

## Online Appendices for “College Students, Political Engagement and Snapchat in the 2020 General Election.”

**Laurie L. Rice and Kenneth W. Moffett, Southern Illinois University Edwardsville**

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

### Appendix A: Results Tables for the Snapchat Chapter

Table A1 corresponds to Figures One and Two in the manuscript. Table A2 provides the results for monitoring what a presidential candidate, political party, another candidate for political office, or a political interest group posts on Snapchat.

Table A1: Matching Estimates of Sending Videos and Pictures via Snapchat on Offline Engagement

	<u>Sending Pictures</u>				<u>Sending Videos</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	3.082	2.749	4.322	2.808	2.426	3.457	4.855	4.344
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.173	.995	1.709	1.962	1.302	1.137	1.453	2.542
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	.728	.762	.849	-1.198	-.187	1.175	1.898	-.903
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	5.436	4.736	7.795	6.814	5.039	5.739	7.812	9.591
T-Statistic	2.627	2.763	2.529	1.432	1.863	3.040	3.340	1.709
P-Value	.009	.006	.011	.152	.062	.002	.001	.087
N	53	66	35	31	53	53	34	25

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 A2: Matching Estimates of Monitoring Snapchat Posts on Offline Engagement

	<u>Level of Monitoring</u>			
	<u>Rarely</u>	<u>Sometimes</u>	<u>Frequently</u>	<u>Very Often</u>
Effect on Offline Civic Engagement	1.919	1.341	-1.107	1.392
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.153	1.192	1.859	3.232
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.390	-1.050	-4.937	-5.350
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.228	3.732	2.723	8.134
T-Statistic	1.665	1.125	-.595	.431
P-Value	.096	.261	.552	.667
N	57	54	26	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.

## Appendix B: 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 2020, how often have you...

Table B1: 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	.

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 2020, how often have you...

Table B2: 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 B3: 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 2020, 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; 2) Other

### Age

In what month and year were you born?

\_\_\_\_\_ Month (use drop down box)

\_\_\_\_\_ Year (use drop down box)

## Appendix C: Balance Statistics for Matching Models

Table C1: 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	1.105	1.135	.873	.988	1.067	.158	1.296	1.135	.402	.920	1.057	.148
	After Matching	1.105	1.146	.833	1.000	1.038	.066	1.296	1.278	.927	.999	1.102	.164
Interest in Politics	Before Matching	2.298	1.939	.0002	.090	.608	.368	2.222	1.939	.012	.187	.859	.296
	After Matching	2.298	2.298	1.000	1.000	1.377	.098	2.222	2.204	.764	1.000	1.185	.091
Strong Partisanship	Before Matching	.421	.398	.744	-	1.033	.018	.463	.398	.376	-	1.055	.074
	After Matching	.421	.439	.809	-	.990	.016	.463	.463	1.000	-	1.000	0
Peer Civic Engagement	Before Matching	7.983	7.721	.421	1.000	1.074	.024	8.000	7.721	.333	.490	.764	.537
	After Matching	7.983	7.918	.745	.999	1.521	.027	8.000	8.037	.879	.977	1.431	.364
Political Science Major	Before Matching	.140	.041	.042	-	3.083	.088	.093	.041	.219	-	2.149	.037
	After Matching	.140	.140	1.000	-	1.000	0	.093	.093	1.000	-	1.000	0
Campaign Attention	Before Matching	2.895	2.517	.013	.283	.797	.404	2.870	2.517	.014	.437	.654	.370
	After Matching	2.895	2.895	1.000	.999	1.112	.148	2.870	2.852	.656	1.000	.907	.055
Liberal	Before Matching	.404	.461	.416	-	.983	.053	.426	.461	.628	-	1.000	.037
	After Matching	.404	.404	1.000	-	1.000	0	.426	.426	1.000	-	1.000	0
Conservative	Before Matching	.281	.185	.136	-	1.359	.088	.259	.185	.247	-	1.294	.074
	After Matching	.281	.281	1.000	-	1.000	0	.259	.241	.565	-	1.051	.018
Sex	Before Matching	.474	.660	.016	.051	1.171	.193	.556	.660	.157	.805	1.018	.111
	After Matching	.474	.474	1.000	1.000	1.000	0	.556	.556	1.000	1.000	1.000	0
Age	Before Matching	19.895	20.157	.278	.417	1.009	.263	19.778	20.157	.085	.677	.758	.407
	After Matching	19.895	19.895	1.000	1.000	1.096	.164	19.778	19.759	.764	1.000	.915	.091

