

Online Appendices for Snapchat and Civic Engagement among College Students

These appendices contain the question wording for each of the variables used in the analysis, balance statistics for the analyses contained in Figure One and Tables One and Two in the manuscript, and a series of tables that detail the robustness checks to which we refer in the paper. These robustness checks include removing one matching variable at a time for each of the specifications detailed in the manuscript.

Appendix A: Question Wording for Variables

This appendix contains the complete list of variables from the surveys that we used in this paper. In all parts of the survey, students had the option of declining to answer a question.

Question Wording for Variables in the Analysis

Treatment Variables

During 2016, how often have you...

Table A1: Snapchat Variables

	Never	Rarely	Sometimes	Regularly	Very Often	Don't Know
Monitored what a presidential candidate, political party, another candidate for political office, or a political interest group posts on Snapchat?	0	1	2	3	4	.
Sent a picture about a presidential candidate, political party, another candidate for political office, or a political interest group on Snapchat?	0	1	2	3	4	.
Sent a video about a presidential candidate, political party, another candidate for political office, or a political interest group on Snapchat?	0	1	2	3	4	.
Chatted with someone about a presidential candidate, political party, another candidate for political office, or a political interest group on Snapchat?	0	1	2	3	4	.
Shared an image or webpage related a presidential candidate, political party, another candidate for political office, or a political interest group on Facebook?	0	1	2	3	4	.

Note: Binary variables were created based on never being the comparison category in each variable. For instance, four binaries were created for monitoring Snapchat posts: rarely vs. never; rarely vs. sometimes; rarely vs. regularly, and rarely vs. very often.

Dependent Variable

Offline Civic Engagement

During 2016, how often have you...

Table A2: Offline Civic Engagement

	Never				Very Often	Don't Know
Worn a campaign button or shirt, put a campaign sticker on your car, or placed a sign in your window or in front of your residence	0	1	2	3	4	.
Tried to talk to people and explain why they should vote for or against one of the parties or candidates	0	1	2	3	4	.
Contacted a newspaper, radio, or TV talk show to express your opinion on an issue	0	1	2	3	4	.
Attended any political meetings, rallies, speeches, dinners, or things like that in support of a particular candidate	0	1	2	3	4	.
Participated in political activities such as protests, marches, or demonstrations	0	1	2	3	4	.
Worked or volunteered on a political campaign for a candidate or party	0	1	2	3	4	.
Contacted or visited someone in government who represents your community	0	1	2	3	4	.
Worked with a group to solve a problem in a community	0	1	2	3	4	.
Made a purchasing decision based on the conduct or values of a company	0	1	2	3	4	.
Contributed money to a Republican candidate, political party, or affiliated organization	0	1	2	3	4	.
Contributed money to a Democratic candidate, political party, or affiliated organization	0	1	2	3	4	.
How frequently have you ever participated in any community service or volunteer activity? By volunteer activity, we mean actually working in some way to help others for no pay	0	1	2	3	4	.

Independent Variables

Blog Readership

In a typical week, how often do you read internet blogs about politics?

4) Very Often; 3) Often; 2) Sometimes; 1) Rarely; 0) Not at All; .) Don't Know

Interest in Politics

How interested would you say you are in politics? Are you...

- 0) Not at all interested; 1) Not very interested; 2) Somewhat interested; 3) Very interested; .) Don't Know

Strong Partisanship

Generally speaking, do you usually think of yourself as a Republican, a Democrat, an Independent, or something else?

- 1) Republican; 2) Democrat; 3) Independent; 4) Other _____

If the respondent answered "Republican," for partisan identification, then s/he was asked the following question:

Do you think of yourself as strongly Republican or not very strong?

- 1) Strong Republican; 2) Not very strong Republican

If the respondent answered "Democrat," for partisan identification, then s/he was asked the following question:

Do you think of yourself as strongly Democratic or not very strong?

- 1) Strong Democrat; 2) Not very strong Democrat

Peer Civic Engagement

Table A3: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly disagree				Strongly agree	Don't Know
My friends are active in volunteer work in their community	0	1	2	3	4	.
My friends vote in elections	0	1	2	3	4	.
My friends encourage me to express my opinions about politics and current events even if they are different from their views	0	1	2	3	4	.

Political Science Major

If you have declared a major(s), what is your area(s) of study? (check all that apply)

_____ Arts; _____ Architecture ; _____ Business; _____ Education; _____ Engineering; _____ Humanities; _____ Interdisciplinary; _____ Math and Sciences; _____ Nursing; _____ Political

Science; _____ Social Sciences, other than Political Science; _____ Social Work; _____ Undeclared; _____ Other

Campaign Attention

During 2016, how often have you paid attention to political campaigns?

- 0) Never; 1) Rarely; 2) Sometimes; 3) Regularly; 4) Very Often

Ideology (Constructed from these Questions)

Generally speaking, how would you describe your political ideology?

- 1) Very conservative; 2) Conservative; 3) Moderate; 4) Liberal; 5) Very liberal; 6) Other _____; 7) Don't know

If the respondent answered "moderate" or "don't know" for ideology, then s/he was asked the following question:

If you had to choose, would you consider yourself a liberal or a conservative?

- 0) Liberal; 1) Conservative

Sex

What is your sex?

- 0) Male; 1) Female

Age

In what month and year were you born?

_____ Month (use drop down box)

_____ Year (use drop down box)

Appendix B: Balance Statistics for Matching Models

Table B1: Balance Statistics for Monitoring Snapchat Posts on Offline Civic Engagement-Rarely and Sometimes Models

