American Economic Journal: Applied Economics 2026, 18(2): 61–106
https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20240455

The Impact of Dating Apps on Young Adults: Evidence from Tinder†

By Berkeren Büyükeren, Alexey Makarin, and Heyu Xiong*

Online dating apps have transformed the dating market, yet their broader effects remain unclear. We study Tinder's impact on college students using its initial marketing focus on Greek organizations for identification. We show that the full-scale launch of Tinder led to a sharp, persistent increase in sexual activity, but with little corresponding impact on the formation of long-term relationships or relationship quality. Dating outcome inequality, especially among men, rose, alongside rates of sexual assault and STDs. However, despite these changes, Tinder's introduction did not worsen students' mental health on average and may have even led to improvements for female students. (*JEL* I12, I23, J13, J16, L86)

The past two decades have seen a radical shift in how people form romantic relationships and, by extension, how the dating market operates. The share of US heterosexual couples who met online has skyrocketed, growing fourfold since the early 2000s and reaching over 40 percent by 2021. In fact, online dating has become the most popular mode of meeting romantic partners (see Figure 1).

The rapid growth of online dating over the past ten years has coincided with the advent of smartphone-based dating apps. While online dating services have been around since the 1990s, the emergence of mobile phone–based applications, headlined by the launch of Tinder, represented a structural change in what was previously a niche industry. With their geolocational capabilities and always-on-hand presence, Tinder and other apps that followed have redefined how people meet romantic partners and popularized online dating to an unprecedented level.

* Büyükeren: EIEF and LUISS (email: bbuyukeren@redphd.it); Makarin: MIT Sloan School of Management and CEPR (email: makarin@mit.edu); Xiong: Case Western Reserve University (email: heyu.xiong@case.edu). Marika Cabral was coeditor for this article. We are grateful to the three anonymous referees, Joe Doyle, Daron Acemoglu, Luca Braghieri, Leonardo Bursztyn, Stefano DellaVigna, Sarah Eichmeyer, Ruben Enikolopov, Daniel Ershov, Raymond Fisman, Matthew Gentzkow, Ro'ee Levy, Andrea Prat, Andrey Simonov, Jesse Shapiro, Ekaterina Zhuravskaya, and seminar participants at EIEF, MIT Sloan, NES, Tufts, and Tulane, as well as conference participants at the CEPR Workshop on Media, Technology, Politics, and Society, MEA, NBER Digital Economics and AI, the Northeast Ohio Economics Workshop, the Quebec Political Economy Conference, and the WEAI Annual Conference for their valuable comments and feedback. We thank Pryce Davies for the superb research assistance. Makarin gratefully acknowledges financial support from the MIT Sloan Health Systems Initiative. The opinions, findings, and conclusions reported in this article are those of the authors and are in no way meant to represent the corporate opinions, views, or policies of the American College Health Association (ACHA). ACHA does not warrant nor assume any liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information presented in this article.

† Go to https://doi.org/10.1257/app.20240455 to visit the article page for additional materials and author disclosure statement(s).



FIGURE 1. SHARE OF COUPLES BY WHEN AND HOW THEY MET

Notes: This figure is based on data from the How Couples Meet and Stay Together (HCMST) project, which surveys couples on when and how they met each other (Rosenfeld, Thomas, and Hausen 2019). We combine the datasets from the two main surveys (2009 and 2017–2022) and transform them to represent each relationship as a unique observation. A variable indicating meeting through a friend (or family) is assigned a value of 1 if the couple met through a friend (or family member) of either the respondent or their partner. The ways of meeting each other are not exclusive and thus need not add up to 100 percent.

Despite the growing popularity of dating apps, the broader implications of their mainstream adoption remain poorly understood. On one hand, economic theory would predict that the entry of a new matching technology, capable of reducing search costs and alleviating information asymmetries, could improve efficiency and allocations (Adachi 2003; Hitsch, Hortaçsu, and Ariely 2010a; Ellison and Ellison 2018). On the other hand, the rise of dating apps has been accompanied by growing public concern—numerous popular press articles have linked dating apps to the rise of hookup culture,[1] declining mental health and sexual activity among young adults,[2,3] and a more skewed distribution of dating matches.[4]

This paper provides the first empirical analysis of the causal impact of online dating apps. We focus on Tinder, a pioneer in the dating app space that remains a dominant market leader.[5] We center our attention on US college students, who were

[1] "Is Romance Really Dead?" CNN, June 19, 2022. https://edition.cnn.com/2022/06/19/health/romance-love-decline-wellness/index.html.

[2] "A Decade of Fruitless Searching: The Toll of Dating App Burnout. *The New York Times*, August 31, 2022. https://www.nytimes.com/2022/08/31/well/mind/burnout-online-dating-apps.html.

[3] "A 'Failure to Launch': Why Young People Are Having Less Sex." *Los Angeles Times*, August 3, 2023. https://www.latimes.com/california/story/2023-08-03/young-adults-less-sex-gen-z-millennials-generations-parents-grandparents.

[4] "How She Ghosted Me: The Men Being Radicalised by Tinder Data." *New Statesman*, January 10, 2020. https://www.newstatesman.com/long-reads/2020/01/how-she-ghosted-me-men-being-radicalised-tinder-data.

[5] According to a Pew Research Center Survey in July 2022, 79 percent of US adults between the ages of 18 and 29 who have ever used online dating have used Tinder at least once (McClain and Gelles-Watnick 2023).

Tinder's main target demographic from the outset and who belong to the age group most affected by the advent of dating apps.[6]

To identify the causal impact of Tinder, we exploit a key institutional feature of Tinder's launch strategy, which was to identify socially influential members of college communities and harness preexisting social networks in order to promote the app. In practice this involved leveraging Greek organizations (fraternities and sororities) operating on college campuses.[7] Tinder relied heavily on Greek organization members to serve as brand ambassadors, and it used fraternity and sorority events to popularize the app.[8] This strategy was widely documented and attested to contemporaneously by both outside observers and the founders of Tinder themselves.[9] As a consequence, the adoption and use of Tinder on college campuses was said to be significantly higher among students who participated in Greek life.

Using three distinct data sources, we empirically verify that Tinder usage was indeed tightly connected to Greek life on college campuses. First, using data on app usage from over 17 million devices, we show that during the 2017–2018 academic year—the earliest period for which these data are available and four years after the initial introduction of the app—Tinder use was significantly higher in colleges with a more pronounced Greek life presence. Second, we show that colleges with Greek life were more likely to be located in towns that exhibited higher Google search intensity for Tinder during the app's initial launch period.[10] Third, analyzing the universe of college newspaper articles from 2013 through 2016 available on LexisNexis, we document that Tinder was consistently more likely to be discussed at colleges with a greater presence of Greek organizations. The articles also reveal personal anecdotes that corroborate the spread of Tinder through Greek systems.

Motivated by this pattern of diffusion, we pursue a difference-in-differences research design that exploits the differential spread of Tinder between Greek and non-Greek students following its full-scale launch. To carry out our analysis, we utilize the National College Health Assessment (NCHA), which surveys college students on a semester-by-semester basis—approximately 1.1 million students at 500 colleges from 2008 through 2019—and provides detailed measures of their sexual activity, relationships, and physical and mental health.

Applying the difference-in-differences strategy, we compare students before and after the full-scale launch of Tinder and across their Greek affiliation. College-by-survey-wave fixed effects allow us to account not only for variables whose impact on student behavior is constant across colleges and time, such as college selectivity or countrywide shocks, but also for any time-varying differences

[6] In the spring of 2013, only 10 percent of adults aged 18 to 24 reported having used online dating services. This number grew to 27 percent by 2015, after the rollout of Tinder (Smith 2016). For other age cohorts, the change between 2013 and 2015 was much smaller. See Supplemental Appendix Figure A1 for more details.

[7] Fraternities and sororities are social organizations at American colleges and universities. They play a central role in the college experience of many American undergraduate students (Even and Smith 2022).

[8] "Here's One of the College Kids Helping Tinder Take Over Campuses." *The Huffington Post*, July 2, 2013. https://www.huffpost.com/entry/tinder-app-college-kids_n_3530585.

[9] "How Tinder Used Greek Life for More than Just Hookups." *Fortune*, August 9, 2016. https://fortune.com/2016/08/09/entrepreneurs-greek-life-tinder.

[10] Google search intensity is a normalized ratio of specific word searches over the total number of searches in a specific location at a given time.

within colleges, such as idiosyncratic changes in campus culture. Rich student-level controls further adjust for potential shifts in the composition of respondents. We confirm the absence of pre-trends in our estimates, which supports the validity of the parallel trends assumption.

First, we characterize the impact of online dating apps on the dating-market equilibrium in terms of sexual activity and relationship formation. This empirical analysis is guided by theoretical predictions in Antler, Bird, and Fershtman (2022, 2023)—namely, that reduced frictions in the dating market can lead to prolonged search and more frequent turnover in romantic couplings. Our results are consistent with these theoretical predictions.

We find that the introduction of Tinder led to a significant and persistent differential increase in the frequency of sexual activity and the number of sexual partners among students involved in Greek life, as compared to their peers at the same institutions in the same semester. In terms of magnitude, after Tinder's introduction, Greek-affiliated students (hereafter, "Greek students") on average had 0.22 more sex partners and became 3.1 percentage points more likely to have had sex in the previous 12 months, equivalent to 0.07–0.08 standard deviations. At the same time, we find no evidence that Tinder affected the share of students in a cohabiting relationship. Taken together, these results suggest that online dating apps induce greater experimentation and turnover in sexual relationships prior to the establishment of a stable romantic match.

Second, we examine the implications of dating apps for relationship quality. Matching on dating apps differs greatly from offline dating. On one hand, the former is associated with substantially lower search costs, implying that Tinder could lead to improvements in average relationship quality. On the other hand, matching in online dating apps relies on arguably more superficial informational cues, which can lead to worse pairings. We measure relationship quality using three separate questions that were designed to elicit instances of relationship problems and abuse. We find no evidence that Tinder affects the share of students experiencing relationship difficulties, suggesting that Tinder neither improves nor worsens match quality.

Third, we study the distributional consequences of Tinder in the dating market and show that Tinder's full-scale launch led to an outward shift of the entire distribution of sex activity for Greek students relative to non-Greek students. That is, when we estimate our baseline specification using indicators for whether a student had more than a certain number of sexual partners in the previous 12 months, we consistently obtain positive coefficients, even for large numbers of partners. These coefficients tend to be larger for male students. We interpret these findings as strong evidence of increased inequality in sexual activity following Tinder's full-scale launch, with the rise of "superstars" among Greek students with a large number of sex partners. These patterns are consistent with a long-standing hypothesis in economics that technologies facilitating an increase in market scale may exacerbate inequality across the "talent" distribution (Rosen 1981; Koenig 2023).

