average of first and second rounds		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
<i>Panel A. ITT Estimation</i>									
Treatment	0.0063 (0.0023)	0.0050 (0.0019)	0.0044 (0.0018)	0.0048 (0.0028)	0.0053 (0.0019)	0.0046 (0.0018)	0.0056 (0.0024)	0.0049 (0.0017)	0.0043 (0.0016)
Strata fixed effects	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Control for past outcome and PO		x	x		x	x		x	x
Additional controls			x			x			x
Observations	3390	2660	2660	3390	2660	2660	3390	2660	2660
R-squared	0.003	0.516	0.528	0.001	0.632	0.645	0.002	0.645	0.655
Mean in Control Group	0.3157	0.2994	0.2994	0.5757	0.5597	0.5597	0.4457	0.4295	0.4295
<i>Panel B. Instrumental variable estimation: "allocated to canvassers" instrumented with "treatment"</i>									
Allocated to canvassers	0.0112 (0.0041)	0.0094 (0.0036)	0.0084 (0.0035)	0.0084 (0.0050)	0.0099 (0.0036)	0.0087 (0.0035)	0.0098 (0.0042)	0.0092 (0.0031)	0.0081 (0.0030)
Strata fixed effects	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Control for past outcome and PO		x	x		x	x		x	x
Additional controls			x			x			x
Observations	3390	2660	2660	3390	2660	2660	3390	2660	2660

*Notes* : Panel A shows the effect of a precinct being assigned to the treatment group (ITT results from Equation [1]). Panel B shows the effect of a precinct being allocated to canvassers (2SLS results from Equation [2]). The unit of observation is the unit of randomization (precinct, or municipality). Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

All regressions include strata fixed effects. Regressions in columns (2), (5), and (8) also control for PO (proxy for the potential to win votes) and for past outcomes, measured at the level of randomization. Additional controls in columns (3), (6), and (9) include the number of registered citizens in the precinct or municipality as well as the level and the five-year change of the following census variables: the municipality's population, the share of men, the share of different age groups (from 0 to 14; from 15 to 29; from 30 to 44; from 45 to 59; from 60 to 74; above 75), the share of working population, and the share of unemployed population among the working population.

Regressions controlling for past outcomes need to exclude precincts whose boundaries had changed after 2007, which explains the lower number of observations.

**Table 6: Impact on all parties' vote shares**

	Hollande		Far-left		Left other than Hollande		Center		Right		Far-right	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)
<i>Panel A. ITT Estimation</i>												
Treatment	0.0063 (0.0023)	0.0044 (0.0018)	0.0000 (0.0004)	0.0003 (0.0005)	-0.0022 (0.0017)	-0.0011 (0.0017)	-0.0008 (0.0010)	-0.0007 (0.0010)	-0.0037 (0.0021)	-0.0043 (0.0016)	0.0006 (0.0018)	0.0016 (0.0016)
Strata fixed effects	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Control for past outcome and PO		x		x		x		x		x		x
Additional controls		x		x		x		x		x		x
Observations	3390	2660	3390	2660	3390	2660	3390	2660	3390	2660	3390	2660
R-squared	0.003	0.528	0.000	0.056	0.001	0.271	0.000	0.231	0.001	0.526	0.000	0.434
Mean in Control Group	0.3157	0.2994	0.0192	0.0200	0.1539	0.1514	0.0837	0.0865	0.2455	0.2528	0.1792	0.1873
<i>Panel B. Instrumental variable estimation: "allocated to canvassers" instrumented with "treatment"</i>												
Allocated to canvassers	0.0112 (0.0041)	0.0084 (0.0035)	0.0000 (0.0007)	0.0007 (0.0009)	-0.0040 (0.0030)	-0.0022 (0.0033)	-0.0015 (0.0018)	-0.0014 (0.0020)	-0.0066 (0.0037)	-0.0082 (0.0030)	0.0011 (0.0031)	0.0031 (0.0030)
Strata fixed effects	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Control for past outcome and PO		x		x		x		x		x		x
Additional controls		x		x		x		x		x		x
Observations	3390	2660	3390	2660	3390	2660	3390	2660	3390	2660	3390	2660

