Hi Jordan, thanks for this draft! This is a great start, but I think your conclusion is premature. This is a messy dataset and when reporting the effect of the N2N program we need to include a bit more description and precision. A few points about the memo:

First, don't forget that only a minority of voters in the "treatment" condition were successfully canvassed (others weren't contacted, weren't home, etc). So the key comparison is between people who were contacted and people who weren't. If we can determine whether actually speaking with voters helps get them to vote, we can figure out how to tweak the program to get more voter contacts.

Second, for readers to interpret what you've done, you'll need to more clearly define your variables and sample. Who are the "people on the volunteer lists"? And what does vb_general_presidential_turnout represent?

Third, remember that so many critical elections are determined by thin margins, so a few percentage points can be critical, p-values shouldn't be our main criterion here. Let's find a time to chat to discuss:

1) Refining the analysis
2) Describing the analysis more clearly
3) Clarifying the form and purpose of these summaries

Best,

Joseph