Variable		Rarely						Sometimes					
		Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference	Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference
Blog Readership	Before Matching	1.533	1.348	.327	.130	.954	.183	2.037	1.348	.0004	<.0001	.850	.685
	After Matching	1.533	1.517	.920	.746	1.082	.159	2.037	1.982	.659	.993	1.076	.089
Interest in Politics	Before Matching	1.950	1.765	.108	.241	.966	.200	1.907	1.765	.210	.435	.845	.148
	After Matching	1.950	1.950	1.000	.999	1.115	.032	1.907	1.907	1.000	.989	1.070	.036
Strong Partisanship	Before Matching	.450	.339	.1116	-	1.119	.117	.481	.339	.057	-	1.131	.148
	After Matching	.450	.450	1.000	-	1.000	0	.481	.444	.415	-	1.011	.036
Peer Civic Engagement	Before Matching	7.650	7.244	.160	.170	.646	.567	8.019	7.244	.010	.106	.616	.852
	After Matching	7.650	7.667	.946	.637	1.269	.365	8.019	7.889	.551	.578	1.064	.500
Political Science Major	Before Matching	.050	.027	.437	-	1.848	.017	.130	.027	.033	-	4.397	.093
	After Matching	.050	.050	1.000	-	1.000	0	.130	.111	.317	-	1.142	.018
Campaign Attention	Before Matching	2.550	2.521	.826	.378	.673	.200	2.833	2.521	.040	.217	.821	.333
	After Matching	2.550	2.550	1.000	1.000	.961	.032	2.833	2.778	.514	.324	1.433	.214
Liberal	Before Matching	.333	.354	.756	-	.985	.017	.426	.354	.328	-	1.086	.074
	After Matching	.333	.333	1.000	-	1.000	0	.426	.426	1.000	-	1.000	0
Conservative	Before Matching	.300	.265	.587	-	1.094	.033	.296	.265	.642	-	1.088	.037
	After Matching	.300	.300	1.000	-	1.000	.016	.296	.296	1.000	-	1.000	0
Sex	Before Matching	.633	.649	.820	-	1.033	.017	.704	.649	.422	-	.930	.056
	After Matching	.633	.633	1.000	-	1.000	0	.704	.722	.656	-	1.039	.018
Age	Before Matching	21.000	21.065	.774	.669	1.244	.183	20.870	21.065	.375	.639	1.022	.204
	After Matching	21.000	21.000	1.000	.901	1.143	.143	20.870	20.815	.579	.665	1.371	.286

Table B2: Balance Statistics for Monitoring Snapchat Posts on Offline Civic Engagement-Frequently and Very Often Models

Variable		Frequently						Very Often					
		Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference	Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference
Blog Readership	Before Matching	2.225	1.348	.0006	.004	1.114	.875	2.714	1.348	.0005	<.0001	1.188	1.333
	After Matching	2.225	2.225	1.000	.749	1.286	.200	2.714	2.667	.658	.998	.991	.143
Interest in Politics	Before Matching	2.225	1.765	.002	<.0001	1.014	.475	2.762	1.765	<.0001	<.0001	.279	1.000
	After Matching	2.225	2.300	.579	.760	1.466	.125	2.762	2.762	1.000	1.000	1.000	0
Strong Partisanship	Before Matching	.450	.339	.193	-	1.129	.100	.476	.339	.245	-	1.165	.143
	After Matching	.450	.425	.565	-	1.013	.025	.476	.429	.708	-	1.085	.048
Peer Civic Engagement	Before Matching	8.125	7.244	.031	.173	.929	.925	8.143	7.244	.162	.108	1.295	.952
	After Matching	8.125	7.975	.595	.967	1.045	.300	8.143	8.095	.888	.990	1.018	.429
Political Science Major	Before Matching	.150	.027	.039	-	5.002	.125	.143	.027	.156	-	4.917	.095
	After Matching	.150	.125	.317	-	1.166	.025	.143	.143	1.000	-	1.000	0
Campaign Attention	Before Matching	3.175	2.521	.0004	.001	.830	.675	3.619	2.521	<.0001	<.0001	.201	1.143
	After Matching	3.175	3.100	.406	.217	1.554	.275	3.619	3.524	.482	.955	.684	.095
Liberal	Before Matching	.450	.354	.259	-	1.107	.100	.476	.354	.299	-	1.142	.095
	After Matching	.450	.425	.565	-	1.013	.025	.476	.429	.658	-	1.019	.048
Conservative	Before Matching	.200	.265	.348	-	.840	.075	.190	.265	.422	-	.829	.095
	After Matching	.200	.200	1.000	-	1.000	0	.190	.190	1.000	-	1.000	0
Sex	Before Matching	.475	.649	.044	-	1.119	.175	.333	.649	.008	-	1.021	.286
	After Matching	.475	.475	1.000	-	1.000	0	.333	.333	1.000	-	1.000	0
Age	Before Matching	20.900	21.065	.507	.811	1.007	.175	20.714	21.065	.315	.214	1.061	.429
	After Matching	20.900	20.925	.885	.926	1.364	.225	20.714	20.714	1.000	.757	1.350	.381

Table B3: Balance Statistics for Politically-Oriented Chatting on Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement-Rarely and Sometimes Models

Variable		Rarely						Sometimes					
		Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference	Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference
Blog Readership	Before Matching	1.347	1.368	.920	.691	1.041	.102	2.203	1.368	<.0001	<.0001	.769	.844
	After Matching	1.347	1.347	1.000	.837	1.022	.154	2.203	2.188	.848	.360	.924	.217
Interest in Politics	Before Matching	1.918	1.754	.152	.236	.748	.163	2.188	1.754	<.0001	.001	.750	.453
	After Matching	1.918	1.918	1.000	1.000	1.000	0	2.188	2.203	.782	.966	.982	.029
Strong Partisanship	Before Matching	.367	.348	.799	-	1.042	.020	.438	.348	.190	-	1.098	.094
	After Matching	.367	.347	.809	-	1.026	.019	.438	.438	1.000	-	1.000	0
Peer Civic Engagement	Before Matching	7.367	7.317	.877	.453	.741	.347	8.063	7.317	.012	.043	.740	.766
	After Matching	7.367	7.449	.755	.909	1.011	.327	8.063	8.094	.857	.556	1.238	.377
Political Science Major	Before Matching	.082	.025	.171	-	3.072	.041	.172	.025	.003	-	5.803	.141
	After Matching	.082	.082	1.000	-	1.000	0	.172	.172	1.000	-	1.000	0
Campaign Attention	Before Matching	2.755	2.501	.120	.231	.944	.245	2.969	2.501	.0007	.015	.785	.500
	After Matching	2.755	2.776	.819	1.000	1.050	.077	2.969	2.969	1.000	.982	1.074	.058
Liberal	Before Matching	.347	.343	.955	-	1.024	0	.453	.343	.106	-	1.114	.109
	After Matching	.347	.347	1.000	-	1.000	0	.453	.453	1.000	-	1.000	0
Conservative	Before Matching	.245	.258	.846	-	.984	.020	.281	.258	.703	-	1.070	.016
	After Matching	.245	.245	1.000	-	1.000	0	.281	.266	.317	-	1.036	.014
Sex	Before Matching	.633	.652	.799	-	1.042	.020	.531	.652	.080	-	1.111	.109
	After Matching	.633	.633	1.000	-	1.000	0	.531	.547	.835	-	1.005	.014
Age	Before Matching	21.000	21.057	.802	.993	.931	.143	21.188	21.057	.497	.537	.831	.219
	After Matching	21.000	20.980	.815	1.000	1.020	.096	21.188	21.234	.833	.800	.899	.174

Table B4: Balance Statistics for Politically-Oriented Chatting on Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement-Frequently and Very Often Models