Table C2: 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	1.423	1.135	.263	.752	.941	.385	3.000	1.135	1.211*10 <sup>-6</sup>	8.034*10 <sup>-16</sup>	.982	1.810
	After Matching	1.423	1.423	1.000	1.000	.865	.077	3.000	2.857	.494	1.000	.982	.143
Interest in Politics	Before Matching	2.269	1.939	.023	.648	.690	.346	2.714	1.939	1.162*10 <sup>-7</sup>	.0004	.332	.810
	After Matching	2.269	2.269	1.000	1.000	1.000	0	2.714	2.714	1.000	1.000	1.000	0
Strong Partisanship	Before Matching	.615	.398	.039	-	1.025	.231	.619	.398	.060	-	1.031	.238
	After Matching	.615	.615	1.000	-	1.000	0	.619	.571	.742	-	.963	.048
Peer Civic Engagement	Before Matching	8.346	7.721	.078	.111	.561	.923	9.524	7.721	.0001	.001	.633	1.905
	After Matching	8.346	8.269	.853	.995	.649	.385	9.524	9.333	.508	1.000	.947	.286
Political Science Major	Before Matching	.038	.041	.941	-	.966	0	.095	.041	.427	-	2.272	.048
	After Matching	.038	.038	1.000	-	1.000	0	.095	.095	1.000	-	1.000	0
Campaign Attention	Before Matching	3.077	2.517	.002	.026	.476	.677	3.619	2.517	1.553*10 <sup>-7</sup>	.0003	.336	1.143
	After Matching	3.077	3.115	.820	.995	.699	.192	3.619	3.571	.567	1.000	1.253	.143
Liberal	Before Matching	.385	.461	.453	-	.988	.077	.381	.461	.479	-	.994	.095
	After Matching	.385	.385	1.000	-	1.000	0	.381	.476	.416	-	.945	.095
Conservative	Before Matching	.385	.185	.055	-	1.628	.192	.333	.185	.182	-	1.543	.143
	After Matching	.385	.385	1.000	-	1.000	0	.333	.333	1.000	-	1.000	0
Sex	Before Matching	.538	.660	.307	.653	.653	.154	.476	.660	.123	.593	1.060	.190
	After Matching	.538	.538	1.000	1.000	1.000	.077	.476	.476	1.000	1.000	1.000	0
Age	Before Matching	19.769	20.157	.225	.162	.831	.654	19.476	20.157	.015	.346	.447	.714
	After Matching	19.769	19.769	1.000	1.000	1.915	.231	19.476	19.571	.755	1.000	.645	.286



Table C3: 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	1.094	1.066	.877	1.000	.934	.094	1.455	1.066	.032	.235	1.108	.379
	After Matching	1.094	1.076	.848	1.000	1.037	.071	1.455	1.424	.844	.992	1.020	.179
Interest in Politics	Before Matching	2.132	1.910	.059	.338	1.028	.245	2.273	1.910	.0002	.038	.797	.364
	After Matching	2.132	2.132	1.000	1.000	1.230	.071	2.273	2.273	1.000	1.000	1.000	0
Strong Partisanship	Before Matching	.472	.354	.118	-	1.107	.113	.515	.354	.019	-	1.105	.167
	After Matching	.472	.472	1.000	-	1.000	0	.515	.515	1.000	-	1.000	0
Peer Civic Engagement	Before Matching	8.245	7.769	.050	.585	.716	.044	7.773	7.679	.755	.994	1.020	.212
	After Matching	8.245	8.208	.859	.979	1.350	.024	7.773	7.758	.929	.858	1.960	.522
Political Science Major	Before Matching	.132	.048	.088	-	2.547	.075	.091	.048	.257	-	1.829	.045
	After Matching	.132	.132	1.000	-	1.000	0	.091	.091	1.000	-	1.000	0
Campaign Attention	Before Matching	2.849	2.457	.013	.247	.801	.415	2.924	2.457	.001	.007	.756	.470
	After Matching	2.849	2.849	1.000	1.000	.901	.036	2.924	2.894	.821	.992	.767	.179
Liberal	Before Matching	.585	.372	.005	-	1.056	.208	.591	.372	.001	-	1.047	.212
	After Matching	.585	.585	1.000	-	1.000	0	.591	.591	1.000	-	1.000	0
Conservative	Before Matching	.132	.219	.099	-	.681	.094	.227	.219	.887	-	1.039	0
	After Matching	.132	.132	1.000	-	1.000	0	.227	.227	1.000	-	1.000	0
Sex	Before Matching	.679	.601	.302	.973	.984	.075	.591	.601	.886	1.000	.927	.015
	After Matching	.679	.679	1.000	1.000	1.000	0	.591	.591	1.000	1.000	1.000	0
Age	Before Matching	20.019	20.150	.543	.649	.673	.321	19.939	20.150	.329	.996	.836	.227
	After Matching	20.019	19.981	.776	1.000	.831	.125	19.939	19.939	1.000	1.000	1.026	.149