We also document several heterogeneity results that speak to the mechanisms behind Tinder's impact. The increase in Greek students' sexual activity following Tinder's full-scale launch is significantly larger for students in their earlier years of study and for students attending more populous and more research-oriented colleges.

These findings are consistent with Tinder reducing search costs, as early years are critical for forming new social connections, and finding partners in larger or more research-focused colleges may be more difficult without online matching tools. Conversely, the effects are smaller for Southern colleges, suggesting that Tinder is particularly effective in environments with less conservative norms surrounding sexual behavior.

Having shown the primary effects of Tinder on the dating-market equilibrium, we explore the potential downstream ramifications of increased sexual activity on mental and physical well-being.

In terms of mental health, we find that Tinder's introduction had a positive average impact on the reported mental well-being of students involved in Greek life. The improvement is around 0.03 standard deviations in magnitude and is observed across all components of the index, including severe depression and reported instances of self-harm. The impact is larger and more pronounced for female students across all index components.

Our findings of positive impact on mental health contradict the common view that dating apps may be causing disproportionate mental distress among young adults due to factors such as online harassment (Smith and Duggan 2013). They also stand in contrast to the deleterious effects of other social networking platforms, such as Facebook (Allcott et al. 2020; Braghieri, Levy, and Makarin 2022). We speculate that the effect could be due to an improvement in self-image as a result of students—especially female students—receiving more romantic attention after the introduction of Tinder. We find this explanation to be well aligned with the existing literature (e.g., Abramova et al. 2016; Jung et al. 2019) and the narrative evidence from around the time that dating apps were introduced. Using an alternative survey question centered around issues impeding students' academic performance, we also document a relative decline in the prevalence of eating disorders among female students, further consistent with potential improvements in body image and self-esteem (Stice et al. 2017).

While our findings suggest that Tinder's introduction led to mental health improvement among Greek students on average, we also discover that it was associated with some negative consequences for some students. Specifically, we observe a significant differential increase in the reported incidence of sexual assault, by 2 percentage points off the mean of 8.7 percent. Naturally, we show that the mental health improvements documented earlier are mainly observed among individuals not reporting having experienced sexual assault.

We also find a positive effect on the probability of being diagnosed with STDs. The effects are substantial in magnitude, with the probability of being diagnosed with chlamydia growing by 0.6 percentage points off the mean of 1.3 percent. This increase in diagnosis likely reflects both the risks associated with increased sexual encounters and also precautionary responses to those behavioral changes, such as increased testing. Consistent with this notion, we find that students also began to seek out HIV tests at a greater frequency after the introduction of Tinder, indicating awareness of certain risks inherent to increased sexual activity.

We perform a series of tests to rule out competing explanations behind our results. One important concern is that students self-select into Greek organization, and as

a result, our estimates may reflect the differential impact by students' observable characteristics, such as gender, race, or body type, and not by their Greek membership per se. We assuage this concern in three ways. First, we estimate a version of our specification that includes the interactions between the post-Tinder-introduction indicator and a rich set of student characteristics. Second, we further account for potential differences between Greek and non-Greek students by predicting the number of sex partners using a least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO) procedure based on a set of student characteristics, their square terms, and first-order interactions, then we include the LASSO-predicted number of sex partners interacted with post-Tinder-introduction as a control variable. Third, we repeat this exercise controlling for the LASSO-predicted Greek membership status itself. Across all these checks, our results remain unchanged. As such, our results are unlikely to be driven by omitted differences between Greek members and other students.

Another potential concern is that our estimates could be biased by self-image-driven misreporting. This is unlikely for several reasons. First, the NCHA survey is anonymous and does not use individually assigned enumerators. Second, the cause for misreporting would have to be convoluted, such that it accounts for increases in the reported numbers of sexual partners and STD diagnoses. Third, we observe no differential change in nonresponse rates for our outcomes.

Finally, we address a key issue of spillover between Greek and non-Greek students. Because non-Greek students inhabit the same campuses as Greek students with whom they are free to associate and interact, non-Greek students may not be a perfect control group, as their outcomes are likely influenced by the behavior of Greek students.[11] This may lead to complications with the veracity of our estimates and questions about whether the comparison between changes in Greek and non-Greek student outcomes may be driven by such possible spillovers.

To examine the impact of spillovers on our estimates, we perform a test where we incrementally restrict our control group to students who are progressively less subject to spillover effects. Specifically, we sequentially remove non-Greek-affiliated students in colleges with successively lower levels of Greek presence from the sample. Importantly, this method makes no assumptions on the directionality of spillover effects and assumes only that the extent of spillover is proportional to the share of Greek students on college campuses. In the most demanding specification, we evaluate the counterfactual using non-Greek students from college campuses where on average only approximately 2 percent of the student body are engaged in Greek life and therefore the extent of spillover effects should be minimal. Yet as we systematically remove the threat of spillovers from our identifying variation, all of our estimates remain stable in both magnitude and statistical significance. This provides strong evidence that while spillover effects undoubtedly take place, they do not explain our findings and in fact must be modest in size.

To further quantify the precise magnitude of these spillover effects and examine Tinder's impact on the overall student population as well as on non-Greek students specifically, we employ a complementary identification strategy. Defining treatment

[11] We use the term spillover broadly to include both the spillover in adoption (of Tinder) and spillover in outcomes.

at the college level based on the share of college students active in Greek life, we examine Tinder's college-wide impact by comparing student outcomes across colleges with varying levels of Greek activity (i.e., more Greek versus less Greek colleges).[12]

Using this alternative strategy, we show that Tinder's full-scale launch led to an increase in the average rate of sexual activity across college campuses with disproportionately more exposure to the app due to higher Greek representation. Importantly, even non-Greek students at heavily Greek colleges experienced an increase in the average number of sex partners and the probability of having sex within the previous 30 days. This suggests that at colleges with large Greek life presence, where network effects are large, the extent of spillover in Tinder adoption is nonnegligible and the "gains" from online dating do not accrue exclusively to Greek students.

While the effect on sexual activity generalizes to the non-Greek student population, the results on relationship formation and mental health do not. In particular, we find that non-Greek students at high-Greek colleges became more likely to be in cohabiting relationships after the introduction of Tinder. The significant increase in relationship formation for non-Greek students stands in sharp contrast to the absence thereof for their Greek counterparts, suggesting that the impact of Tinder on dating behavior may be distinct for the two student groups. The statistically insignificant results on mental health for non-Greek students are also notable and suggest that the impact on mental health may be heterogeneous across the student population. However, due to the lower precision of the college-level estimates, we cannot definitively rule out improvements in mental health that could be comparable in magnitude to those observed among Greek students at the individual level.

By organizing our analysis at the college level, we can tie our estimates to the first-stage college-level results on app usage and offer a better assessment of the magnitude of the effects. A back-of-the-envelope calculation suggests that moving a college from the twenty-fifth percentile to the median level of Tinder use (i.e., a 0.285 percentage point increase in average daily use of Tinder) increases the average number of sex partners at a college by 0.16, the share of students in cohabiting relationships by 2.1 percentage points, and the share diagnosed with chlamydia by 0.5 percentage points. Average mental health improves (if the statistically insignificant coefficient is taken seriously) by 0.03 standard deviations.[13]

Overall, our results suggest that the advent of Tinder has significantly reshaped the dating-market equilibrium in line with theoretical predictions by prolonging search, increasing turnover in romantic relationships, and increasing inequality in dating activity. These changes are consistent with Tinder facilitating the rise of

[12] The idea behind this approach is that because of strong network effects in the utility of dating apps, overall Tinder usage should be greater on campuses with a larger Greek presence. This is attested to by our first-stage findings and by Tinder's strategy of targeting Greek students.

[13] We lack precise information on individual-level Tinder adoption rates to fully back out the treatment effect on Greek students in our baseline individual-level specifications. However, using the best available estimate—a 40 percentage point higher adoption rate of Tinder among Greek students compared to non-Greek students, as reported by a Tinder representative at Tufts University—we estimate that students' adoption of Tinder led to a 0.19 standard deviation increase in the number of sexual partners, a 0.08 standard deviation improvement in mental health, and a 0.132 standard deviation rise in reported chlamydia cases for students adopting the technology. However, these magnitudes should be interpreted with caution, as they rely on a single ballpark figure.

hookup culture on college campuses. At the same time, our findings indicate that online dating apps are not to blame for the worrisome trends in declining sexual activity and worsening mental health among young adults documented by prominent psychologists (Twenge et al. 2019; Twenge and Park 2019).

This paper is the first to study the causal impact of mobile online dating technologies on individual outcomes. The vast majority of existing research relies on correlational exercises—see Bonilla-Zorita, Griffiths, and Kuss (2021) for the literature review. For instance, in a survey of 400 college students, Shapiro et al. (2017) find that Tinder use is positively associated with the number of sex partners and having experienced nonconsensual sex. Surveying college students in Hong Kong, Choi, Wong, and Fong (2018) find that dating app users were more likely to report being sexually abused in the previous year relative to nonusers. Holtzhausen et al. (2020) find a negative association between the use of swipe-based dating apps and mental health. While these studies are informative about the potential issues associated with dating apps, causal evidence is lacking. The review article by Bonilla-Zorita, Griffiths, and Kuss (2021) advises that "it is recommended for further study to […] consider methodologies that can establish causality" (p. 2272).

The only study identifying a causal relationship between online dating and health is Greenwood and Agarwal (2016). Using the staggered introduction of Craigslist across cities in Florida from 2002 to 2006 for identification, the authors find that the advent of Craigslist is associated with significantly higher asymptomatic HIV counts, especially among African Americans. In contrast, we study Tinder, a platform used solely (and much more often than Craigslist) for online dating, during a time when online dating became normalized (Rosenfeld, Thomas, and Hausen 2019).[14] We also study various additional outcomes, not only STDs, thus drawing a much more comprehensive picture of the overall effects of online dating technologies.[15]

While our study focuses exclusively on college students, Tinder's targeted promotional strategy within this group offers a causal framework to estimate effects on a wide range of outcomes. Further, understanding the impact of dating apps on such outcomes as poor mental health and sexual assaults is of substantive intrinsic interest given the prevalence of these problems on college campuses and the efforts to ameliorate them (e.g., Fedina, Holmes, and Backes 2018).