Variable		Frequently						Very Often					
		Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference	Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference
Blog Readership	Before Matching	2.227	1.368	.011	.001	1.070	.818	3.375	1.368	<.0001	<.0001	.420	1.938
	After Matching	2.227	2.273	.911	.543	.988	.304	3.375	3.375	1.000	.987	.855	.125
Interest in Politics	Before Matching	2.409	1.754	<.0001	.002	.488	.682	2.688	1.754	<.0001	<.0001	.321	1.000
	After Matching	2.409	2.364	.567	.961	1.032	.043	2.688	2.625	.659	.842	.917	.063
Strong Partisanship	Before Matching	.636	.348	.014	-	1.065	.273	.563	.348	.120	-	1.153	.188
	After Matching	.636	.636	1.000	-	1.000	0	.563	.500	.659	-	.984	.063
Peer Civic Engagement	Before Matching	8.546	7.317	.013	.048	.731	1.318	7.813	7.317	.532	.115	1.606	.875
	After Matching	8.546	8.591	.871	.984	1.220	.348	7.812	8.000	.652	.974	1.377	.563
Political Science Major	Before Matching	.045	.025	.670	-	1.824	0	.125	.025	.264	-	4.682	.063
	After Matching	.045	.045	1.000	-	1.000	0	.125	.125	1.000	-	1.000	0
Campaign Attention	Before Matching	3.318	2.501	.002	<.0001	1.007	.909	3.625	2.501	<.0001	<.0001	.213	1.188
	After Matching	3.318	3.273	.658	.884	1.514	.217	3.625	3.625	1.000	1.000	1.000	0
Liberal	Before Matching	.545	.343	.082	-	1.150	.182	.625	.343	.042	-	1.107	.250
	After Matching	.545	.545	1.000	-	1.000	0	.625	.625	1.000	-	1.000	0
Conservative	Before Matching	.273	.258	.882	-	1.083	0	.188	.258	.506	-	.847	.063
	After Matching	.273	.273	1.000	-	1.000	0	.188	.188	1.000	-	1.000	0
Sex	Before Matching	.727	.652	.458	-	.913	.091	.250	.652	.003	-	.878	.375
	After Matching	.727	.682	.567	-	.914	.043	.250	.313	.568	-	.873	.063
Age	Before Matching	19.955	21.057	.0004	.003	.634	1.136	20.750	21.057	.402	.738	.831	.375
	After Matching	19.955	20.045	.686	.713	1.477	.391	20.750	20.812	.830	.646	1.419	.313

Table B5: Balance Statistics for Sending Pictures via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement-Rarely and Sometimes Models

Variable		Rarely						Sometimes					
		Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference	Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference
Blog Readership	Before Matching	1.222	1.426	.321	.47	.825	.222	2.083	1.426	.001	<.0001	.664	.667
	After Matching	1.222	1.222	1.000	1.000	1.000	0	2.083	2.063	.842	.991	.847	.098
Interest in Politics	Before Matching	1.667	1.810	.248	.215	.834	.133	2.104	1.810	.014	.040	.795	.313
	After Matching	1.667	1.667	1.000	1.000	1.000	0	2.104	2.083	.707	.991	1.032	.020
Strong Partisanship	Before Matching	.311	.359	.519	-	.950	.044	.417	.359	.454	-	.453	.062
	After Matching	.311	.311	1.000	-	1.000	0	.417	.417	1.000	-	1.000	0.000
Peer Civic Engagement	Before Matching	7.600	7.311	.420	.865	.886	.356	7.958	7.311	.035	.144	.639	.792
	After Matching	7.600	7.600	1.000	.885	1.614	.362	7.958	7.896	.757	.882	1.059	.294
Political Science Major	Before Matching	.044	.040	.898	-	1.122	.002	.125	.040	.092	-	2.886	.083
	After Matching	.044	.044	1.000	-	1.000	0	.125	.125	1.000	-	1.000	0
Campaign Attention	Before Matching	2.467	2.563	.58	.740	.933	.133	2.854	2.563	.058	.094	.781	.313
	After Matching	2.467	2.489	.868	.885	1.287	.128	2.854	2.896	.772	.967	1.492	.137
Liberal	Before Matching	.311	.349	.615	-	.963	.044	.479	.349	.095	-	1.120	.125
	After Matching	.311	.311	1.000	-	1.000	0	.479	.479	1.000	-	1.000	0
Conservative	Before Matching	.333	.263	.348	-	1.170	.067	.229	.263	.610	-	.929	.042
	After Matching	.333	.333	1.000	-	1.000	0	.229	.208	.565	-	1.071	.020
Sex	Before Matching	.600	.641	.603	-	1.064	.044	.583	.641	.454	-	1.076	.063
	After Matching	.600	.600	1.000	-	1.000	0	.583	.625	.618	-	1.037	.039
Age	Before Matching	20.756	21.043	.203	.172	.863	.378	21.250	21.043	.362	.315	.946	.292
	After Matching	20.756	20.778	.877	.604	1.494	.255	21.250	21.208	.656	.994	1.053	.078

Table B6: Balance Statistics for Sending Pictures via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement -Frequently and Very Often Models

Variable		Frequently						Very Often					
		Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference	Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference
Blog Readership	Before Matching	2.174	1.426	.013	.011	.858	.739	3.158	1.426	<.0001	<.0001	.633	1.684
	After Matching	2.174	2.217	.849	.946	.935	.208	3.158	3.158	1.000	.998	.849	.105
Interest in Politics	Before Matching	2.391	1.810	.0003	.021	.608	.609	2.632	1.810	<.0001	.002	.347	.895
	After Matching	2.391	2.348	.741	.555	1.313	.167	2.632	2.579	.658	.883	.955	.053
Strong Partisanship	Before Matching	.565	.359	.070	-	1.113	.217	.632	.359	.030	-	1.064	.263
	After Matching	.565	.565	1.000	-	1.000	0	.632	.632	1.000	-	1.000	0
Peer Civic Engagement	Before Matching	8.696	7.311	.003	.058	.665	1.435	8.211	7.311	.250	.006	1.876	1.158
	After Matching	8.696	8.696	1.000	.993	.912	.208	8.211	8.316	.808	.605	1.872	1.053
Political Science Major	Before Matching	.087	.040	.451	-	2.145	.043	.158	.040	.190	-	3.627	.105
	After Matching	.087	.087	1.000	-	1.000	0	.158	.158	1.000	-	1.000	0
Campaign Attention	Before Matching	3.304	2.563	.0003	.007	.564	.783	3.632	2.563	<.0001	.001	.205	1.105
	After Matching	3.304	3.304	1.000	.984	1.155	.083	3.632	3.632	1.000	1.000	1.000	0
Liberal	Before Matching	.478	.349	.247	-	1.146	.130	.579	.349	.067	-	1.130	.211
	After Matching	.478	.478	1.000	-	1.000	0	.579	.579	1.000	-	1.000	0
Conservative	Before Matching	.304	.263	.683	-	1.140	.043	.158	.263	.252	-	.723	.105
	After Matching	.304	.304	1.000	-	1.000	0	.158	.158	1.000	-	1.000	0
Sex	Before Matching	.652	.641	.914	-	1.028	0	.474	.641	.180	-	1.140	.158
	After Matching	.652	.652	1.000	-	1.000	0	.474	.526	.709	-	1.000	.053
Age	Before Matching	20.609	21.043	.182	.350	.950	.478	20.789	21.043	.503	.556	1.104	.316
	After Matching	20.609	20.609	1.000	.518	1.267	.292	20.789	20.737	.837	.742	1.631	.474