Table C4: 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	1.657	1.066	.014	.033	1.054	.571	2.419	1.066	1.659*10 <sup>-5</sup>	.0001	1.311	1.323
	After Matching	1.657	1.600	.529	1.000	.958	.229	2.419	2.452	.566	1.000	.912	.094
Interest in Politics	Before Matching	2.400	1.910	.0003	.022	.804	.514	2.710	1.910	1.308*10 <sup>-9</sup>	3.719*10 <sup>-7</sup>	.466	.839
	After Matching	2.400	2.400	1.000	1.000	1.323	.057	2.710	2.677	.318	1.000	.956	.031
Strong Partisanship	Before Matching	.629	.354	.003	-	1.047	.286	.710	.354	.0002	-	.928	.355
	After Matching	.629	.629	1.000	-	1.000	0	.710	.645	.417	-	.900	.063
Peer Civic Engagement	Before Matching	8.086	7.679	.203	.654	.607	.686	9.516	7.679	6.507*10 <sup>-6</sup>	.0003	.695	1.936
	After Matching	8.086	7.971	.808	.976	.676	.400	9.516	9.355	.370	.964	1.196	.438
Political Science Major	Before Matching	.029	.048	.531	-	.623	.029	.032	.048	.648	-	.703	.032
	After Matching	.029	.029	1.000	-	1.000	0	.032	.032	1.000	-	1.000	0
Campaign Attention	Before Matching	3.114	2.457	5.117*10 <sup>-5</sup>	.002	.482	.714	3.581	2.457	7.857*10 <sup>-12</sup>	9.939*10 <sup>-6</sup>	.293	1.129
	After Matching	3.114	3.114	1.000	1.000	1.591	.171	3.581	3.484	.367	1.000	.734	.094
Liberal	Before Matching	.629	.372	.005	-	1.025	.257	.452	.372	.408	-	1.092	.065
	After Matching	.629	.629	1.000	-	1.000	0	.452	.452	1.000	-	1.000	0
Conservative	Before Matching	.257	.219	.631	-	1.145	.029	.323	.219	.250	-	1.315	.097
	After Matching	.257	.257	1.000	-	1.000	0	.323	.258	.318	-	1.141	.063
Sex	Before Matching	.686	.601	.370	.998	1.060	.086	.613	.601	.896	1.000	.926	.065
	After Matching	.686	.686	1.000	1.000	1.265	.057	.613	.710	.367	.999	1.152	.094
Age	Before Matching	19.629	20.150	.089	.277	.962	.571	19.677	20.150	.045	.481	.462	.613
	After Matching	19.629	19.800	.493	.683	1.614	.343	19.677	19.581	.573	.999	.876	.219