*Notes* : Panel A shows the effect of a precinct being assigned to the treatment group (ITT results from Equation [1]). Panel B shows the effect of a precinct being allocated to canvassers (2SLS results from Equation [2]). The unit of observation is the unit of randomization (precinct, or municipality). Robust standard errors are in parentheses. The far-left candidates (columns 3 and 4) were Nathalie Arthaud (endorsed by Lutte Ouvrière) and Philippe Poutou (Ligue Communiste Révolutionnaire). The candidates on the left other than François Hollande (columns 5 and 6) were Eva Joly (Europe Ecologie Les Verts) and Jean-Luc Mélenchon (Front de Gauche). The candidate on the center (columns 7 and 8) was François Bayrou (Modem). The candidates on the right (columns 9 and 10) were Nicolas Sarkozy (Union pour un Mouvement Populaire) and Nicolas Dupont-Aignan (Debout la République). The candidate on the far right (columns 11 and 12) was Marine Le Pen (Front National). All regressions include strata fixed effects. Regressions in even-numbered columns control for PO (proxy for the potential to win votes), past outcomes, measured at the level of randomization, and additional controls. Additional controls include the number of registered citizens in the precinct or municipality as well as the level and the five-year change of the following census variables: the municipality's population, the share of men, the share of different age groups (from 0 to 14; from 15 to 29; from 30 to 44; from 45 to 59; from 60 to 74; above 75), the share of working population, and the share of unemployed population among the working population. Regressions controlling for past outcomes need to exclude precincts whose boundaries had changed after 2007, which explains the lower number of observations.

**Table 7: Impact on voter turnout at the following elections**

	Voter turnout				
	2012 presidential election		2012 parliamentary elections		2014 european elections
	First round (1)	Second round (2)	First round (3)	Second round (4)	(5)
<i>Panel A. ITT Estimation</i>					
Treatment	0.0011 (0.0015)	-0.0008 (0.0014)	-0.0024 (0.0022)	-0.0025 (0.0024)	0.0014 (0.0027)
Strata fixed effects	x	x	x	x	x
Control for past outcome and PO	x	x	x	x	x
Additional controls	x	x	x	x	x
Constituency fixed effects			x	x	
Observations	2660	2660	2660	2443	2544
R-squared	0.410	0.326	0.347	0.307	0.226
Mean in Control Group	0.8081	0.8122	0.5884	0.5680	0.4457
<i>Panel B. Instrumental variable estimation: "allocated to canvassers" instrumented with "treatment"</i>					
Allocated to canvassers	0.0021 (0.0028)	-0.0015 (0.0028)	-0.0046 (0.0042)	-0.0049 (0.0046)	0.0026 (0.0051)
Strata fixed effects	x	x	x	x	x
Control for past outcome and PO	x	x	x	x	x
Additional controls	x	x	x	x	x
Constituency fixed effects			x	x	
Observations	2660	2660	2660	2443	2544

Notes : Panel A shows the effect of a precinct being assigned to the treatment group (ITT results from Equation [1]). Panel B shows the effect of a precinct being allocated to canvassers (2SLS results from Equation [2]). The unit of observation is the unit of randomization (precinct, or municipality). Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

All regressions include strata fixed effects, control for PO (proxy for the potential to win votes), past outcomes, measured at the level of randomization, and additional controls. Additional controls include the number of registered citizens in the precinct or municipality as well as the level and the five-year change of the following census variables: the municipality's population, the share of men, the share of different age groups (from 0 to 14; from 15 to 29; from 30 to 44; from 45 to 59; from 60 to 74; above 75), the share of working population, and the share of unemployed population among the working population. Regressions in columns (3) and (4) also control for constituency fixed effects to account for differences in the number and identity of competing candidates across constituencies, at the 2012 parliamentary elections.

