MOVEMENT POLITICS PROGRAM OVERVIEW

**PRIORITY STATES**

Pres: AZ, IA, WI, MI, PA, NC, NH & ME-2

Senate: AL, NC, ME, IA, CO & AZ

US House: AZ, NV, WA, CO, IA, MN, WI, MI, IL, PA, NH, ME, NC

Legislature Swings R-D; NC, MI, WI, MN, IA, AZ (MO Veto Proof)
And in a time when so many of our conversations feel shallow despite the embarrassment of platforms on which we can have those conversations, deep canvassing offers a promising alternative, a way to find common ground and make human connections in a time of political polarization and tribalism. Even in a pandemic.
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BACKGROUND:
C3 DEEP CANVASS TESTS – EXAMPLES OF IMPACT

- Miami, 2015
  - Trans-Inclusive Non-Discrimination Law Support (After Defining Transgender)
  - Effect on Support Margin (CACE): 12%

- 4 States, 2016
  - Protect Trans People From Being Fired for Being Trans
  - Effect on Support Margin (CACE): 9%

- 3 Sites in CA & TN, 2018
  - DACA Support
  - Effect on Support Margin (CACE): 8%

- 3 States, 2019
  - Undoc. Imm in Medicaid
  - Effect on Support Margin (CACE): 20%

- CA & TN, 2020
  - Undoc. Imm In-State Tuition
  - Effect on Support Margin (CACE): 15%
And they last!
VOTE MARGIN EFFECTS BY ELECTION OFFICE TARGETED

Includes 333 treatments from 155 tests
WHY PERSUASION?
Persuade to vote & vote the right way

2016 to 2018

- Total Margin Change
- President to Midterm Dropoff
- New Voters
- Voted Both Times

Turnout got Democrats to break-even point

At least 89% of the final margin was due to people changing their votes
Figure 1: Effect on Vote Margin of Pro-Biden, Anti-Biden, Pro-Trump, and Anti-Trump Information

Notes: This Figure shows the average effects of showing respondents specific pro-Biden, anti-Biden, pro-Trump, and anti-Trump statements on Trump vote share, coded as -1/0/1. The estimates are from multivariate regressions reported in Table A1. 95% confidence intervals surround point estimates.
**TRADITIONAL CANVASS**

- Get an ID (Yes / No / Maybe)
- Train Canvassers to Use a Script
- Canvasser Delivers a Message

**DEEP CANVASS**

- Surface Complexity (1 - 10 Scale)
- Train Canvassers to Listen & Ask Questions
- Canvasser and Voter Exchange Vulnerable Stories
DEEP CANVASS SCRIPT STRUCTURE

Step 1: 1-10 Scale - Surface complexity

Step 2/3: Story Share - Care and Personal Stake Stories

Step 4: Help voter process conflict with Biden

Step 5: Make the Case

Step 6: 1-10 scale
SCRIPT NARRATIVE - Who will represent my needs?

MAP EMOTIONAL JOURNEY OF VOTERS
Build rapport through wellness check and empathy through vulnerable story sharing.

ACTIVATE HOPE and AGENCY
Story sharing about care and personal stake in the election and making the case for “a President that has compassion & care”.

BRIDGE to BIDEN
Share stories VP Biden’s character and personal experiences of tragedy and role in leading country during crisis.
THE SCRIPT PROCESS

Collaborative & Iterative Process

3 months

6 states, 9 organizations

15 organizers

27 Iterations!
Experiment Overview

Conversations
- 90% of voters shared a personal story
- 695 completed conversations

Voters
- States: MI, MN, NC, NH, PA, and WI
- Higher propensity voters
RESEARCH DESIGN (DIFFERENCE-IN-DIFFERENCES)

Survey Recruitment → Two Online Surveys → Reached Not Reached → Online Survey ~6 days after

Note for technical audience: placebo tests look good, results in full deck online.
Calls increased Biden vote margin by 3.1 points ($p = 0.03$)
VOTE MARGIN EFFECTS BY ELECTION OFFICE TARGETED

30x greater effect

Effect on vote margin (pp)
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Includes 333 treatments from 155 tests
HOW BIG IS 3.1PP ON VOTE MARGIN?

Larger than the 2016 victory margin in 9 states: Michigan; Pennsylvania; Wisconsin; Florida; New Hampshire; Minnesota; Nebraska CD-2; Nevada; and Maine

Total of 108 electoral votes
DIGGING INTO THE MOVEMENT

Effect of Calls on Being:

- Strong Trump: 3.75%
- Not Strong Trump: 5%
- Lean Trump: -2.5%
- Undecided: 0%
- Lean Biden: -1.25%
- Not Strong Biden: 1.25%
- Strong Biden: 2.5%

Not counted in 3.1pp!
WHO IS MOVING?

Effect on Trump Vote Margin

Independents: -9%
Democrats: -6.75%
Republicans: -4.5%
Women: -2.25%
Men: 0%
Independent Women: 0%
Next Research Steps

- Persuasion model for scale-up targeting
- One month survey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Priority States: AZ WI MI PA - MN NC NH</th>
<th>7 states</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mass Texting Program</td>
<td>8 million voters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deep Canvass Conversations</td>
<td>350,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volunteer Shifts</td>
<td>44,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL BUDGET</strong></td>
<td>$4.61 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CURRENT GAP</strong></td>
<td>$2.79 M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>COST PER DEEP CANVASS CONVERSATION</strong></td>
<td>$14.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROJECTED COST PER NET DEMOCRATIC VOTE</strong></td>
<td>$475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For more information contact Adam Kruggel at a.kruggel@peoplesaction.org