Table B7: Balance Statistics for Sending Videos via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement-Rarely and Sometimes Models

Variable		Rarely						Sometimes					
		Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference	Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference
Blog Readership	Before Matching	1.615	1.411	.454	.531	.923	.269	2.029	1.411	.010	.006	.839	.618
	After Matching	1.615	1.577	.820	1.000	1.043	0	2.029	2.009	1.000	.892	.869	.231
Interest in Politics	Before Matching	1.846	1.797	.790	.947	.871	.115	2.265	1.797	.0002	.004	.541	.500
	After Matching	1.846	1.846	1.000	1.000	1.000	0	2.265	2.265	1.000	.990	1.000	.026
Strong Partisanship	Before Matching	.423	.345	.447	-	1.121	.077	.471	.345	.170	-	1.134	.118
	After Matching	.423	.423	1.000	-	1.000	0	.471	.471	1.000	-	1.000	0
Peer Civic Engagement	Before Matching	8.077	7.328	.082	.141	.751	.962	8.000	7.328	.102	.106	.910	.824
	After Matching	8.077	8.000	.831	.457	.911	.667	8.000	8.029	.870	.811	1.130	.385
Political Science Major	Before Matching	.038	.046	.842	-	.866	.038	.088	.046	.413	-	1.867	.029
	After Matching	.038	.038	1.000	-	1.000	0	.088	.088	1.000	-	1.000	0
Campaign Attention	Before Matching	2.539	2.553	.948	.673	.950	.154	3.059	2.553	.002	.014	.553	.529
	After Matching	2.539	2.577	.741	.760	.829	.185	3.059	3.088	.707	.766	1.168	.128
Liberal	Before Matching	.423	.347	.461	-	1.117	.077	.471	.347	.179	-	1.130	.118
	After Matching	.423	.423	1.000	-	1.000	0	.471	.471	1.000	-	1.000	0
Conservative	Before Matching	.346	.262	.394	-	1.216	.077	.206	.262	.454	-	.870	.059
	After Matching	.346	.346	1.000	-	1.000	0	.206	.206	1.000	-	1.000	0
Sex	Before Matching	.615	.641	.803	-	1.067	0	.588	.641	.559	-	1.081	.059
	After Matching	.615	.615	1.000	-	1.000	0	.588	.588	1.000	-	1.000	0
Age	Before Matching	20.923	21.015	.746	.838	.986	.231	21.324	21.015	.248	.136	.956	.412
	After Matching	20.923	20.923	1.000	.981	1.077	.185	21.324	21.294	.913	.371	1.551	.462

Table B8: Balance Statistics for Sending Videos via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement-Frequently and Very Often Models

Variable		Frequently						Very Often					
		Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference	Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference
Blog Readership	Before Matching	2.684	1.411	<.0001	<.0001	.584	1.211	3.167	1.411	<.0001	<.0001	.691	1.778
	After Matching	2.684	2.737	.755	.689	.701	.450	3.167	3.167	1.000	.849	1.364	.222
Interest in Politics	Before Matching	2.368	1.797	.002	.027	.662	.632	2.667	1.797	<.0001	<.0001	.333	.889
	After Matching	2.368	2.316	.742	.801	.696	.200	2.667	2.667	1.000	1.000	1.000	0
Strong Partisanship	Before Matching	.632	.345	.023	-	1.085	.263	.667	.345	.013	-	1.039	.333
	After Matching	.632	.632	1.000	-	1.000	.050	.667	.667	1.000	-	1.000	0
Peer Civic Engagement	Before Matching	8.895	7.328	.001	.010	.540	1.632	8.056	7.328	.364	.004	1.946	1.222
	After Matching	8.895	8.895	1.000	.971	.871	.400	8.056	7.944	.845	.529	1.926	1.111
Political Science Major	Before Matching	.105	.046	.461	-	2.239	.053	.167	.046	.203	-	3.312	.111
	After Matching	.105	.105	1.000	-	1.000	0	.167	.167	1.000	-	1.000	0
Campaign Attention	Before Matching	3.368	2.553	.0002	.010	.483	.842	3.667	2.553	<.0001	<.0001	.196	1.111
	After Matching	3.368	3.368	1.000	1.000	1.000	0	3.667	3.667	1.000	1.000	1.000	0
Liberal	Before Matching	.421	.347	.541	-	1.133	.053	.667	.347	.013	-	1.036	.333
	After Matching	.421	.421	1.000	-	1.000	0	.667	.667	1.000	-	1.000	0
Conservative	Before Matching	.368	.262	.368	-	1.268	.105	.111	.262	.072	-	.540	.167
	After Matching	.368	.368	1.000	-	1.000	0	.111	.111	1.000	-	1.000	0
Sex	Before Matching	.579	.641	.610	-	1.115	.053	.444	.641	.127	-	1.133	.167
	After Matching	.579	.632	.742	-	1.047	0	.444	.444	1.000	-	1.000	0
Age	Before Matching	20.737	21.015	.371	.566	.728	.421	20.667	21.015	.390	.359	1.195	.444
	After Matching	20.737	20.737	1.000	.922	1.253	.200	20.667	20.611	.837	.717	1.751	.500

Table B9: Balance Statistics for Sharing Websites and Pictures via Facebook on Offline Civic Engagement-Rarely and Sometimes Models