Table C5: 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	1.226	1.057	.345	.699	.909	.245	1.453	1.057	.055	.419	1.221	.396
	After Matching	1.226	1.245	.839	1.000	.867	.093	1.453	1.415	.594	1.000	1.066	.073
Interest in Politics	Before Matching	2.132	1.926	.071	.572	.960	.208	2.302	1.926	.001	.020	.867	.377
	After Matching	2.132	2.132	1.000	1.000	1.153	.037	2.302	2.302	1.000	1.000	1.000	0
Strong Partisanship	Before Matching	.434	.365	.354	-	1.077	.075	.528	.365	.031	-	1.092	.170
	After Matching	.434	.434	1.000	-	1.000	0	.528	.528	1.000	-	1.000	0
Peer Civic Engagement	Before Matching	8.019	7.725	.320	.993	.841	.396	7.736	7.725	.975	.999	1.164	.264
	After Matching	8.019	8.038	.913	.893	1.571	.352	7.736	7.755	.905	.999	1.393	.345
Political Science Major	Before Matching	.113	.054	.197	-	2.004	.057	.075	.054	.576	-	1.393	.019
	After Matching	.113	.113	1.000	-	1.000	0	.075	.075	1.000	-	1.000	0
Campaign Attention	Before Matching	2.698	2.490	.200	.741	.900	.208	2.981	2.490	.001	.030	.691	.491
	After Matching	2.698	2.717	.842	.998	.865	.167	2.981	2.962	.882	.999	.811	.164
Liberal	Before Matching	.585	.388	.009	-	1.039	.189	.567	.388	.018	-	1.051	.170
	After Matching	.585	.585	1.000	-	1.000	0	.567	.567	1.000	-	1.000	0
Conservative	Before Matching	.113	.224	.027	-	.587	.113	.226	.224	.967	-	1.025	0
	After Matching	.113	.113	1.000	-	1.000	0	.226	.226	1.000	-	1.000	0
Sex	Before Matching	.679	.612	.402	1.000	1.146	.057	.585	.612	.715	1.000	.946	.038
	After Matching	.679	.679	1.000	1.000	1.148	.037	.585	.604	.809	1.000	1.015	.055
Age	Before Matching	19.698	20.147	.048	.541	.784	.453	20.000	20.147	.550	.988	.980	.151
	After Matching	19.698	19.698	1.000	1.000	.966	.130	20...	19.943	.818	.999	1.254	.218

Table C6: 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	1.853	1.057	.002	.009	1.146	.765	2.440	1.057	.0001	.001	1.416	1.360
	After Matching	1.853	1.824	.657	1.000	1.023	.079	2.440	2.240	.370	.906	1.030	.280
Interest in Politics	Before Matching	2.294	1.926	.007	.254	.858	.382	2.920	1.926	<2.2*10 <sup>-16</sup>	.318	.127	1.000
	After Matching	2.294	2.265	.810	1.000	1.352	.105	2.920	2.880	4.279*10 <sup>-10</sup>	1.000	.697	.040
Strong Partisanship	Before Matching	.647	.365	.002	-	1.012	.265	.760	.365	.0002	-	.817	.400
	After Matching	.647	.647	1.000	-	1.000	0	.760	.760	1.000	-	1.000	0
Peer Civic Engagement	Before Matching	8.235	7.725	.201	.087	1.042	.676	9.640	7.725	4.005*10 <sup>-5</sup>	.002	.777	2.000
	After Matching	8.235	8.157	.871	.897	1.298	.526	9.640	9.400	.176	.906	1.531	.480
Political Science Major	Before Matching	.029	.054	.446	-	.576	.029	.040	.054	.743	-	.783	.040
	After Matching	.029	.029	1.000	-	1.000	0	.040	.040	1.000	-	1.000	0
Campaign Attention	Before Matching	3.088	2.490	.0001	.002	.434	.618	3.800	2.490	<2.2*10 <sup>-16</sup>	7.857*10 <sup>-7</sup>	.127	1.360
	After Matching	3.088	3.118	.707	1.000	1.385	.079	3.800	3.720	.318	1.000	.794	.080
Liberal	Before Matching	.647	.388	.005	-	.988	.265	.400	.388	.909	-	1.050	0
	After Matching	.647	.647	1.000	-	1.000	0	.400	.400	1.000	-	1.000	0
Conservative	Before Matching	.206	.224	.809	-	.967	.029	.400	.2224	.097	-	1.435	.160
	After Matching	.206	.206	1.000	-	1.000	0	.400	.320	.318	-	1.103	.080
Sex	Before Matching	.647	.612	.690	1.000	.902	.088	.520	.612	.391	.998	.997	.120
	After Matching	.647	.647	1.000	1.000	1.000	0	.520	.520	1.000	1.000	1.000	0
Age	Before Matching	19.853	20.147	.328	.800	.968	.324	19.720	20.147	.099	.483	.487	.600
	After Matching	19.853	19.863	.968	.897	1.592	.289	19.720	19.680	.843	1.000	.882	.200