This paper also relates to significant literature in economics on marriage markets, dating back to Becker's theory of marriage (Becker 1973; for a recent overview, see Chiappori 2020). The dating market as a precursor to the marriage market has also received attention from economists. We add to this literature by documenting how online dating apps change the equilibrium dating patterns empirically in a particular community—in this case, colleges.

[14] For instance, Craiglist has also been used for sex work. For example, see Cunningham, DeAngelo, and Tripp (2024), who show that the staggered rollout of Craigslist erotic services reduced female homicides and reported rape offenses.

[15] A few studies examine how dating platform design causally shapes user behavior. Bapna et al. (2016b) analyze the impact of an anonymous viewing feature on user behavior. Jung et al. (2019) study the impact of mobile app creation by online dating sites on users who initially used the online platform and then switched to the mobile platform. Using a differences-in-differences strategy, the authors find that mobile app adoption caused users to view more profiles, log in throughout the day, and be more impulsive and uninhibited.

Much of the work in this line of research has used online interactions to identify mate preferences to better understand current marriage markets and to predict how online dating might shape these markets. This is exemplified by Hitsch, Hortaçsu, and Ariely (2010a), who use the demographic, physical, and interaction data of 6,000 randomly selected online daters to estimate a model of mate-match preferences. The authors find that actual online matches closely resemble the ideal matches generated by the Gale-Shapley algorithm, suggesting that online dating markets are efficient and have uniquely low search costs, unlike real-world marriage markets.[16] Meanwhile, Antler, Bird, and Fershtman (2022, 2023) study the dating market theoretically, suggesting that by lowering search costs, dating apps may lead to greater experimentation and prolonged search before marriage. Our estimates are in line with these predictions.

This paper also relates to the nascent literature on the causal effects of the internet and, more narrowly, social networking technologies on sexual activity, marriage, and individual well-being. Bhuller et al. (2013) find a positive effect of internet use on sex crime, possibly due to increased consumption of pornography (see also Ciacci and Sviatschi 2022). Bellou (2015) finds that broadband internet has led to higher marriage rates by thickening the marriage market. Allcott et al. (2020); Mosquera et al. (2020); and Allcott, Gentzkow, and Song (2022) document the negative impact of social media on one's well-being broadly defined, although not considering outcome variables related to dating or sexual behavior. Braghieri, Levy, and Makarin (2022) leverage the staggered introduction of Facebook across US colleges to document its negative effects, specifically on mental health.[17] We contribute to this research agenda by examining the causal impact of a social networking technology—online dating apps—that has so far been overlooked but that has arguably altered the societal landscape just as much as social media.

I. Background

Tinder is a social networking and online dating application. It soft launched in the Apple App Store in September 2012. In contrast to existing online dating platforms, Tinder was designed from the ground up to be a smartphone-based app. Its biggest innovation was the swipe feature (released in May 2013), which allows

[16] Other studies estimating online partner preferences include Hitsch, Hortaçsu, and Ariely (2010b), who document the quantitative importance of racial preferences; Huber and Malhotra (2017), who find a preference for partners with similar political characteristics; and Neyt, Vandenbulcke, and Baert (2019) and Egebark et al. (2021), who reveal that women tend to prefer more highly educated partners, while men do not seem to have a preference for higher education, and that both men and women place a similar premium on physical attractiveness. Fisman et al. (2006, 2008) and Bhargava and Fisman (2014) estimate mating preferences in the context of in-person speed dating experiments. In the context of arranged marriages in India, Banerjee et al. (2013) study marriage preferences by analyzing matrimonial newspaper advertisements and find a strong preference for within-caste marriage. Bursztyn, Fujiwara, and Pallais (2017) conduct a field experiment showing that single, female MBA students reported lower desired salaries and willingness to travel when they expected their classmates to see their preferences.

[17] For a comprehensive overview of the literature on the economics and politics of social media, see Zhuravskaya, Petrova, and Enikolopov (2020) and Aridor et al. (2024). See Enikolopov, Makarin, and Petrova (2020) for an example of a study that similarly utilizes the early diffusion patterns of a social networking platform to identify its causal effects.

users to anonymously swipe right or left to indicate whether they like or dislike other users' profiles. Two users are matched and allowed to interact only if they both swiped right on each other's profile. The Android version of Tinder launched in July 2013.

Simply put, Tinder has normalized and popularized online dating, especially among young adults. By 2020, Tinder had 75 million monthly active users, and by 2021, Tinder had recorded more than 65 billion matches worldwide (it is available in more than 190 countries). Many competitors have since launched, but Tinder remains the market leader. As of July 2022, 79 percent of adults aged 18 to 29 and 46 percent of all US adults who had ever engaged in online dating had used Tinder at least once. This usage far surpassed that of any other dating app or website (McClain and Gelles-Watnick 2023).[18]

Tinder capitalizes on network effects, so gaining early traction was crucial to its success. To accomplish this, Tinder was heavily targeted toward college students in its initial launch. To grow its user base in the first year, the developers followed the college-based promotion strategy. Search data from Google Trends for 2013 and 2014 corroborate the fact that Tinder targeted the college student population: In the first two years that Tinder became available nationally, most of the top 30 cities in terms of Google search intensity for Tinder were college towns or at least contained a college whose student body was a significant part of the local population (see Supplemental Appendix Table A1).

However, beyond just promoting the app first to college students, Tinder founders honed their strategy by aiming to spread the app through the existing, already-dense networks of the Greek system on college campuses. Because fraternities and sororities host numerous parties and organize other social events, they are often the linchpin of social activity on college campuses. As such, they are (or were) socially influential subcommunities with an outsize sway on the overall student body.

Commenting on this strategy, the app's cofounder Justin Mateen told Fortune.com in 2016, "We penetrated the Greek system. … The most valuable lesson I learned is the power and influence that the Greek system has on a student body."[19]

Mateen himself was a fraternity member at the University of Southern California, where he and his cofounders launched the app through the university's Greek system. He said, "We knew that if it were to resonate with college kids who were already in a very socially charged environment, that other people would find value in the product as well."[20]

To promote the app during its early days, the whole Tinder team would "drive by every fraternity and sorority in Los Angeles, then San Diego, then Orange County, and

[18] Note that 53 percent of adults aged 18 to 29 have reported ever using online dating apps or websites (McClain and Gelles-Watnick 2023). As such, 42 percent (0.53×0.79) of all adults aged 18 to 29 in the United States had used Tinder at least once as of July 2022.

[19] "How Tinder Used Greek Life for More than Just Hookups," *Fortune*, August 9, 2016. https://fortune.com/2016/08/09/entrepreneurs-greek-life-tinder.

[20] "Inside Tinder: Meet the Guys Who Turned Dating into an Addiction," *Time*, February 6, 2014. https://time.com/4837/tinder-meet-the-guys-who-turned-dating-into-an-addiction.

every school we could cover," said another cofounder, Sean Rad.[21] The strategy paid dividends: Every time they visited a sorority or fraternity to pitch Tinder, they would see sign-ups immediately after.

Tinder also sent its vice president of marketing at the time, Whitney Wolfe Herd, on a cross-country trip to pitch the app to fraternity and sorority members. Wolfe Herd, herself a sorority member at Southern Methodist University, would go on to found the rival dating app Bumble. According to Joe Munoz, who developed Tinder's technical backend, Wolfe Herd would go to sorority chapters, "do her presentation, and have all the girls at the meetings install the app. Then she'd go to the corresponding brother fraternity—they'd open the app and see all these cute girls they knew." Tinder had fewer than 5,000 users before Wolfe Herd's trip; when she returned, there were some 15,000 (Moazed and Johnson 2016).[22]

Invigorated by the success of this Greek-based marketing campaign, Tinder's creators doubled down by hiring on-campus representatives across the United States through a campus ambassador program, recruiting mostly from Greek organizations.[23] For example, in 2013, a Tinder brand ambassador at Tufts University, Nick Aull, himself a member of the Theta Delta Chi fraternity, organized Tinder-themed fraternity parties where, to enter, partygoers had to download the Tinder app on their smartphones.[24] Aull also partnered with fraternity and sorority chapters at nearby schools, including Boston University and Harvard University, to organize events there.

To further investigate the prevalence of Greek students among Tinder representatives, in October 2022 we conducted a search for "Tinder Campus Ambassador" on LinkedIn. We identified 47 such ambassadors, most of whom served in the position between 2018 and 2020. Importantly, 33 of the 47 indicated that they were involved in Greek life during college, many in leadership positions.

Because of these strategies, fraternity and sorority members became the earliest adopters of Tinder on college campuses. In 2013, Aull estimated that only 40 percent of undergraduate students at Tufts had downloaded the Tinder app but that 80 percent of the school's Greek population used it. In a 2016 interview, a Tinder spokesperson stated that the fraternity and sorority demographic group remained one of Tinder's most active user cohorts at the time.[25]

Fraternities and sororities continued to be important for Tinder long past the initial launch. For instance, in 2019 it came to light that Tinder has been signing exclusive

[21] "Founder of $3 Billion Tinder Reveals the Clever Marketing Tricks He Used to Make the App Go Viral," *Business Insider*, February 15, 2017. https://www.businessinsider.com/how-tinder-went-viral-sean-rad-reveals-app-marketing-tricks-in-podcast-2017-2.

[22] Despite Tinder's team first promoting the app at select schools, it is infeasible to use the promotion timing patterns in a staggered difference-in-differences strategy. Detailed information on which colleges Tinder first promoted at and at what time proved to be inaccessible. Furthermore, unlike platforms such as Facebook, which had a sharp, phased school-by-school launch, Tinder became instantly accessible to everyone with a smartphone at every college once it launched in the Apple App Store. Therefore, it is more logical and feasible to base the identification strategy on the timing of Tinder's full-scale launch in the summer of 2013 and its decision to target a certain subset of the student body within schools rather than tracing the differences in promotion timing across schools.

[23] "How Tinder Acquired 50 Million Users," *Hackernoon*, July 1, 2021. https://hackernoon.com/how-tinder-acquired-50-million-users-z1o35nw.

[24] "Here's One of the College Kids Helping Tinder Take Over Campuses," *The Huffington Post*, July 2, 2013. https://www.huffpost.com/entry/tinder-app-college-kids_n_3530585.