Variable		Rarely						Sometimes					
		Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference	Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference
Blog Readership	Before Matching	1.531	1.132	.014	.044	1.180	.385	1.644	1.133	.0005	<.0001	.967	.509
	After Matching	1.531	1.510	.743	.853	1.132	.122	1.644	1.673	.765	.944	.964	.103
Interest in Politics	Before Matching	1.771	1.664	.295	.535	1.093	.115	2.039	1.664	<.0001	<.0001	.623	.375
	After Matching	1.771	1.760	.848	.501	1.560	.143	2.039	2.039	1.000	.964	.880	.028
Strong Partisanship	Before Matching	.354	.295	.297	-	1.107	.063	.433	.295	.015	-	1.187	.135
	After Matching	.354	.354	1.000	-	1.000	0	.433	.433	1.000	-	1.000	0
Peer Civic Engagement	Before Matching	7.896	7.133	.003	.073	.744	.813	7.923	7.133	.004	.031	.901	.827
	After Matching	7.896	7.854	.716	.678	1.389	.276	7.923	7.849	.752	.409	1.463	.383
Political Science Major	Before Matching	.052	.022	.224	-	2.296	.031	.019	.022	.858	-	.876	0
	After Matching	.052	.052	1.000	-	1.000	0	.019	.019	1.000	-	1.000	0
Campaign Attention	Before Matching	2.625	2.321	.017	.131	.875	.313	2.875	2.321	<.0001	<.0001	.719	.558
	After Matching	2.625	2.625	1.000	.883	1.273	.102	2.875	2.875	1.000	.991	1.123	.037
Liberal	Before Matching	.385	.258	.026	-	1.245	.125	.337	.337	.147	-	1.172	.077
	After Matching	.385	.365	.724	-	1.023	.020	.337	.337	1.000	-	1.000	0
Conservative	Before Matching	.188	.292	.034	-	.743	.104	.317	.292	.631	-	1.055	.029
	After Matching	.188	.177	.797	-	1.045	.010	.317	.317	1.000	-	1.000	0
Sex	Before Matching	.708	.554	.006	-	.842	.156	.673	.554	.032	-	.896	.125
	After Matching	.708	.708	1.000	-	1.000	0	.673	.673	1.000	-	1.000	0
Age	Before Matching	21.146	21.144	.991	.852	.850	.146	21.096	21.144	.790	.742	.943	.163
	After Matching	21.146	21.198	.809	.779	.848	.194	21.096	21.077	.881	.827	1.069	.187

Table B10: Balance Statistics for Sharing Websites and Pictures via Facebook on Offline Civic Engagement -Frequently and Very Often Models

Variable		Frequently						Very Often					
		Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference	Mean Treated	Mean Control	T-Test P-Value	K-S- Test P-Value	Var. Ratio (Tr/Co)	Mean eQQ Difference
Blog Readership	Before Matching	2.145	1.133	<.0001	<.0001	1.203	1.000	2.690	1.133	<.0001	<.0001	1.326	1.552
	After Matching	2.145	2.081	.494	.996	1.009	.046	2.690	2.567	.156	.951	1.076	.119
Interest in Politics	Before Matching	2.307	1.664	<.0001	<.0001	.700	.661	2.567	1.6664	<.0001	<.0001	.587	.910
	After Matching	2.307	2.274	.480	.930	.962	.046	2.567	2.508	.156	.568	.990	.015
Strong Partisanship	Before Matching	.532	.295	.001	-	1.212	.242	.582	.295	<.0001	-	1.183	.284
	After Matching	.532	.484	.439	-	.997	.046	.582	.597	.809	-	1.011	.015
Peer Civic Engagement	Before Matching	7.532	7.133	.267	.189	1.323	.484	7.836	7.133	.042	.012	1.098	.716
	After Matching	7.532	7.667	.466	.207	1.824	.600	7.836	7.597	.374	.095	1.658	.746
Political Science Major	Before Matching	.177	.022	.003	-	6.826	.145	.134	.022	.011	-	5.432	.104
	After Matching	.177	.161	.317	-	1.079	.015	.134	.104	.156	-	1.243	.030
Campaign Attention	Before Matching	3.129	2.321	<.0001	<.0001	.518	.806	3.403	2.321	<.0001	<.0001	.616	1.090
	After Matching	3.129	3.081	.439	.842	1.065	.046	3.404	3.343	.394	.871	.981	.060
Liberal	Before Matching	.613	.258	<.0001	-	1.254	.355	.478	.258	.001	-	1.317	.224
	After Matching	.613	.597	.317	-	.986	.015	.478	.448	.156	-	1.009	.030
Conservative	Before Matching	.161	.292	.019	-	.663	.129	.343	.292	.425	-	1.104	.045
	After Matching	.161	.194	.565	-	.867	.031	.343	.373	.480	-	.964	.030
Sex	Before Matching	.710	.5554	.019	-	.844	.161	.478	.554	.271	-	1.021	.075
	After Matching	.710	.726	.740	-	1.035	.015	.478	.567	.132	-	1.016	.090
Age	Before Matching	21.161	21.144	.938	.978	1.012	.097	21.134	21.144	.965	.991	1.016	.045
	After Matching	21.161	21.323	.416	.624	1.039	.246	21.134	21.164	.812	.652	1.081	.239

Appendix C: Robustness Checks for Matching Analyses Depicted in Tables One and Two and Figure One

Table C1: Matching Estimates of Monitoring Snapchat Posts on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Blog Readership

	<u>Level of Monitoring</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	-.347	.512	3.509	2.716
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.905	1.666	1.213	2.383
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-2.157	-2.830	1.058	-2.255
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	1.464	3.854	5.960	7.687
T-Statistic	-.383	.307	2.893	1.140
P-Value	.701	.759	.004	.254
N	60	54	41	21

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C2: Matching Estimates of Monitoring Snapchat Posts on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Interest in Politics

	<u>Level of Monitoring</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.024	1.987	4.009	.917
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.877	1.159	1.619	2.562
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.731	-.337	.737	-4.427
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.779	4.311	7.281	6.261
T-Statistic	1.167	1.714	2.476	.358
P-Value	.243	.087	.013	.720
N	60	55	41	21

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C3: Matching Estimates of Monitoring Snapchat Posts on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Strong Partisanship

	<u>Level of Monitoring</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	-.514	1.529	2.870	3.363
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.978	1.374	1.526	1.888
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-2.471	-1.227	-.217	-.575
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	1.443	4.285	5.957	7.301
T-Statistic	-.526	1.113	1.880	1.781
P-Value	.599	.266	.060	.075
N	60	54	40	21

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C4: Matching Estimates of Monitoring Snapchat Posts on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Peer Civic Engagement

	<u>Level of Monitoring</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	-.756	1.365	2.084	2.359
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.802	1.330	1.496	2.022
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-2.358	-1.298	-.939	-1.847
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	.846	4.028	5.107	6.565
T-Statistic	.943	1.026	1.393	1.167
P-Value	.346	.305	.164	.243
N	66	58	41	22

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C5: Matching Estimates of Monitoring Snapchat Posts on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Political Science Major