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

Table D1: 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	1.155	1.530	1.535	2.589
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.098	1.076	1.529	2.186
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-1.044	-.628	-1.615	-1.958
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	3.354	3.688	4.685	7.136
T-Statistic	1.051	1.421	1.004	1.185
P-Value	.293	.155	.315	.236
N	57	54	26	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 D2: 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	2.347	1.943	1.165	.382
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.361	1.202	1.865	2.324
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.359	-.468	-2.677	-5.933
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	5.053	4.354	5.007	6.859
T-Statistic	1.724	1.617	.625	.165
P-Value	.085	.106	.532	.869
N	57	54	26	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 D3: 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	1.419	1.126	1.226	2.874
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.155	1.202	1.575	2.226
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-1.155	-1.285	-2.019	-1.769
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	3.861	3.537	4.471	7.517
T-Statistic	1.228	.937	.779	2.191
P-Value	.219	.349	.436	.197
N	57	54	26	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 D4: 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	3.508	1.316	-.239	.105
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.204	1.189	1.887	2.381
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	1.098	-1.066	-4.119	-4.833
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	5.918	3.698	3.641	5.043
T-Statistic	2.913	1.107	-.127	.044
P-Value	.004	.268	.899	.965
N	58	57	27	23

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 D5: 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	2.023	2.053	-.603	-.174
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.098	1.208	1.958	2.955
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.174	-.370	-4.636	-6.338
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.220	4.476	3.430	5.990
T-Statistic	1.843	1.699	-.308	-.059
P-Value	.065	.089	.758	.953
N	60	54	26	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 D6: 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	2.216	2.563	.588	2.220
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.139	1.039	1.699	2.299
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.065	.479	-2.912	-2.576
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.497	4.647	4.088	7.016
T-Statistic	1.946	2.468	.346	.966
P-Value	.052	.014	.729	.334
N	57	54	26	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 D7: 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	1.796	1.144	.519	.463
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.401	1.294	1.829	3.066
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-1.007	-1.450	-3.249	-5.914
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.599	3.738	4.287	6.840
T-Statistic	1.282	.884	.284	.151
P-Value	.200	.377	.777	.880
N	60	55	26	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 D8: 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	1.769	2.311	-.820	.735
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.155	1.129	1.828	3.168
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.544	.046	-4.586	-5.873
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.082	4.576	2.946	7.343
T-Statistic	1.531	2.047	-.448	.232
P-Value	.126	.041	.654	.817
N	57	54	26	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 D9: 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	2.639	2.712	-.301	2.283
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.228	1.045	1.454	2.744
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	.179	.616	-3.290	-3.441
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	5.099	4.808	2.688	8.007
T-Statistic	2.150	2.595	-.207	.832
P-Value	.032	.010	.836	.405
N	57	54	27	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 D10: 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	2.929	2.895	5.326	2.374
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.267	.943	1.768	1.920
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	.386	1.012	1.737	-1.547
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	5.472	4.778	8.915	6.295
T-Statistic	2.313	3.071	3.013	1.236
P-Value	.021	.002	.003	.216
N	53	67	36	31

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 D11: 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	3.639	3.714	6.300	3.614
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.292	.960	1.526	2.046
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	1.046	1.797	3.199	-.564
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	6.232	5.631	9.401	7.792
T-Statistic	2.817	3.869	4.129	1.767
P-Value	.005	.0001	$3.643 \times 10^{-5}$	.077
N	53	66	35	31

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 D12: 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	2.456	1.844	5.209	5.218
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.375	1.011	1.609	1.906
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.304	-.175	1.940	1.326
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	5.216	3.863	8.478	9.110
T-Statistic	1.787	1.823	3.238	2.738
P-Value	.074	.068	.001	.006
N	53	66	35	31

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 D13: 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	4.483	2.172	5.279	3.546
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.412	1.015	1.476	2.524
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	1.653	.145	2.280	-1.590
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	7.313	4.199	8.278	8.682
T-Statistic	3.176	2.140	3.576	1.405
P-Value	.001	.032	.0003	.160
N	56	66	35	34

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 D14: 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	2.839	1.266	6.071	-.077
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.301	1.103	1.591	1.912
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	.229	-.937	2.838	-3.981
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	5.449	3.469	9.304	3.827
T-Statistic	2.181	1.148	3.817	-.040
P-Value	.029	.251	.0001	.968
N	54	67	35	31