[25] "How This College Junior Scored a Scholarship … from Tinder," *Refinery 29*, April 18, 2016. https://www.refinery29.com/en-us/2016/04/108639/tinder-scholarship-workman.

partnerships with Greek organizations to prevent them from partnering with competitors—most notably, Bumble.[26]

We also note that the early expansion of Bumble—the second most popular online dating app among young adults: 51 percent of 18-to-29-year-olds who have engaged in online dating have used it (McClain and Gelles-Watnick 2023)—bore striking similarities to Tinder, with a heavy reliance on sororities and fraternities. Early on, in 2015, Bumble founder (and former Tinder marketing executive) Whitney Wolfe Herd spent weekends "traveling to Texas campuses, bringing free yellow Hanky Panky underwear to the sororities and free beer to the fraternities, telling the fraternity brothers that all the girls were looking for their next formal dates on Bumble."[27] And in 2021, Bumble employed 420 brand ambassadors across more than 100 college campuses.[28]

To the best of our knowledge, no other major social media website or application pursued a similar strategy of targeting Greek students on college campuses. This Greek-centered approach was unique to the dating apps Tinder and Bumble. This fact is critical to our research design.

Following the advent of Tinder, online dating became a much more common and pronounced feature of college social life. This is evident both anecdotally and in survey data.

We examine several waves of surveys conducted by the Pew Research Center (Pew) and the Online College Social Life Survey series, both of which asked questions regarding online dating and dating apps. Supplemental Appendix Table A3 shows that the number of college-age respondents who indicated that they used online dating services ranged from 0 percent to 10 percent from 2005 through 2013, depending on the survey source and the specific question asked. However, after Tinder became widely adopted, the number jumped to 29 percent in 2015 and 50 percent in 2019, underscoring the remarkable normalization of online dating for this demographic group within a relatively short period.

Supplemental Appendix Figure A1 illustrates similar trends for all young adults, without restricting the sample to college students, and using data from two surveys conducted by Pew in April–May 2013 and June–July 2015, just before and soon after Tinder's full-scale launch. The data show that in the spring of 2013, young adults were much less inclined to use dating websites or apps compared to other age cohorts. However, two years later, the percentage of young adults using dating websites and apps increased dramatically, from 10 percent to 27 percent, whereas usage among other age groups remained stable.

[26] "Frats Are Signing 'Exclusive Contracts' to Use Tinder or Bumble," *Futurism*, August 14, 2019. https://futurism.com/the-byte/frats-signing-contracts-tinder-bumble.

[27] "How Whitney Wolfe Herd Turned a Vision of a Better Internet into a Billion-Dollar Brand," *Time*, March 19, 2021. https://time.com/5947727/whitney-wolfe-herd-bumble.

[28] In our search of college newspapers on LexisNexis mentioning Bumble, we found only three such articles from 2015 and ten such articles from 2016. Of these 13 articles, 11 were published in schools with Greek life on campus, indicating a tight relationship between Bumble and Greek life, similar to that of Tinder. These numbers also suggest that Bumble was not a significant topic in our college newspaper data before 2017. Despite this, our post-2016 findings could reflect the combined influence of both Bumble and Tinder on college campuses.

II. Data

Throughout most of our study, we use the NCHA survey as our primary data source. For our first-stage results, we also use LexisNexis data on college newspapers and app usage data from Complementics.

A. *NCHA Survey Data*

The main dependent and independent variables in our empirical analysis are derived from the NCHA survey, which was launched by the American College Health Association (ACHA) in 1998 to gather detailed data on the physical and mental health of college students.

The survey is conducted each semester across hundreds of colleges and universities.[29] From 2008 through 2019, the survey data contain close to 1.3 million individual student responses (ACHA 2008–2019). To ensure consistent comparisons, we restrict our attention only to full-time undergraduate students, reducing our sample to approximately 1.1 million responses. Since the survey employs a rotating panel of colleges, the resulting dataset is an unbalanced panel, meaning that some of the colleges included in one semester may be absent in another.[30] Throughout our analysis, we will account for these sample composition changes by including college fixed effects based on anonymized college identifiers available in the NCHA data.

This rich survey allows us to conduct a uniquely comprehensive, multifaceted analysis of the impact of dating apps—specifically, Tinder—on the behavior and health of young adults. It contains information about sexual activity, relationship outcomes, the potential negative consequences of sexual activity, and mental health.

For sex-related outcomes, we use measures of recent sexual activity (i.e., the number of sex partners a student had in the previous year and whether a student had sex in the previous 30 days), relationship status (i.e., whether a student was in a romantic relationship at the time of the survey), and cohabitation status (i.e., whether a student was in a cohabitating romantic relationship at the time of the survey). We also examine questions pertaining to relationship quality, such as whether a student had been in an abusive relationship, had been in a difficult relationship, or had experienced relationship problems in the previous year. To explore negative outcomes associated with sexual activity, we examine whether a student had experienced sexual assault in the previous year, had been diagnosed with or treated for chlamydia in the previous year, or had ever tested for HIV.

To examine mental health outcomes, we use a comprehensive set of questions that assesses whether a student felt hopeless, overwhelmed, mentally exhausted, very lonely, very sad, or severely depressed; experienced overwhelming anxiety or overwhelming anger; engaged in intentional self-harm; or even considered suicide. Respective outcomes were defined based on experiencing these mental health issues

[29] For brevity, we refer to all academic institutions in the NCHA as "colleges" throughout the paper.

[30] Over 90 percent of colleges appear in the data more than once between fall 2008 and spring 2019. The median number of appearances per college is four. When exploring the robustness of our main estimates, we show that our results are robust when restricting attention only to colleges that appear in the data at least four times.

over the preceding 30 days. To aggregate the responses and reduce data dimensionality, we follow Braghieri, Levy, and Makarin (2022) and construct an index of poor mental health by standardizing all the variables based on the questions mentioned above to have a mean of zero and a standard deviation of one, summing the resulting variables, and then standardizing the resulting sum.

In addition to using the variables previously mentioned, our analysis also uses students' membership status at fraternities and sororities on campus.

This information is crucial to our empirical strategy: It allows us to compare students whom Tinder had specifically targeted to encourage app adoption with students who were less likely to have faced such targeting. We also calculate the proportion of Greek students in each college to use in an alternative college-level specification.

For a detailed description of variable definitions, with the precise question formulations and coding, see Supplemental Appendix Table A2.

Descriptive Statistics and Trends in Sexual Activity.—Table 1 presents descriptive statistics for individual students and colleges included in our analysis. Panel A of Table 1 indicates that 70 percent of survey respondents are White, 6 percent are Black, and 12 percent are Asian. About 11 percent of the students were involved in Greek life. The median full-time undergraduate college student who responded to the survey was a sophomore, as indicated by the college-grade variable, and was 20 years old.

Panel B shows that the average number of sexual partners in the survey sample was 1.5, that 47 percent of the students were in a romantic relationship, and that 11 percent were cohabiting. Panel C reveals that about 11 percent of students experienced abusive relationships in the previous year and that a high percentage reported having been in a difficult relationship or experienced relationship problems (32 percent and 31 percent, respectively). Panel D reveals that a nonnegligible portion of students reported negative consequences related to sexual activity: 9 percent reported having experienced sexual assault and 2 percent reported being diagnosed with or treated for chlamydia. In addition, about 26 percent reported having ever been tested for HIV. Finally, panel E indicates that a striking number of students reported having experienced mental health issues: 35 percent felt overwhelming anxiety and 18 percent felt severely depressed at least once in the previous 30 days.

Because our study explores the impact of a dating app on college students, we pay special attention to the overall trend in sexual activity among individuals in our sample. This is particularly pertinent given the numerous studies indicating that the percentage of young adults who engage in sexual intercourse has been declining in recent years (Twenge et al. 2019). We investigate whether this is evident in our data, as such trends may lead to mechanical and spurious correlations.

In Figure 2, we plot the average number of sex partners for individual students over time separately for Greek and non-Greek students. We distinguish between the two groups of students given the rationale of our identification strategy. Reassuringly, we observe that the frequency of sexual activity for non-Greek students is fairly stable and shows no discernible trend (except for seasonal fluctuations) throughout the entire sample period. By contrast, for Greek students, the figure depicts a dramatic

Table 1—Summary Statistics

	Mean	Std. dev.	Twenty-fifth percentile	Median	Seventy-fifth percentile	Observations
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Panel A. Student characteristics						
White	0.70	0.46	0	1	1	1,097,961
Black	0.06	0.24	0	0	0	1,096,858
Asian	0.12	0.32	0	0	0	1,096,645
Male	0.33	0.47	0	0	1	1,076,700
Greek involvement	0.11	0.31	0	0	0	1,072,732
Fraternity (Greek and male)	0.03	0.18	0	0	0	1,065,776
Sorority (Greek and female)	0.07	0.26	0	0	0	1,065,776
College grade	2.52	1.25	1	2	4	1,071,284
Age	21.27	4.93	19	20	22	1,073,659
BMI	24.48	5.45	20.98	23.18	26.57	1,061,744
Height	66.72	4.08	64	66	70	1,069,588
Gay/lesbian	0.03	0.16	0	0	0	1,072,346
Panel B. Sexual characteristics						
Number of sex partners (previous 12 months)	1.50	3.03	0	1	2	1,076,006
Sex previous 12 months	0.67	0.47	0	1	1	1,076,006
Sex previous 30 days	0.52	0.50	0	1	1	1,082,882
In relationship	0.47	0.50	0	0	1	1,076,544
Cohabiting	0.11	0.32	0	0	0	1,076,544
Panel C. Relationship quality						
Abusive relationship	0.11	0.31	0	0	0	1,092,342
Difficult relationship	0.32	0.47	0	0	1	1,081,307
Relationship problems	0.31	0.46	0	0	1	1,069,588
Panel D. Negative consequences						
Sexual assault	0.09	0.28	0	0	0	1,093,523
Chlamydia	0.01	0.11	0	0	0	1,077,696
HIV test	0.26	0.44	0	0	1	1,024,991
Panel E. Mental health characteristics						
Hopeless (previous 30 days)	0.46	0.50	0	0	1	1,080,917
Overwhelmed (previous 30 days)	0.69	0.46	1	1	1	1,082,945
Exhausted (not physically, previous 30 days)	0.66	0.48	0	1	1	1,098,765
Very lonely (previous 30 days)	0.39	0.49	0	0	1	1,082,002
Very sad (previous 30 days)	0.41	0.49	0	0	1	1,080,490
Severely depressed (previous 30 days)	0.19	0.39	0	0	0	1,081,836
Overwhelming anxiety (previous 30 days)	0.35	0.48	0	0	1	1,081,642
Overwhelming anger (previous 30 days)	0.22	0.41	0	0	0	1,079,072
Self-harm (previous 30 days)	0.03	0.16	0	0	0	1,082,428
Considered suicide (previous 30 days)	0.03	0.18	0	0	0	1,082,704