**Table 8: Impact on vote shares of PS candidates at the following elections**

	PS vote share as fraction of expressed votes					PS vote share as fraction of registered voters				
	2012 presidential election		2012 parliamentary elections		2014 european elections	2012 presidential election		2012 parliamentary elections		2014 european elections
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)
<i>Panel A. ITT Estimation</i>										
Treatment	0.0044 (0.0018)	0.0046 (0.0018)	0.0094 (0.0026)	0.0073 (0.0024)	0.0037 (0.0021)	0.0035 (0.0015)	0.0032 (0.0016)	0.0042 (0.0018)	0.0031 (0.0019)	0.0017 (0.0012)
Strata fixed effects	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Control for past outcome and PO	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Additional controls	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Constituency fixed effects			x	x				x	x	
Observations	2660	2660	2660	2443	2544	2660	2660	2660	2443	2544
R-squared	0.528	0.645	0.692	0.827	0.302	0.480	0.602	0.624	0.726	0.239
Mean in Control Group	0.2994	0.5597	0.3246	0.4545	0.1425	0.2355	0.4241	0.1876	0.2481	0.0605
<i>Panel B. Instrumental variable estimation: "allocated to canvassers" instrumented with "treatment"</i>										
Allocated to canvassers	0.0084 (0.0035)	0.0087 (0.0035)	0.0181 (0.0050)	0.0142 (0.0048)	0.0070 (0.0039)	0.0067 (0.0029)	0.0061 (0.0030)	0.0080 (0.0034)	0.0060 (0.0037)	0.0032 (0.0022)
Strata fixed effects	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Control for past outcome and PO	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Additional controls	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Constituency fixed effects			x	x				x	x	
Observations	2660	2660	2660	2443	2544	2660	2660	2660	2443	2544

Notes: Panel A shows the effect of a precinct being assigned to the treatment group (ITT results from Equation [1]). Panel B shows the effect of a precinct being allocated to canvassers (2SLS results from Equation [2]). The unit of observation is the unit of randomization (precinct, or municipality). Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

All regressions include strata fixed effects, control for PO (proxy for the potential to win votes), past outcomes, measured at the level of randomization, and additional controls. Additional controls include the number of registered citizens in the precinct or municipality as well as the level and the five-year change of the following census variables: the municipality's population, the share of men, the share of different age groups (from 0 to 14; from 15 to 29; from 30 to 44; from 45 to 59; from 60 to 74; above 75), the share of working population, and the share of unemployed population among the working population. Regressions in columns (3), (4), (8), and (9) also control for constituency fixed effects to account for differences in the number and identity of competing candidates across constituencies, at the 2012 parliamentary elections.

**Table 9: Placebo - Impact on voter turnout in 2007**

	First round			Voter turnout Second round			Average of first and second rounds		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
<i>Panel A. ITT Estimation</i>									
Treatment	-0.0026 (0.0014)	-0.0026 (0.0014)	-0.0023 (0.0014)	-0.0005 (0.0012)	0.0001 (0.0013)	0.0003 (0.0012)	-0.0015 (0.0012)	-0.0011 (0.0012)	-0.0009 (0.0012)
Strata fixed effects	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Control for past outcome		x	x		x	x		x	x
Additional controls			x			x			x
Observations	2660	2133	2133	2660	2133	2133	2660	2133	2133
R-squared	0.002	0.267	0.301	0.000	0.196	0.243	0.001	0.303	0.341
Mean in Control Group	0.8428	0.8494	0.8494	0.8373	0.8432	0.8432	0.8400	0.8463	0.8463
<i>Panel B. Instrumental variable estimation: "allocated to canvassers" instrumented with "treatment"</i>									
Allocated to canvassers	-0.0048 (0.0026)	-0.0049 (0.0028)	-0.0044 (0.0027)	-0.0009 (0.0023)	0.0001 (0.0024)	0.0005 (0.0024)	-0.0029 (0.0023)	-0.0021 (0.0023)	-0.0017 (0.0023)
Strata fixed effects	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Control for past outcome		x	x		x	x		x	x
Additional controls			x			x			x
Observations	2660	2133	2133	2660	2133	2133	2660	2133	2133