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 D15: 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	3.514	2.415	3.698	4.631
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.313	.993	1.858	2.404
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	.879	.432	-.077	-.278
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	6.149	4.398	7.473	9.540
T-Statistic	2.675	2.432	1.990	1.927
P-Value	.007	.015	.047	.054
N	53	66	35	31

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 D16: 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	3.677	1.911	5.103	1.926
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.266	1.115	1.591	2.359
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	1.139	-.316	1.870	-2.886
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	6.215	4.138	8.336	6.738
T-Statistic	2.904	1.715	3.207	.817
P-Value	.004	.086	.001	.414
N	55	66	35	32

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 D17: 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	3.518	1.210	5.277	3.367
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.298	1.053	1.633	1.888
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	.913	-.893	1.959	-.488
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	6.123	3.313	8.595	7.222
T-Statistic	2.710	1.149	3.232	1.784
P-Value	.006	.251	.001	.075
N	53	67	35	31

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 D18: 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	2.887	3.013	5.513	4.619
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.284	1.039	1.618	2.267
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	.310	.938	2.228	-.010
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	5.464	5.088	8.798	9.248
T-Statistic	2.249	2.900	3.407	2.037
P-Value	.024	.004	.001	.042
N	53	66	36	31

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 D19: 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	2.080	3.644	5.168	3.150
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.322	1.338	1.695	2.765
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.573	.959	1.724	-2.557
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.733	6.329	8.612	8.857
T-Statistic	1.574	2.724	3.049	1.139
P-Value	.116	.006	.002	.255
N	53	53	35	25

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 D20: 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	4.352	4.116	4.899	3.331
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.174	1.088	1.434	2.581
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	1.996	1.932	1.981	-1.996
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	6.708	6.300	7.817	8.658
T-Statistic	3.708	3.783	3.417	1.291
P-Value	.0002	.0002	.0006	.197
N	53	53	34	25

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 D21: 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	1.388	4.445	4.241	3.867
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.262	1.131	1.491	1.917
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-1.145	2.175	1.207	-.090
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	3.921	6.715	7.275	7.824
T-Statistic	1.100	3.932	2.844	2.017
P-Value	.271	8.426*10 <sup>-5</sup>	.004	.044
N	53	53	34	25

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 D22: 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	3.342	3.387	5.598	4.429
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.368	1.137	1.174	2.324
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	.599	1.105	3.209	-.340
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	6.085	5.669	7.987	9.198
T-Statistic	2.444	2.979	4.768	1.906
P-Value	.015	.003	1.86*10 <sup>-6</sup>	.057
N	55	53	34	28

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 D23: 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	2.492	3.440	4.874	3.666
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.319	1.253	1.281	2.333
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.154	.926	2.267	-1.149
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	5.138	5.954	7.481	8.481
T-Statistic	1.890	2.746	3.806	1.572
P-Value	.059	.006	.0001	.116
N	54	54	34	25

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 D24: 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	1.769	3.499	5.483	6.131
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.359	1.297	1.586	2.903
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.959	.896	2.255	.139
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.497	6.102	8.711	12.123
T-Statistic	1.301	2.697	3.458	2.112
P-Value	.193	.007	.0005	.035
N	53	53	34	25

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 D25: 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	3.176	2.603	5.144	1.340
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.343	1.402	1.423	2.879
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	.485	-.211	2.248	-4.591
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	5.867	5.417	8.040	7.271
T-Statistic	2.366	1.856	3.615	.465
P-Value	.018	.063	.003	.642
N	56	53	34	26

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 D26: 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	2.502	2.328	5.423	5.143
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.298	1.116	1.602	2.628
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.103	.088	2.163	-.281
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	5.107	4.568	8.683	10.567
T-Statistic	1.928	2.086	3.384	1.957
P-Value	.054	.037	.001	.050
N	53	53	34	25

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 D27: 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	2.287	3.261	5.413	3.025
Abadie-Imbens Standard Error	1.351	1.184	1.557	2.618
95% Confidence Interval Lower Bound	-.424	.885	2.249	-2.379
95% Confidence Interval Upper Bound	4.998	5.637	8.577	8.429
T-Statistic	1.692	2.755	3.476	1.156
P-Value	.091	.006	.005	.248
N	53	53	35	25

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.