Notes: This table presents the summary statistics for our analytical sample of the NCHA survey between fall 2008 and spring 2019. The sample is restricted to undergraduate students. Height is measured in inches. For detailed variable definitions, see Supplemental Appendix Table A2. For the breakdown by Greek membership and post-Tinder-introduction indicator, see Supplemental Appendix Table A4.

rise in sexual activity that coincides with Tinder's full-scale launch. These twin sets of observations form the foundation of our empirical strategy; we explore these patterns more systematically in the following sections.[31]

[31] In Supplemental Appendix Figure A3, we further break down the trend for the non-Greek students by whether or not they attended schools with large Greek presence. The figure shows that non-Greek students at schools with heavy Greek life activity also experienced a (smaller) uptick in sexual activity following Tinder's introduction. Non-Greek students at non-Greek colleges exhibited no such change. The totality of these patterns is consistent with the narrative evidence surrounding the launch of Tinder. Specifically, Greek students were the earliest and biggest



FIGURE 2. THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF SEX PARTNERS BETWEEN GREEK AND NON-GREEK MEMBERS

Notes: This figure presents the evolution of the average number of sexual partners in the previous 12 months for Greek and non-Greek members across semesters. The data source is the NCHA survey; the sample is restricted to undergraduate students.

B. *LexisNexis Newspaper Data*

Our secondary source of data is the universe of college newspaper articles available on LexisNexis during the 2013–2016 period (LexisNexis 2013–2016). Our search yielded 796,612 articles from 600 newspapers across 574 college campuses.

We analyzed the headlines and full text of these articles—searching for the keyword "Tinder"—to ascertain the use and popularity of the app on individual campuses. We calculated the number of articles pertaining to Tinder written by students at each college, which serves as a proxy for the college-specific popularity of Tinder during its initial expansion period.

To examine whether reporting and coverage of Tinder varied between campuses with and without Greek activity, we supplement the newspaper data with additional college-level characteristics. For each college present in the LexisNexis database, we collect information from the college's Common Data Set (CDS) on whether that college has fraternity or sorority housing and the percentage of undergraduate students participating in Greek life. For each college, we attempt to find this information for the 2012–2013 academic year, just prior to the full-scale launch of Tinder. For the colleges where the 2012–2013 CDS data are not available, we use information from the earliest available year. Ultimately, we collected Greek life information for 540 colleges.

adopters of this technology and there were positive spillovers in usage from Greek students onto the rest of the student body. In schools with less Greek life activity, the degree of this spillover would be lower, and consequently the use (or lack thereof) of Tinder may not be sufficient to generate an observable increase in the average number of sex partners. We conduct a more detailed examination of the potential effects of Tinder on all (including non-Greek) students in Section VII.

C. *App-Usage Data*

To further validate our first stage, we use the actual app-usage data from Complementics, a data exchange platform that consolidates device-level information regarding the location and timing of mobile app usage. We obtain this data for the earliest available period, from September 21, 2017, to May 15, 2018 (Complementics 2017–2018). For each day within this period, we have two datasets, one for location and one for app usage. The location dataset captures the zip code of a series of "pings" from 17.1 million devices in the United States, each identified by a 64-digit device hash. The app-usage dataset documents the app name and device hash for each unique app-usage session each day. We exclusively retain data related to Tinder app usage. For each day, we determined the primary zip code of a device by calculating the modal location of its pings, enabling us to count the number of unique devices within a zip code. We then merge this device-level location data with the app-usage dataset using the device hash. We measure the average daily usage rate of Tinder within a zip code during the 2017–2018 academic year by dividing the daily number of devices using Tinder by the daily number of unique devices and then taking an average across days. We then merge these data with the Greek life indicators from the CDS introduced above based on colleges' zip codes.

III. Empirical Strategy

To identify Tinder's impact on student dating behavior and health, we employ a difference-in-differences strategy that exploits the fact that students involved in Greek life were more likely to adopt and use the app. That is, we compare Greek and non-Greek student outcomes within each college-semester pair before and after Tinder's full-scale launch.

Our approach is summarized in the following regression specification:

$$y_i = \alpha_{c(i)t(i)} + \beta \times Greek_i \times Post_{t(i)} + \mathbf{X_i}\gamma + \epsilon_\mathbf{i}, \tag{1}$$

where y_i is the outcome of student i attending college $c(i)$ surveyed during semester $t(i)$; $Greek_i$ takes the value of 1 if a student i is a fraternity or sorority member and 0 otherwise; $Post_{t(i)}$ refers to the period after Tinder's full-scale launch in the summer of 2013, a timing choice that we discuss in detail below; $\alpha_{c(i)t(i)}$ represents a set of college-semester fixed effects; and $\mathbf{X_i}$ is a vector of individual-level student characteristics (including standalone $Greek_i$).

Though Tinder soft launched in the Apple App Store in September 2012, we consider spring 2013 as the last academic semester prior to treatment, for two reasons. First, Tinder did not develop its innovative swipe feature until May 2013, after which it experienced rapid growth in popularity. Second, Tinder did not launch on the Android platform until July 2013. With Android accounting for 51.5 percent of the US smartphone market share in 2013, Tinder was effectively unavailable to half of the mobile phone–using population until the fall 2013 semester.[32]

[32] See the Comscore press release at https://www.comscore.com/Insights/Press-Releases/2014/2/comScore-Reports-December-2013-US-Smartphone-Subscriber-Market-Share.

Because of these two factors, the adoption and usage of Tinder did not reach critical mass until after the summer of 2013. This is corroborated and attested to across a wide array of sources and data. For instance, using a panel of millions of American mobile phone users, Abolfathi and Santamaria (2020) show that Tinder downloads did not start taking off until July 2013. Google Trends data display a similar pattern. As shown in Supplemental Appendix Figure A2, the search intensity for Tinder began growing exponentially after May 2013 and plateaued shortly after the midpoint of 2014, signifying the increasing and eventual leveling off of adoption. This timeline is also consistent with evidence from college newspapers. As discussed below in Section IV, reporting of Tinder in college newspapers did not start until the fall of 2013. On account of these factors, throughout this paper, we treat spring 2013 as the last academic semester before Tinder's full-scale launch.

The coefficient of interest in equation (1), β, identifies the causal effect associated with differential exposure to and adoption of Tinder between Greek and non-Greek students under the assumption that the outcomes for Greek life students would have evolved along parallel trends relative to their non-Greek peers within the same college and semester in the absence of Tinder. We assess the viability of this assumption by estimating a fully dynamic version of equation (1) that allows us to check for pre-trends and visualize the evolution of the outcome variables prior to Tinder's full-scale launch.

We utilize a rich set of fixed effects to address competing explanations. Specifically, college-semester fixed effects account for any time-invariant differences across colleges (e.g., certain colleges may have a reputation as "party schools"), any shocks that affect students across all colleges at the same time (e.g., one could expect greater dating activity after the spring break), and, most rigorously, addressing all alternative interpretations that have to do with college-specific shocks, such as fluctuations in college-specific norms surrounding romantic and sexual activity. To reduce the possibility of our estimates being driven by the survey compositional changes, in nondynamic specifications we control for a rich set of student-level controls such as age, gender, race, international student status, height, body mass index (BMI), and sexual orientation.

We address concerns related to the potential external validity of our results to non-Greek students by employing a complementary college-level identification strategy. In this alternative approach, we compare colleges with a higher share of Greek students to those with a lower share, before and after Tinder's full-scale launch, thus accounting for potential effects among non-Greek students. With this approach, we obtain similar results for almost all outcomes. For more details, see Section VII.

It is worth noting that because we do not utilize variation in treatment timing, our research design approximates the canonical 2×2 difference-in-differences framework and eludes some of the potential limitations with two-way fixed-effects models that have been raised in recent econometrics literature (Callaway and Sant'Anna 2021; Goodman-Bacon 2021). As a result, we estimate equation (1) using OLS, with the standard errors clustered at the college level.

A. *Selection into Greek Organizations*

Because our analysis involves repeated cross-sectional data, we face a possible concern that the composition of Greek organizations is changing over time. Specifically, if the characteristics of Greek students were trending in ways that deviate from the rest of the student population, this may bias our difference-in-differences estimates, especially if those changes coincide with the timing of Tinder's full-scale launch.

To address this issue, we perform two exercises. First, we show in Supplemental Appendix Figure A4 that the share of undergraduate students active in Greek organizations remains fairly static before and after the summer of 2013. This reassuring finding demonstrates that the popularity of Greek life did not systematically change after Tinder's full-scale launch.

Second, we show that while Greek students have always been different from the overall student population on observable characteristics, those differences did not widen following the advent of Tinder. As shown in Supplemental Appendix Table A4, the difference between Greek and non-Greek students across a wide array of characteristics was fairly balanced between the pre- and post-Tinder-introduction periods. With the notable exception that Greek students became less international relative to the rest of the student population, none of the other changes are statistically significant.[33]

These patterns suggest that differential selection into Greek organizations is unlikely to drive any potential findings. Nevertheless, to further assuage this concern, we will include the aforementioned student-level controls in most of our analysis and will present robustness checks for interacting these characteristics with the post-Tinder-introduction indicator.

IV. First-Stage Relationship

A key assumption that underlies our research design is that fraternity and sorority members were more likely than non-Greeks to adopt and use Tinder. While anecdotal evidence in Section I does point to the importance of Greek organizations for Tinder's early diffusion on college campuses, in this section we provide quantitative evidence to support this idea. To this end, we utilize information from college newspapers and Google Trends around the time of Tinder's full-scale launch. We then complement these sources with the zip code–level data on relative Tinder usage during the 2017–2018 academic year.

A. *Evidence from College Newspapers*

First, we use LexisNexis to identify all college newspaper articles containing the word "Tinder" around the time of Tinder's full-scale launch (2013–2016). We consider the discussion of Tinder in news articles a proxy for the popularity of the dating

[33] To a certain extent, BMI and weight can endogenously change as a response to the introduction of dating apps. Thus, the absence of significant differential changes in these variables suggests that students did not increase their efforts in making themselves more attractive on the dating market as a reaction to Tinder's full-scale launch.

app on college campuses. This presumption is reasonable because these newspaper articles are written by students and reflect trends or developments pertinent to student life on campus.