*Notes* : Panel A shows the effect of a precinct being assigned to the treatment group (ITT results from Equation [1]). Panel B shows the effect of a precinct being allocated to canvassers (2SLS results from Equation [2]). The unit of observation is the unit of randomization (precinct, or municipality). Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

All regressions include strata fixed effects. Regressions in columns (2), (5), and (8) also control for past outcomes, measured at the level of randomization. Additional controls in columns (3), (6), and (9) include the number of registered citizens in the precinct or municipality, the municipality's population, the share of men, the share of different age groups (from 0 to 14; from 15 to 29; from 30 to 44; from 45 to 59; from 60 to 74; above 75), the share of working population, and the share of unemployed population among the working population.

Regressions controlling for past outcomes need to exclude precincts whose boundaries had changed after 2002, which explains the lower number of observations.

**Table 10: Placebo - Impact on Royal's vote share in 2007**

	Royal's vote share								
	First round			Second round			Average of first and second rounds		
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
<i>Panel A. ITT Estimation</i>									
Treatment	0.0050 (0.0027)	0.0015 (0.0024)	0.0007 (0.0023)	0.0009 (0.0029)	-0.0013 (0.0024)	-0.0014 (0.0023)	0.0029 (0.0026)	-0.0002 (0.0020)	-0.0006 (0.0020)
Strata fixed effects	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Control for past outcome		x	x		x	x		x	x
Additional controls			x			x			x
Observations	2660	2133	2133	2660	2133	2133	2660	2133	2133
R-squared	0.002	0.371	0.395	0.000	0.495	0.509	0.001	0.525	0.541
Mean in Control Group	0.2740	0.2620	0.2620	0.5146	0.5056	0.5056	0.3943	0.3838	0.3838
<i>Panel B. Instrumental variable estimation: "allocated to canvassers" instrumented with "treatment"</i>									
Allocated to canvassers	0.0093 (0.0049)	0.0028 (0.0045)	0.0015 (0.0045)	0.0016 (0.0054)	-0.0025 (0.0046)	-0.0028 (0.0046)	0.0055 (0.0048)	-0.0004 (0.0039)	-0.0011 (0.0039)
Strata fixed effects	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Control for past outcome		x	x		x	x		x	x
Additional controls			x			x			x
Observations	2660	2133	2133	2660	2133	2133	2660	2133	2133

*Notes* : Panel A shows the effect of a precinct being assigned to the treatment group (ITT results from Equation [1]). Panel B shows the effect of a precinct being allocated to canvassers (2SLS results from Equation [2]). The unit of observation is the unit of randomization (precinct, or municipality). Robust standard errors are in parentheses.

All regressions include strata fixed effects. Regressions in columns (2), (5), and (8) also control for past outcomes, measured at the level of randomization. Past PS vote share at the second round of the 2002 presidential election is proxied by the sum of first round vote shares of all Left-wing candidates since the PS candidate (Lionel Jospin) failed to qualify for the second round (he unexpectedly arrived third, behind the Right and Far-right candidates). Additional controls in columns (3), (6), and (9) include the number of registered citizens in the precinct or municipality, the municipality's population, the share of men, the share of different age groups (from 0 to 14; from 15 to 29; from 30 to 44; from 45 to 59; from 60 to 74; above 75), the share of working population, and the share of unemployed population among the working population.

Regressions controlling for past outcomes need to exclude precincts whose boundaries had changed after 2002, which explains the lower number of observations.