Table A2: Meta-Analysis Result By Base Rate of Turnout Including New Studies

Turnout Rate in Control Group	All Canvassing: Average CACE	N	Nonadvocacy canvassing only: Average CACE	N
Under % 30	4.7891 [1.1344]	23	3.2816 [0.9608]	17
% 30 to % 50	6.2261 [1.0131]	16	6.6953 [1.1646]	13
% 50 to % 70	1.8288 [0.7436]	14	2.2142 [0.8792]	11
% 70 and higher	0.6649 [1.0233]	3	0.6173 [1.0937]	2

* Standard errors in brackets. Overall estimates for all canvassing studies and all non-advocacy studies are 3.9690 [0.6184] with a confidence interval ranging from (2.7569, 5.1811) and 3.8172 [0.6308] with a confidence interval ranging from (2.5808, 5.0536) respectively.

Table B1: Direct Mail Non-Partisan No Social Pressure

	Estimate	SE	T-Value	P-Value	Lower CI	Upper CI	N
New	0.4679 ***	0.0808	5.7905	<.0001	0.3095	0.6263	59

Table B2: Direct Mail Non-Partisan No Social Pressure, No Gratitude, No Soft Social Pressure

	Estimate	SE	T-Value	P-Value	Lower CI	Upper CI	N
New	0.2963 ***	0.0806	3.6756	0.0002	0.1383	0.4544	49

Table B3: Direct Mail Advocacy Mailers that do not invoke Social Pressure

	Estimate	SE	T-Value	P-Value	Lower CI	Upper CI	
New	0.0783	0.0766	1.0221	0.3067	-0.0719	0.2285	23

Table B4: Direct Mail Pooled Social Pressure

	Estimate	SE	T-Value	P-Value	Lower CI	Upper CI	N
New	2.1459 ***	0.3636	5.9024	<.0001	1.4333	2.8585	21

Table C1: Volunteer Calls (32 Studies in Overall, 28 in Original)

	Estimate	SE	T-Value	P-Value	Lower CI	Upper CI	N
New	2.7999 ***	0.5326	5.2569	<.0001	1.7560	3.8439	32

Table C2: Commercial Phone Banking (22 Studies in Overall, 19 in Original)

	Estimate	SE	T-Value	P-Value	Lower CI	Upper CI	N
New	0.9469***	0.2138	4.4294	<.0001	0.5279	1.3659	22

Table C3: Robo Calls (6 Studies in Overall, 4 in Original)

	Estimate	SE	T-Value	P-Value	Lower CI	Upper CI	N
New	0.2342 *	0.0997	2.3494	0.0188	0.0388	0.4296	6

Table D1: Text Message Appeals

Estimate	SE	T-Value	P-Value	Lower CI	Upper CI	N
00.2895 **	0.0937	3.0887	0.0020	0.1058	0.4732	13

Table E1: New Study Tabs – Canvassing

Author	Meta_b	Meta_SE	Advocacy	Control_turnout
Kalla and Broockman NC	2.310	1.040	1	50% to 70%
Broockman and Green One AZ	2.625	1.722	0	50% to 70%
Bailey et al. 2016 Persuasion	1.500	2.003	1	50% to 70%
Melissa R. Michelson Spectra 2015	11	5.600	1	$> 30\%$
Melissa R. Michelson Spectra 2016	1	2.900	1	$< 70\%$