With these data, we test whether colleges with greater fraternity and sorority presence had more articles written about Tinder following the app's full-scale launch. Supplemental Appendix Figure A5 depicts these results. Prior to 2013, no articles regarding Tinder were published in college newspapers. However, from fall 2013 onward, colleges with Greek life became disproportionately likely to publish articles related to Tinder—the share of colleges with Greek life or greater Greek presence that published Tinder-related articles far exceeded that of their non-Greek/less Greek counterparts. Supplemental Appendix Figure A6 displays the corresponding dynamic difference-in-differences estimates, confirming that the disparities in the frequency of Tinder-related articles between colleges with varying levels of Greek life are statistically significant for most of the study period.

To ensure that these results are not driven by a differential propensity for news production between Greek and non-Greek colleges, we regress the incidence and number of college newspaper articles published about Tinder between 2013 and 2016 on measures of Greek life participation, controlling for the total number of articles published. Supplemental Appendix Table A5 presents these results. Our analysis reveals a strong positive correlation between Greek life presence and Tinder coverage. Specifically, colleges with Greek life had a 14.5 percentage point–higher likelihood of publishing at least one newspaper article about Tinder from 2013 to 2016 and, on average, published one more Tinder-related article during that period compared to colleges without Greek life. The extent of news coverage is also increasing in the share of students involved in Greek life.

Because college newspapers often feature interviews or commentary from current students, we investigate the content of the articles for additional context. We find numerous direct references to the influence of Greek organizations on Tinder's early diffusion.

For instance, in the fall 2013 semester, when Tinder started gaining traction, a sophomore at the University of Nebraska–Lincoln told *The Daily Nebraskan* that he had heard of Tinder from his fraternity brothers.[34] That same semester, the *Daily Emerald* of the University of Oregon published a story that included accounts from two sorority students who described meeting their boyfriends on Tinder,[35] and a second-year student at UC Davis told the *The California Aggie* that she created a Tinder profile after one of her sorority sisters recommended the app.[36]

We also discovered similar anecdotes in articles published by newspapers at UCLA, Arizona State University, and Yale University in the fall of 2013. Altogether, from 2013 through 2016, 105 Tinder-related articles were published by newspapers

[34] "Dating App Tinder Connects Users through Facebook Proximity," *The Daily Nebraskan*, October 3, 2013. http://www.dailynebraskan.com/culture/dating-app-tinder-connects-users-through-facebook-proximity/article_bcbc4ea8-2be3-11e3-8a80-001a4bcf6878.html.

[35] "Wanna Hook Up? There's an App for That!," *Daily Emerald*, October 15, 2013. https://advance.lexis.com/document?crid=96a50b56-e76b-452b-82fe-e8c5b9cdb946&pddocfullpath.

[36] "Tinder Sweeps through UC Davis," *The California Aggie*, October 17, 2013. https://theaggie.org/2013/10/17/tinder-sweeps-through-uc-davis.

at colleges with Greek life that included specific references to fraternities or sororities or featured interviews with fraternity or sorority members. This textual evidence further substantiates the intricate link between Greek organizations and Tinder, especially in the early days of its launch.

B. *Evidence from Google Search Intensity*

We conduct an additional test of the first-stage relationship in the early diffusion of Tinder using data from Google Trends (2008–2020). Specifically, we focus on the 540 colleges sourced from LexisNexis and examine whether the cities or towns of those colleges rank among the top 100 cities in the United States in terms of the relative frequency of Google queries for the Tinder app in 2013 and 2014. We explore how the likelihood of ranking higher in Google search intensity varies as a function of participation in Greek life at those colleges. We adopt the same metrics of Greek life activity that we employed in the newspaper exercise—namely, the presence of Greek organizations at a college, the share of students involved in Greek life, and the indicators for whether the proportion of undergraduate students involved in fraternities or sororities was greater than the median.

Supplemental Appendix Table A6 presents the results. Towns with colleges that have Greek organizations are 5.2 percentage points more likely to rank among the top 100 cities in terms of Google search intensity for *Tinder* in 2013 and 2014, compared to towns whose colleges had no Greek organizations. The likelihood of appearing in this top-100 list is also significantly higher for colleges with a larger share of students involved in fraternities or sororities.

C. *Evidence from App-Usage Data*

To further confirm the greater adoption of Tinder at colleges with Greek life, we analyze the data on actual Tinder app usage from Complementics, covering the period from September 21, 2017, to May 15, 2018. We calculate the average daily usage of Tinder within the zip codes of each college and, for greater comparability, merge it with the CDS based on the LexisNexis sample of colleges. We then repeat the same correlational exercise that checks whether Tinder usage was higher in the zip codes of colleges with more substantial Greek life.

The results, shown in Supplemental Appendix Table A7, reveal that average daily Tinder usage at colleges with Greek organizations was 0.3 percentage points higher during the 2017–2018 academic year, from a baseline of 1.2 percent, equating to a magnitude of 0.27 standard deviations. Furthermore, there is a positive association between fraternity and sorority membership and Tinder use.[37] Overall, these results confirm that the patterns observed in the newspaper and Google Trends data are mirrored in the actual app-usage statistics and that Tinder remained consistently more popular at colleges with greater Greek life presence four years after its full-scale launch.

[37] The results are similar when we consider alternative ways of calculating college-level Tinder usage.

Taken together, these first-stage results drawn from three distinct data sources confirm the existence of an intricate link between Greek students and the adoption and promotion of Tinder.

V. Main Results

Encouraged by the first-stage evidence in Section IV, we estimate Tinder's impact using the difference-in-differences strategy introduced in Section III. To start, we investigate how Tinder's introduction altered the dating-market equilibrium on college campuses by focusing on variables related to sexual activity, relationship formation, and relationship quality. Then we consider the distributional consequences of Tinder in terms of its impact on sexual activity. Finally, we explore the downstream impact of Tinder on a wider array of outcomes, such as mental and physical well-being.

A. *Impact of Tinder on the Dating Market*

Theoretical Predictions.—We start by characterizing Tinder's impact on dating-market behavior and outcomes among college-age students. Our analysis is guided by theoretical predictions from Antler, Bird, and Fershtman (2022, 2023), who develop matching models of the dating and marriage markets with search and learning frictions. In their models, advances in search technologies that facilitate meeting potential partners, such as the emergence of dating apps, are predicted to reduce the amount of time that individuals spend dating each partner and increase the number of partners they date before marriage. We empirically test these hypotheses by examining Tinder's effect on sexual activity and relationship formation.

Baseline Results.—We analyze Tinder's impact on two NCHA survey questions related to sex activities: reported number of sexual partners within the previous 12 months and whether a respondent had sex within the previous 30 days. These two variables shed light on the student's frequency of sexual activity, which is indicative of search duration or turnover in the dating market.

First, we estimate an event-study version of equation (1) for these two outcomes, which helps us assess the plausibility of the common-trends assumption and, consequently, the viability of our difference-in-differences design. Specifically, we estimate the following specification:

$$Y_i = \alpha_{c(i)t(i)} + \sum_{t=2008F}^{2019S} \beta_{t(i)} \times Greek_i + \gamma \times Greek_i + \varepsilon_i, \tag{2}$$

where Y_i measures behavior of student i in college $c(i)$ at semester $t(i)$, $Greek_i$ takes the value of 1 if the student i is a fraternity or sorority member and 0 otherwise, and $\alpha_{c(i)t(i)}$ and $\beta_t(i)$ are the college-semester and semester fixed effects, respectively. Standard errors are clustered at the college level. We visualize the estimates by plotting the $\beta_{t(i)}$ coefficients over time, with the spring of 2013 as an omitted category.



FIGURE 3. EFFECT OF TINDER'S INTRODUCTION ON STUDENT SEXUAL ACTIVITY

Notes: These event-study figures plot the coefficients for student Greek membership interacted with semester indicators estimated using equation (2). They illustrate the evolution of sexual activity for Greek life members relative to their peers within the same school and semester. The outcomes are (i) the number of sex partners a student had within the previous 12 months and (ii) an indicator for whether a student had sex in the previous 30 days. The event-study regressions do not contain any controls except for the school and semester fixed effects. Spring 2013 is the baseline period. For detailed variable definitions, see Supplemental Appendix Table A2. The upper and lower lines represent 95 percent confidence intervals. Standard errors are clustered at the college level.

Figure 3 presents the results. Through the lens of our difference-in-differences model, it shows that the introduction of Tinder led to a significant increase in sexual activity. That is, in comparison to non-Greek students, students belonging to Greek organizations, specifically targeted by the app, increased the average number of sexual partners and the share of students who had sex in the previous 30 days. For both outcomes, the figures display an absence of pre-trends and an upward trend-break following Tinder's full-scale launch. These patterns support the identifying assumption that the sexual activity of Greek and non-Greek students would have evolved along parallel trends in the absence of Tinder's full-scale launch.

Table 2—Sexual Behavior and Activity

	Number of sex partners, previous 12 months		Sex, previous 30 days		Sex, previous 12 months		Number of sex partners (conditional on > 0)	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Fraternity/sorority × post	0.220	0.224	0.039	0.029	0.040	0.031	0.134	0.165
	(0.029)	(0.029)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.031)	(0.031)
College-semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls		✓		✓		✓		✓
Observations	1,011,613	1,011,613	1,017,813	1,017,813	1,011,613	1,011,613	681,898	681,898
Mean of dep. var.	1.492	1.492	0.520	0.520	0.674	0.674	2.214	2.214
SD of dep. var.	2.912	2.912	0.500	0.500	0.469	0.469	3.313	3.313

Notes: This table presents the estimates of the impact of Tinder's introduction on student sexual activity. The outcome variables are the number of sexual partners that a student had within the previous 12 months, an indicator for whether a student had sex within the previous 12 months, an indicator for whether a student had sex in the previous 30 days, and the number of sexual partners that a student had within the previous 12 months, conditional on having at least one. The coefficient of interest is the interaction of a student's fraternity or sorority membership and an indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. All columns include college-semester fixed effects. Columns 2, 4, 6, and 8 include controls for age, gender, race, grade level, international student status, sexual orientation, height, and BMI. For detailed variable definitions, see Supplemental Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level.