	<u>Level of Monitoring</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	.079	1.315	4.488	3.310
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.870	1.359	1.525	1.919
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-1.662	-1.411	1.403	-.693
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	1.820	4.041	7.573	7.313
T-Statistic	.090	.968	2.943	1.725
P-Value	.928	.333	.003	.085
N	60	54	40	21

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C6: Matching Estimates of Monitoring Snapchat Posts on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Campaign Attention

	<u>Level of Monitoring</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	-.555	1.222	1.505	1.739
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.953	1.462	1.418	2.171
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-2.462	-1.711	-1.364	-2.790
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	1.352	4.155	4.374	6.268
T-Statistic	-.582	.836	1.061	.801
P-Value	.560	.403	.289	.423
N	60	54	40	21

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C7: Matching Estimates of Monitoring Snapchat Posts on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Ideology

	<u>Level of Monitoring</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	-.062	.425	2.645	2.278
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.891	1.404	1.465	2.077
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-1.843	-2.391	-.319	-2.055
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	1.719	3.241	5.609	6.611
T-Statistic	-.070	.303	1.806	1.097
P-Value	.945	.762	.071	.273
N	63	54	40	21

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C8: Matching Estimates of Monitoring Snapchat Posts on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Sex

	<u>Level of Monitoring</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	.214	.750	3.177	2.844
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.024	1.563	1.484	2.520
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-1.835	-2.385	.175	-2.413
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.263	3.885	6.179	8.100
T-Statistic	.209	.480	2.141	1.129
P-Value	.834	.631	.032	.259
N	60	54	40	21

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C9: Matching Estimates of Monitoring Snapchat Posts on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Age

	<u>Level of Monitoring</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	.777	.831	1.857	.546
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.794	1.534	1.413	2.988
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.812	-2.246	-1.002	-5.687
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.366	3.908	4.715	6.779
T-Statistic	.979	.542	1.314	.183
P-Value	.327	.588	.189	.855
N	60	54	40	21

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C10: Matching Estimates of Sending Pictures via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Blog Readership

	<u>Level of Sending Pictures</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.362	3.716	5.361	6.158
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.856	1.009	2.155	2.791
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.363	1.687	.892	.294
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	3.087	5.745	9.830	12.022
T-Statistic	1.592	3.683	2.488	2.207
P-Value	.111	.0002	.013	.027
N	45	49	23	19

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C11: Matching Estimates of Sending Pictures via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Interest in Politics

	<u>Level of Sending Pictures</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	.996	1.168	7.074	5.048
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.065	1.130	2.090	2.244
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-1.150	-1.106	2.739	.333
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	3.142	3.442	11.409	9.763
T-Statistic	.935	1.034	3.384	2.250
P-Value	.350	.301	.001	.024
N	45	48	23	19

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C12: Matching Estimates of Sending Pictures via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Strong Partisanship

	<u>Level of Sending Pictures</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.020	2.717	5.410	4.869
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.899	1.201	2.144	2.641
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.791	.301	.974	-.680
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.831	5.133	9.846	10.418
T-Statistic	1.134	2.262	2.523	1.844
P-Value	.257	.024	.012	.065
N	45	48	24	19

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C13: Matching Estimates of Sending Pictures via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Peer Civic Engagement

	<u>Level of Sending Pictures</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	2.607	1.093	5.176	5.570
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.966	1.314	2.430	2.261
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	.662	-1.544	.148	.820
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.552	3.730	10.204	10.320
T-Statistic	2.700	.832	2.130	2.464
P-Value	.006	.406	.033	.014
N	47	53	24	19

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C14: Matching Estimates of Sending Pictures via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Political Science Major

	<u>Level of Sending Pictures</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.893	.062	5.517	6.624
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.988	1.366	1.871	2.325
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.098	-2.686	1.637	1.758
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	3.884	2.810	9.397	11.490
T-Statistic	1.916	.046	2.948	2.849
P-Value	.055	.964	.003	.004
N	45	48	23	20

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C15: Matching Estimates of Sending Pictures via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Campaign Attention

	<u>Level of Sending Pictures</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.969	1.954	6.149	6.132
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.947	1.219	2.289	2.993
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	.061	-.499	1.402	-.156
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	3.878	4.407	10.896	12.420
T-Statistic	2.079	1.603	2.686	2.049
P-Value	.038	.109	.007	.040
N	45	48	23	19

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C16: Matching Estimates of Sending Pictures via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Ideology

	<u>Level of Sending Pictures</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.320	1.571	6.039	6.595
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.935	1.175	2.168	2.059
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.563	-.793	1.543	2.286
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	3.203	3.935	10.535	10.904
T-Statistic	1.413	1.338	2.785	3.203
P-Value	.158	.181	.005	.001
N	46	48	23	20

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C17: Matching Estimates of Sending Pictures via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Sex

	<u>Level of Sending Pictures</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.513	2.620	6.821	4.329
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.015	1.195	1.737	2.100
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.532	.216	3.218	-.083
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	3.558	5.024	10.424	8.741
T-Statistic	1.491	2.193	3.927	2.061
P-Value	.136	.028	<.0001	.039
N	45	48	23	19

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C18: Matching Estimates of Sending Pictures via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Age

	<u>Level of Sending Pictures</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.291	2.917	6.310	5.022
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.923	1.005	1.958	1.953
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.569	.895	2.249	.919
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	3.151	4.939	10.371	9.125
T-Statistic	1.399	2.902	3.223	2.571
P-Value	.162	.004	.001	.010
N	45	48	23	19

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C19: Matching Estimates of Sending Videos via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Blog Readership

	<u>Level of Sending Videos</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.560	4.425	7.178	7.926
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.558	1.325	2.821	2.595
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-2.463	1.729	1.274	2.451
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	5.583	7.121	13.082	13.401
T-Statistic	1.001	3.389	2.544	3.054
P-Value	.317	.001	.011	.002
N	26	34	20	18

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C20: Matching Estimates of Sending Videos via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Interest in Politics

	<u>Level of Sending Videos</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	2.301	3.145	7.383	5.024
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.245	1.679	2.823	2.781
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.264	-.272	1.452	-.844
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.866	6.562	13.314	10.892
T-Statistic	1.848	1.873	2.615	1.807
P-Value	.065	.061	.009	.071
N	26	34	19	18

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C21: Matching Estimates of Sending Videos via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Strong Partisanship

	<u>Level of Sending Videos</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.703	4.775	6.658	5.263
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.215	1.365	2.250	2.125
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.800	1.997	1.931	.779
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.206	7.553	11.385	9.747
T-Statistic	1.402	3.497	2.960	2.477
P-Value	.161	.0005	.003	.013
N	26	34	19	18

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C22: Matching Estimates of Sending Videos via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Peer Civic Engagement