Table E2: New Study Tabs – Direct Mailing

Context	Study	ATE	SE	Advocacy?	Social pressure?
2010G	Gerber et al. – Connecticut	0.924	0.194	0	0
2014G	Gerber et al. – 17 States	0.700	0.100	0	1
2014G	Gerber et al. – Mississippi	3.400	0.354	0	1
2017G	Endres and Panagopoulos – Virginia	-0.032	0.478	0	0
2014P	Hughes et al. – CA (Information)	0.467	0.097	0	0
2014P	Hughes et al. – CA (Partisan)	0.530	0.120	1	0
2016G	Mann and Fischer – North Carolina	1.253	0.458	0	1
2015M	Michelson – Washington	6.400	1.600	1	0
2012P	Ying Shi – North Carolina	-0.672	0.509	1	0
2016P	Michael Sweeney – Illinois	1.670	1.087	0	1
2014G	Gerber et al. – AR, FL, GA, KS, MA, MI, and WI	0.420	0.127	0	0
2010P	Binder et al. – California	-0.050	0.495	0	0
2012G	Mann, Torres and Sinclair – Florida	0.030	0.020	0	0
2014G	Gerber et al. – AK, GA, LA, MI, NC, and TX	0.800	0.200	0	1
2015G	Mann, Davis, and Michelson – NJ, VA	2.2043	0.125	0	1
2016G	Mann, Davis, and Michelson - North Carolina	1.0004	0.407	0	1
2010G	Rogers, Ternvoski, Yoeli – 17 States	0.601	0.134	0	0
2016S	Hans Hassell – Minnesota	0.446	0.833	1	0
2013M	Murray and Matland – Dane County, WI and El Paso County, TX	0.350	0.198	0	0
2016P	Costa, Schaffner, Prevost – Pennsylvania	4.500	2.164	2	0
2016G	Costa, Schaffner, Prevost – Colorado	3.500	1.299	2	0

Table E3: New Study Tabs – Commercial Phone Calls

Author	EID	Meta_b	Meta_SE	SocialPressure
Gerber et al.	2014 Midterm GHFR	1.24	1.425	0
Gerber et al.	2014 Primary	1.421	0.681	0
Gerber et al.	2014 Primary Study 1 Norms	2.300	0.707	0

Table E4-1: New Study Tabs – Robo Calls (Overall Effect)

Context	Study	Meta_b	Meta_SE	SocialPressure
2014G	Kling and Strattman – GA, NE, NM, OH, PA, and VA	0.316	0.184	0
2014P	Zelizer – Texas	0.59	0.25	0

Table E4-2: New Study Tabs – Robo Calls (Per Call Effect)

Author	EID	Meta_b	Meta_SE	SocialPressure
Kling and Strattman	November 2014	0.003	0.065	0
Zelizer	2014 Primary	0.580	0.680	0

Table E5: New Study Tabs – Volunteer Calls

Context	Study	Meta_b	Meta_SE	SocialPressure
2013S	Pringle et al. – Palo Alto	4.444	2.162	0
2014G	Bedolla et al. – NALEO	1.171	0.460	0
2014G	Bedolla et al. – CoCo	14.256	9.111	0
2014G	Bedolla et al. – AAAJ	2.202	4.639	0

Table E6: Study Tabs – Robo Calls

Context	Study	Meta_b	Meta_SE	SocialPressure
2001G	Nickerson – Seattle	-0.600	0.900	0
2006G	Shaw et al. – Texas	0.380	0.268	0
2004G	Green and Karlan – Missouri and North Carolina	-0.022	0.312	0
2002G	Ramirez – NALEO	0.036	0.197	0
2008P,G	Green – Michigan (not included)	1.866	0.460	1
2014G	Kling and Strattman – GA, NE, NM, OH, PA, and VA	0.316	0.184	0
2014P	Zelizer – Texas	0.59	0.25	0

Table E7: New Study Tabs – Text Messaging

Author	Meta_b	Meta_SE	Social_Pressure
Bedolla et al. Oakland Rising	10.864	4.527	0
Bedolla et al. Chirla	-0.035	2.670	0
Bedolla et al.MFV	2.577	2.439	0
Bedolla et al.SCOPE	3.586	3.037	0
Joshua Kalla NextGen IL	0.250	0.200	0
Dale and Strauss 2009	3.100	1.100	0
Malhotra et al.	0.794	0.247	0
Ternovski, Kalla, Keane	-0.322	0.512	0
Broockman and Green	0.440	0.260	0
Broockman, Green, and Sutherland	0.0003	0.006	0
Yan and Kalla	0.590	0.108	0
Panagopoulos	0.029	0.067	0
Vote.org	0.2504971	0.04396138	0