Next, we present the baseline estimates in a table format. Specifically, we estimate equation (1) using a model with only the college-semester fixed effects, then enriching it by including a set of controls, such as age, gender, race, grade, height, BMI, international student status, and sexual orientation. To explore the dating-activity shifts in greater detail, we break down the number of sexual partners in the previous year into the share of students having sex in the previous year (extensive margin) and the number of sexual partners conditional on having engaged in sexual activity in the previous year (intensive margin).

Table 2 presents the results. Compared to non-Greek students, students belonging to Greek organizations increased their average number of sexual partners in the previous year by 0.22. This effect amounts to a magnitude of 0.08 standard deviations.[38] Greek students also became 3 to 4 percentage points more likely to have engaged in sexual activity in the previous 30 days and in the previous year. Finally, we find significant changes along the intensive margin, as Greek students started to have 0.13–0.16 more sexual partners, even conditional on having engaged in sexual activity in the previous year (columns 7–8).

The fact that Tinder led to a substantial increase in sexual activity among Greek students is perhaps surprising given that Greek students are a socially active group with numerous in-person opportunities to meet romantic partners (e.g., parties and mixers). However, we argue that this is plausible because Tinder alleviates

[38] While we lack systematic data on the difference in Tinder usage between Greek and non-Greek students on the same college campus, the 40 percentage point difference indicated by a campus ambassador at Tufts (see Section I for further details) implies a 0.19 standard deviation increase in the number of sexual partners for Greek students if the effect is weighted by such differential use of Tinder. Similarly, effects on other outcomes can be adjusted in this manner for a better sense of the magnitude of the average treatment effect on the treated. We discuss these calculations in greater detail in Section VII.

information asymmetry, reduces search costs, and possibly diminishes the psychological costs of failed match attempts. In particular, by showing users only potential matches that express mutual attraction, Tinder's design features remove uncertainty about whether romantic feelings are reciprocated, which could be a barrier to efficient matching in offline social settings. As a result, the introduction of Tinder can meaningfully increase sexual encounters even for a group of students who have other preexisting offline outlets and venues for dating.

Effect Persistence.—Another takeaway from the event-study plots in Figure 3 is that, even four years after the launch of Tinder, the impact on Greek students does not dissipate. This nonconvergence is perhaps surprising at the outset, because one may expect the differences in Tinder use between Greek and non-Greek students to diminish over time as the app became more widespread.

However, we argue that such nonconvergence is plausible, for two reasons. First, as we discuss in Section I, Tinder's focus on college Greek organizations was not limited to the initial launch; it persisted well after. Section IV further shows that the differences in Tinder popularity between colleges with and without Greek life were still present in 2017–2018. Second, our data are a repeated cross section rather than a longitudinal panel. Therefore, our dynamic estimates do not follow the same cohort over time; rather, they represent different cohorts of individuals while they are in college. Since the minimum age to use Tinder is 18, our college student sample is composed of individuals enjoying their first opportunity to use the app. As a result, if there exists a difference in the initial take-up of Tinder between Greek and non-Greek students when they first enter college or, simply, a difference in the speed of adoption—which is plausible given Tinder's continual attention to fraternities and sororities—then our estimates would reflect that, even if the discrepancy in Tinder usage disappears as these students age out of our sample.

Distributional Consequences.—In a seminal article, Rosen (1981) argues that technological change facilitating an increase in market scale may amplify inequality across the talent distribution. Because online dating apps allow people to more efficiently search for romantic partners well beyond the confines of their immediate social networks, they allow them to capitalize on economies of scale and match with large numbers of potential partners. As such, the introduction of online dating apps could have induced distributional changes in dating activity across the student population.

In Table 3, we test this idea by examining whether Tinder's full-scale launch led to an outward shift of the entire distribution of sexual activity among Greek students relative to non-Greek students. Specifically, Table 3 presents a version of our baseline estimates from Table 2, but now using indicators for whether a student had more than a certain number of sexual partners in the past 12 months (ranging from strictly over zero to strictly over eight; see Supplemental Appendix Table B1 for additional estimates for indicators strictly over nine and ten partners) as outcomes. Across all such indicators, we consistently obtain positive coefficients, which also tend to grow as a proportion of the dependent variable mean as we move toward the right tail of the distribution. Supplemental Appendix Table A8 breaks these results down by gender and shows that the effects are larger in absolute terms for male students.

Table 3—Distribution of Sexual Activity

	> 0 partners	> 1 partners	> 2 partners	> 3 partners	> 4 partners	> 5 partners	> 6 partners	> 7 partners	> 8 partners
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)
Fraternity/sorority	0.031	0.032	0.034	0.026	0.021	0.015	0.012	0.009	0.006
× post	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)
College-semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,011,613	1,011,613	1,011,613	1,011,613	1,011,613	1,011,613	1,011,613	1,011,613	1,011,613
Mean of dep. var.	0.674	0.262	0.160	0.099	0.065	0.043	0.030	0.023	0.017
SD of dep. var.	0.469	0.440	0.367	0.299	0.247	0.202	0.170	0.149	0.129

Notes: This table presents the estimates of the impact of Tinder's introduction on the distribution of student sexual activity. The outcome variable is an indicator for whether a student had more than a given number of sex partners (ranging from strictly over zero to strictly over eight) within the previous 12 months. The coefficient of interest is the interaction of a student's fraternity or sorority membership and an indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. All columns include college-semester fixed effects and controls (age, gender, race, grade, international student status, sexual orientation, height, and BMI). Supplemental Appendix Table B1 presents the full table, including students with more than nine and ten sex partners. Supplemental Appendix Table A8 presents these results broken down by gender. For detailed variable definitions, see Supplemental Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level.

These findings strongly indicate that Tinder's full-scale launch increased inequality on the dating market and facilitated the emergence of "superstar" effects in dating outcomes.

Heterogeneity.—To further explore the distributional consequences and shed light on the mechanisms of Tinder's impact on dating activity, we analyze the heterogeneity of our baseline estimates across various student- and college-level characteristics.

Supplemental Appendix Table A9 summarizes our findings. While we observe no statistically significant heterogeneity by race, sexual orientation, or overweight status, we do find significantly larger effects for students in their earlier years of study (column 7). This result is consistent with the intuition that early college years are when most new social connections are formed, making a tool that reduces search costs in dating, such as Tinder, particularly useful. These estimates also support the idea that effects may persist over time due to the sustained impact among students in earlier years of study, despite convergence for students in later years.

In addition, the effects are significantly larger for students attending large and research-oriented colleges (columns 9 and 10) and are significantly smaller for those in southern colleges (column 11). Effects are somewhat smaller, though not statistically significant, for students at small-city and religious colleges (columns 12 and 13). These patterns suggest that Tinder's impact is more pronounced in environments with less conservative norms surrounding sexual behavior. Moreover, the findings support the idea that Tinder reduces search costs, as its impact appears to be amplified in settings such as larger or research-oriented colleges and urban areas, where finding partners without online matching tools may be more challenging.

Overall, these heterogeneity estimates suggest that Tinder's impact is mediated at least in part through reductions in search costs. They also indicate the importance of norms surrounding sexual behavior in determining online dating apps' ultimate impact.

B. *Relationship Formation and Quality*

The substantial rise in sexual activity documented in Section VA is consistent with the notion that the reduction in search costs and alleviation of information asymmetries associated with technologies such as Tinder lead to greater experimentation in the dating market. However, the implications of easier search for the formation of stable relationships are less straightforward. While Tinder may make it easier to find the "right" partner, it also reduces the cost of continued search, potentially undercutting the need to invest in any given relationship (Antler, Bird, and Fershtman 2022, 2023). Similarly, the resulting impact on relationship quality could also be theoretically ambiguous.

Since marriage was rare among individuals in our study population, we focus on whether students were in a cohabiting relationship with their partner as an instance of a stable match, since cohabitation is often a precursor to a long-term partnership. Although more recent versions of the NCHA directly ask respondents if they are in a committed relationship, this question was not included in the surveys from the years we are analyzing; therefore, cohabitation serves as the best available measure of commitment in our study.

To measure relationship quality, we construct variables based on three separate NCHA questions: whether a student had, within the previous 12 months, (i) been in an emotionally or physically abusive relationship, (ii) found intimate relationships traumatic or very difficult, and (iii) experienced relationship difficulties.

Table 4 displays the difference-in-differences estimates for these outcomes. We find that the introduction of Tinder did not lead to significant changes in the likelihood that students were cohabiting with their relationship partners or that students were in a romantic relationship more generally. We also do not observe consistent change in reports of relationship problems, either in a sample of all respondents or in a subsample of students who were then in a relationship.

Overall, the results indicate that the introduction of Tinder led to a sizable increase in sexual activity among students in fraternities and sororities—the communities specifically targeted by Tinder—compared to other students on campus. In contrast, the effect on relationship formation was small. Despite Tinder's innovative matching system reducing the costs of finding a partner, we also find little evidence that the app had any significant impact on relationship quality. These effects are consistent with the general perception,[39] as well as with student experiences chronicled in college newspapers[40,41] that the introduction of Tinder widened the pool of potential partners, resulting in commitment problems and greater turnover, possibly contributing to the rise of hookup culture.

[39] "You Up? College in the Age of Tinder," *The New York Times*, February 14, 2018. https://www.nytimes.com/2018/02/14/opinion/you-up-college-in-the-age-of-tinder.html.

[40] "Looking for Love: Tulane Students Cope with New Dating Culture," *The Tulane Hullabaloo*, February 16, 2017. https://tulanehullabaloo.com/18597/news/tulane-dating-scene.

[41] "Online Dating App Tinder Gains Popularity among College Students," *Daily Bruin*, February 15, 2014. https://dailybruin.com/2014/02/15/online-dating-app-tinder-gains-popularity-among-college-students-2.