	<u>Level of Sending Videos</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.695	2.891	4.722	5.345
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.269	1.580	2.453	2.766
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.900	-.316	-.412	-.491
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.290	6.098	9.856	11.182
T-Statistic	1.336	1.830	1.925	1.932
P-Value	.182	.067	.054	.053
N	30	36	20	18

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C23: Matching Estimates of Sending Videos via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Political Science Major

	<u>Level of Sending Videos</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.447	3.218	6.275	8.561
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.345	1.142	2.905	2.312
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-1.323	.894	.195	3.683
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.218	5.542	12.355	13.439
T-Statistic	1.076	2.819	2.160	3.702
P-Value	.282	.005	.031	.0002
N	26	34	20	18

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C24: Matching Estimates of Sending Videos via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Campaign Attention

	<u>Level of Sending Videos</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.233	2.139	6.446	7.351
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.448	1.261	2.022	2.226
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-1.750	-.427	2.198	2.654
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.216	4.705	10.694	12.047
T-Statistic	.851	1.696	3.188	3.302
P-Value	.395	.090	.001	.001
N	26	34	19	18

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C25: Matching Estimates of Sending Videos via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Ideology

	<u>Level of Sending Videos</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	.974	3.361	6.325	7.399
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.787	1.340	2.587	2.214
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-2.707	.634	.890	2.747
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.655	6.088	11.760	12.051
T-Statistic	.545	2.509	2.446	3.341
P-Value	.586	.012	.014	.001
N	26	34	19	19

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C26: Matching Estimates of Sending Videos via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Sex

	<u>Level of Sending Videos</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	.980	2.796	7.844	7.805
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.798	1.344	2.438	2.169
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-2.724	.061	5.020	3.228
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.684	5.531	10.668	12.382
T-Statistic	.545	2.080	3.217	3.599
P-Value	.586	.038	.001	.003
N	26	34	19	18

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C27: Matching Estimates of Sending Videos via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Age

	<u>Level of Sending Videos</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	2.241	2.721	6.696	5.893
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.334	1.171	2.781	2.085
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.507	.338	.853	1.494
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.989	5.104	12.539	10.292
T-Statistic	1.679	2.324	2.408	2.826
P-Value	.093	.020	.016	.005
N	26	34	19	18

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C28: Matching Estimates of Politically-Oriented Chatting via Snapchat while Omitting Blog Readership

	<u>Level of Politically-Oriented Chatting</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	.777	2.966	2.909	5.187
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.902	1.070	2.455	4.486
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-1.037	.828	-2.197	-4.323
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.591	5.104	8.015	14.697
T-Statistic	.861	2.771	1.185	1.156
P-Value	.389	.006	.236	.248
N	49	64	22	17

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C29: Matching Estimates of Politically-Oriented Chatting via Snapchat while Omitting Interest in Politics

	<u>Level of Politically-Oriented Chatting</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	.039	3.273	3.566	3.700
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.132	1.220	2.311	3.473
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-2.236	.835	-1.241	-3.697
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.314	5.711	8.373	11.097
T-Statistic	.034	2.683	1.543	1.065
P-Value	.973	.007	.123	.287
N	50	64	22	16

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C30: Matching Estimates of Politically-Oriented Chatting via Snapchat while Omitting Strong Partisanship

	<u>Level of Politically-Oriented Chatting</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	-1.082	3.260	4.316	6.701
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.129	1.113	2.621	3.069
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-3.352	1.036	-1.136	.164
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	1.188	5.484	9.768	13.238
T-Statistic	.959	2.928	1.647	2.184
P-Value	.338	.003	.100	.029
N	49	64	22	16

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C31: Matching Estimates of Politically-Oriented Chatting via Snapchat while Omitting Peer Civic Engagement

	<u>Level of Politically-Oriented Chatting</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	-.226	2.093	2.433	3.850
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.782	1.114	2.311	3.078
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-1.792	-.132	-2.360	-2.706
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	1.340	4.318	7.226	10.406
T-Statistic	-.289	1.878	1.053	1.250
P-Value	.773	.060	.292	.211
N	57	67	23	16

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C32: Matching Estimates of Politically-Oriented Chatting via Snapchat while Omitting Political Science Major

	<u>Level of Politically-Oriented Chatting</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	.589	1.426	4.208	2.711
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.098	1.092	2.787	3.241
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-1.619	-.755	-1.572	-4.192
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.797	3.608	9.988	9.614
T-Statistic	.537	1.306	1.510	.836
P-Value	.591	.192	.131	.403
N	49	65	23	16

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C33: Matching Estimates of Politically-Oriented Chatting via Snapchat while Omitting Campaign Attention

	<u>Level of Politically-Oriented Chatting</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	.233	2.017	3.878	3.475
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.174	1.214	2.720	3.523
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-2.128	-.041	-1.780	-4.029
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.594	4.443	9.536	10.979
T-Statistic	.199	1.799	1.426	.987
P-Value	.842	.072	.154	.324
N	49	64	22	16

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C34: Matching Estimates of Politically-Oriented Chatting via Snapchat while Omitting Ideology

	<u>Level of Politically-Oriented Chatting</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	.270	3.258	2.534	2.086
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.127	1.078	2.421	3.195
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-1.993	1.105	-2.502	-4.719
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.533	5.411	7.570	8.891
T-Statistic	.240	3.023	1.047	.653
P-Value	.811	.003	.296	.514
N	52	66	22	16

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C35: Matching Estimates of Politically-Oriented Chatting via Snapchat while Omitting Sex

	<u>Level of Politically-Oriented Chatting</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	-.133	2.440	4.247	2.937
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.083	1.140	2.582	3.400
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-2.322	.162	-1.124	-4.305
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.034	4.718	9.618	10.179
T-Statistic	-.123	2.140	1.645	.864
P-Value	.902	.032	.100	.387
N	49	64	22	16

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C36: Matching Estimates of Politically-Oriented Chatting via Snapchat while Omitting Age

	<u>Level of Politically-Oriented Chatting</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	-.677	3.030	3.083	3.090
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.163	.956	2.118	3.293
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-3.016	1.120	-1.322	-3.924
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	1.662	4.940	7.488	10.104
T-Statistic	.582	3.170	1.456	.938
P-Value	.560	.002	.145	.348
N	49	64	22	16

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C37: Matching Estimates of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Blog Readership

	<u>Level of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.677	3.526	3.881	7.727
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.735	.868	1.350	1.258
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	.218	1.805	1.182	5.217
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	3.136	5.247	6.580	10.237
T-Statistic	2.279	4.061	2.895	6.143
P-Value	.023	<.0001	.004	<.0001
N	98	104	63	69

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C38: Matching Estimates of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Interest in Politics

	<u>Level of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.068	2.812	5.526	7.312
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.736	.824	1.243	1.483
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.393	1.178	3.041	4.352
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.529	4.446	8.011	10.272
T-Statistic	1.452	3.413	4.447	4.932
P-Value	.147	.0006	<.0001	<.0001
N	97	104	62	68

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C39: Matching Estimates of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Strong Partisanship

	<u>Level of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	.669	3.415	4.456	6.980
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.765	.813	1.411	1.507
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.850	1.803	1.635	3.972
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.188	5.027	7.277	9.988
T-Statistic	.874	4.198	3.158	4.631
P-Value	.382	<.0001	.002	<.0001
N	96	104	62	67

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C40: Matching Estimates of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Peer Civic Engagement

	<u>Level of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.022	2.715	4.059	6.890
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.703	.815	1.246	1.578
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.372	1.100	1.570	3.740
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.416	4.330	6.544	10.040
T-Statistic	1.454	3.331	3.257	4.366
P-Value	.146	.0009	.001	<.0001
N	104	111	67	68

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C41: Matching Estimates of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Political Science Major

	<u>Level of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.134	2.761	4.295	6.968
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.748	.852	1.392	1.589
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.351	1.071	1.512	3.796
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.619	4.451	7.078	10.140
T-Statistic	1.515	3.239	3.086	4.386
P-Value	.130	.001	.002	<.0001
N	96	105	62	68

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C42: Matching Estimates of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Campaign Attention

	<u>Level of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.389	2.963	4.938	7.814
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.711	.868	1.234	1.518
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.022	1.242	2.471	4.784
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.800	4.684	7.405	10.844
T-Statistic	1.949	3.414	4.002	5.148
P-Value	.051	.0006	<.0001	<.0001
N	96	104	62	67

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C43: Matching Estimates of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Ideology

	<u>Level of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.395	3.254	5.643	7.817
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.666	.775	1.297	1.634
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	.074	1.719	3.050	4.557
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.716	4.789	8.236	11.077
T-Statistic	2.094	4.198	4.352	4.784
P-Value	.036	<.0001	<.0001	<.0001
N	105	114	63	70

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C44: Matching Estimates of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Sex

	<u>Level of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.238	3.129	4.694	7.543
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.642	.873	1.304	1.548
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.036	1.398	2.087	4.453
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.512	4.860	7.301	10.633
T-Statistic	1.929	3.585	3.600	4.872
P-Value	.054	.0003	.0003	<.0001
N	97	104	62	67

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table C45: Matching Estimates of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook on Offline Civic Engagement while Omitting Age

	<u>Level of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.340	3.144	4.056	6.936
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.798	.811	1.282	1.388
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.244	1.536	1.493	4.161
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.924	4.752	6.619	9.711
T-Statistic	1.680	3.876	3.164	4.996
P-Value	.093	.0001	.002	<.0001
N	96	104	62	67

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of monitoring is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Appendix D: Supplemental Models for Paper Analyses

Table D1: Confirmatory Factor Analysis on Snapchat Activity Variables

<u>Latent Factor</u>	<u>Model</u>
Monitoring	.526*** (.043)
Sharing Pictures	.983*** (.032)
Sharing Videos	.898*** (.030)
Chatting	.779*** (.035)
Comparative Fit Index	.961
Tucker-Lewis Index	.883
Log-Likelihood	-3050.55
Bayesian Information Criterion	6178.934
Chi-Square	62.702
P>Chi-Square	<.0001

Notes: First, the values in parentheses are standard errors. Second, * denotes $p < .05$; ** denotes $p < .01$, and *** denotes $p < .0001$, all two-tailed tests.

Table D2: Weighted Matching Estimates of Monitoring Snapchat Posts on Offline Civic Engagement

	<u>Level of Monitoring</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	-.992	1.097	3.468	2.548
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.895	1.428	1.413	1.791
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-2.784	-1.760	.610	-1.188
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	.800	3.954	6.326	6.284
T-Statistic	-1.108	.768	2.455	1.423
P-Value	.268	.442	.014	.155
N	59	53	40	21

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of sending pictures is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table D3: Weighted Matching Estimates of Politically Oriented Chatting via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement

	<u>Level of Sending Videos</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	-.225	2.096	2.600	4.757
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.024	1.092	2.495	4.911
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-2.284	-.087	-2.605	-5.703
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	1.834	4.279	7.805	15.217
T-Statistic	-.219	1.919	1.042	.969
P-Value	.826	.055	.298	.333
N	49	63	21	16

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of sending videos is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table D4: Weighted Matching Estimates of Sending Pictures via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement

	<u>Level of Sending Pictures</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.760	1.551	5.810	4.215
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.940	1.388	1.917	1.946
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.137	-1.243	1.834	.126
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	3.655	4.345	9.786	8.304
T-Statistic	1.872	1.118	3.031	2.165
P-Value	.061	.264	.002	.030
N	44	47	23	19

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of sending pictures is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table D5: Weighted Matching Estimates of Sending Videos via Snapchat on Offline Civic Engagement

	<u>Level of Sending Videos</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.781	2.532	6.757	7.137
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.368	1.431	3.094	2.178
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-1.043	-.383	.257	2.161
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.605	5.447	13.257	11.353
T-Statistic	1.302	1.770	2.184	3.277
P-Value	.193	.077	.029	.001
N	25	33	19	18

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of sending videos is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table D6: Weighted Matching Estimates of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook on Offline Civic Engagement

	<u>Level of Sharing Pictures and Websites on Facebook</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	.983	2.700	4.328	6.951
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	.748	.896	1.210	1.575
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.502	.923	1.909	3.807
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	2.469	4.477	6.747	10.095
T-Statistic	1.315	3.014	3.578	4.413
P-Value	.189	.003	.0003	<.0001
N	95	103	62	67

Notes: In each two-column set, the level of sending videos is compared with those who never did so. Second, the covariates on which the matching is based are described in the text. Third, the effects on offline civic engagement are the average treatment effect for the treated (ATET). Finally, the matching results are from 1:1 genetic matching with post-matching bias adjustment. Thus, the N represents the matched number of observations.

Table D7: Activity Levels on Snapchat versus Facebook

<u>Activity Level</u>	<u>Type of Politically-Oriented Activity</u>		
	<u>Sharing Pictures on Snapchat</u>	<u>Sharing Video on Snapchat</u>	<u>Sharing Pictures and Webpages on Facebook</u>
Never	74.50%	82.10%	46.56%
Rarely	8.76%	5.09%	16.67%
Sometimes	8.91%	6.02%	16.79%
Regularly	4.30%	3.70%	9.54%
Very Often	3.53%	3.09%	10.43%

Note: Totals may not add to 100% due to rounding.