Table 4—Relationship Status and Relationship Quality

						Conditional on being in a relationship		
	Cohabiting	In relationship	Abusive relationship	Difficult relationship	Relationship problems	Abusive relationship	Difficult relationship	Relationship problems
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Fraternity/sorority × post	−0.003	0.004	0.000	−0.000	−0.005	0.002	−0.006	−0.002
	(0.002)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.005)	(0.005)
College-semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,021,665	1,021,665	1,020,889	1,018,725	1,013,866	482,206	481,090	478,814
Mean of dep. var.	0.114	0.473	0.105	0.320	0.316	0.115	0.350	0.377
SD of dep. var.	0.318	0.499	0.307	0.467	0.465	0.320	0.477	0.485

Notes: This table presents the estimates of the impact of Tinder's introduction on relationship incidence and quality. The outcome variables are whether the student was in a cohabitating relationship, whether the student was in a relationship (not necessarily cohabiting), whether a student had been in an emotionally or physically abusive relationship within the previous 12 months, whether a student had a difficult romantic relationship that was traumatic or very difficult to handle within the previous 12 months, and whether a student experienced any problems in their romantic relationships within the previous 12 months. The last three columns present the estimates for the relationship quality metrics for a subset of students who were in a relationship at the moment of the survey. The coefficient of interest is the interaction of a student's fraternity or sorority membership and an indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. All columns include college-semester fixed effects and controls (age, gender, race, grade level, international student status, sexual orientation, height, and BMI). For detailed variable definitions, see Supplemental Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level.

C. *Downstream Effects*

Having shown that Tinder affects sexual and romantic behavior among college students, we now turn to examine the potential downstream implications of the app's introduction on a broader set of outcomes related to physical well-being and mental health.

Physical Well-Being.—First, we explore the downstream effects of increased sexual activity on possible risks associated with increased sexual activity. To this end, we construct three variables based on the NCHA survey questions related to sexual violence and STDs: (i) whether a student had been subject to sexual abuse within the previous 12 months, (ii) whether a student had been diagnosed or treated by any professional for chlamydia, and (iii) whether a student had ever been tested for HIV infection.

Table 5 reports the difference-in-differences estimates for these outcomes. Following Tinder's full-scale launch, the incidence of sexual assault among Greek students increased by 1.9 percentage points, which is substantial given that the average incidence of sexual assault in our sample is 8.7 percent. The effect's magnitude corresponds to 0.07 standard deviations. Columns 3 through 6 also show a statistically significant increase in the incidence of chlamydia and HIV tests among Greek students—by 0.6 and 1.6 percentage points, respectively. The magnitudes are also nonnegligible when compared to the sample averages; they correspond to 0.05 and 0.04 standard deviations, respectively.[42]

[42] Supplemental Appendix Table A10 presents these results broken down by gender. Unsurprisingly, the positive coefficient for sexual assault is nearly 20 percent larger for female students compared to their male counterparts. The coefficients for STD diagnosis and testing are also slightly larger for female students.

Table 5—Negative Outcomes Related to Sexual Activity

	Sexual assault		Chlamydia		HIV test	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Fraternity/sorority × post	0.021	0.019	0.006	0.006	0.020	0.016
	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.003)
College-semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls		✓		✓		✓
Observations	1,021,581	1,021,581	1,017,685	1,017,685	966,806	966,806
Mean of dep. var.	0.087	0.087	0.013	0.013	0.257	0.257
SD of dep. var.	0.282	0.282	0.113	0.113	0.437	0.437

Notes: This table presents the estimates of the impact of Tinder's introduction on negative outcomes related to sexual activity. The outcome variables are reported experiences of sexual abuse within the previous 12 months, having been diagnosed with or treated for chlamydia within the previous 12 months, and having ever tested for HIV. The coefficient of interest is the interaction of a student's fraternity or sorority membership and an indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. All columns include college-semester fixed effects. Columns 2, 4, and 6 include controls for a student's age, gender, race, grade, international student status, sexual orientation, height, and BMI. Supplemental Appendix Table A10 presents these results broken down by gender. For detailed variable definitions, see Supplemental Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level.

To further visualize the findings, we present event-study plots for these three outcomes in Figure 4. These plots display no pre-trends, but then there's a clear trend break in the outcomes' evolution following Tinder's full-scale launch. Overall, these results suggest that by increasing sexual activity among college students, Tinder also had negative consequences in terms of the risks associated with increased sexual activity, such as increased reports of sexual assault and STDs.

One caveat to a straightforward interpretation of the result on STDs, however, is that it could also reflect an increase in testing—people engaging in casual or unprotected sex may take precautionary steps by seeking out tests for STDs. Therefore, our estimates may reflect both an actual increase in chlamydia incidence and a behavioral response to the increased risk associated with casual sex activity. This interpretation is consistent with the observed increase in HIV testing.

Mental Health.—Next, motivated by discussions in the popular press about the potential harmful effects of online dating apps for mental health[43] as well as existing correlational evidence (Holtzhausen et al. 2020), we investigate whether the availability of Tinder had an impact on students' mental well-being.

Conveniently, the NCHA survey contains a wealth of questions covering a wide spectrum of mental health–related issues: feeling hopeless, overwhelmed, mentally exhausted, very lonely, very sad, so depressed that it was difficult to function, overwhelming anxiety, or overwhelming anger; intentionally injuring oneself; and even seriously considering suicide. We define respective outcomes based on the incidence of these mental health issues in the previous 12 months. To reduce data dimensionality and assuage the concern of multiple hypothesis testing, we follow Braghieri, Levy, and Makarin (2022) and create an index for experiencing poor mental health

[43] "A Decade of Fruitless Searching: The Toll of Dating App Burnout," *The New York Times*, August 31, 2022. https://www.nytimes.com/2022/08/31/well/mind/burnout-online-dating-apps.html.



FIGURE 4. EFFECT OF TINDER'S INTRODUCTION ON NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES OF SEXUAL ACTIVITY

(*continued*)

within the previous 12 months. Specifically, we first sum up the standardized versions of the individual mental health variables, and then we standardize the resulting variable.

Table 6 shows the results (see also Supplemental Appendix Table B2 for the full set of outcomes). In contrast to both the press and the existing correlational studies, we find that Greek students, who were disproportionately targeted by Tinder's promotional campaigns, reported better mental health conditions in the semesters following Tinder's full-scale launch. This pattern of relative improvement is present across all mental health conditions. On average, Greek students saw a 0.033 standard deviation improvement in their mental health index.

When separated by gender, the results in Table 6 display a stronger improvement in reported mental health for female students. For male students, the effect appears to oscillate depending on the specific mental health issue, whereas for female students



FIGURE 4. EFFECT OF TINDER'S INTRODUCTION ON NEGATIVE CONSEQUENCES OF SEXUAL ACTIVITY *(continued)*

Notes: These event-study figures plot the coefficients for Greek membership interacted with semester indicators estimated using equation (2). They illustrate the evolution of negative consequences of sexual activity for Greek life members relative to their peers within the same school and semester. Outcomes are (i) an indicator for whether a student reported being sexually abused within the previous 12 months, (ii) an indicator for whether a student was diagnosed with or treated for chlamydia within the previous 12 months, and (iii) an indicator for a student ever having tested for HIV. Regressions include only school-by-semester fixed effects; spring 2013 is the baseline period. See Supplemental Appendix Table A2. Dashed lines show 95 percent confidence intervals; standard errors are clustered at the college level.

the effect is consistently significant throughout all reported mental health issues. Figure 5 illustrates the sharp nature of this effect by presenting an event-study plot for the mental health index among female students. While the pre-Tinder coefficients are mostly nearing zero, the point estimates after the full launch of Tinder are consistently negative and statistically significant.

Given the results from the previous section showing an increase in sexual assault, the improvement in average mental health could be surprising. Because sexual assault is relatively rare in our sample, we hypothesize that the improvement in mental health is driven by individuals other than those who experienced sexual assault. Supplemental Appendix Table A11 corroborates this hypothesis by showing that the positive effects become stronger when we exclude the victims of sexual assault from the sample.

We further examine the channels behind these effects on mental health by investigating whether they are driven directly by the increase in sexual activity. To do so, we add the number of sex partners in the previous year and sex incidence in the previous 30 days as additional controls. The results, displayed in Supplemental Appendix Table A12, show that the effects on mental health remain unchanged after controlling for sexual activity and, if anything, the point estimates become larger in magnitude. This suggests that the chief channel through which Tinder is improving mental health may not be through increased sexual activity. Instead, we speculate that the relative gains in mental health could be, in part, a result of improved self-image or morale due to receiving more sexual/romantic attention after Tinder's introduction (Abramova

TABLE 6—MENTAL HEALTH

	Hopeless (1)	Overwhelmed (2)	Mentally exhausted (3)	Very lonely (4)	Severely depressed (5)
Panel A. All					
Fraternity/sorority × post	−0.008	−0.012	−0.012	−0.010	−0.010
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.003)
College-semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,017,002	1,018,978	1,023,379	1,018,279	1,018,283
Mean of dep. var.	0.466	0.695	0.667	0.390	0.187
SD of dep. var.	0.499	0.461	0.471	0.488	0.390
Panel B. Males					
Fraternity/sorority × post	−0.006	−0.013	−0.016	−0.016	−0.005
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.004)
College-semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	332,182	332,600	334,472	332,375	332,494
Mean of dep. var.	0.416	0.574	0.563	0.326	0.153
SD of dep. var.	0.493	0.494	0.496	0.469	0.360
Panel C. Females					
Fraternity/sorority × post	−0.009	−0.013	−0.011	−0.009	−0.012
	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)
College-semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	683,197	684,754	687,277	684,283	684,165
Mean of dep. var.	0.491	0.753	0.717	0.421	0.203
SD of dep. var.	0.500	0.431	0.450	0.494	0.402

	Overwhelming anxiety (6)	Overwhelming anger (7)	Considered suicide (8)	Index poor mental health (30 days) (9)
Panel A. All				
Fraternity/sorority × post	−0.010	−0.007	−0.004	−0.033
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.007)
College-semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,018,058	1,015,640	1,018,986	1,023,379
Mean of dep. var.	0.356	0.215	0.033	0.100
SD of dep. var.	0.479	0.411	0.177	1.028
Panel B. Males				
Fraternity/sorority × post	−0.004	−0.007	−0.001	−0.025
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.012)
College-semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	332,433	331,789	332,760	334,472
Mean of dep. var.	0.257	0.189	0.032	−0.115
SD of dep. var.	0.437	0.392	0.175	1.004
Panel C. Females				
Fraternity/sorority × post	−0.015	−0.006	−0.005	−0.037
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.009)
College-semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	684,001	682,230	684,601	687,277
Mean of dep. var.	0.404	0.227	0.033	0.203
SD of dep. var.	0.491	0.419	0.178	1.023

Notes: This table presents the estimates of the impact of Tinder's introduction on student mental health. The outcome variables are feeling hopeless, overwhelmed, mentally exhausted, very lonely, severely depressed (such that it was difficult to function), overwhelming anxiety, overwhelming anger, and considering suicide within the previous 30 days. Supplemental Appendix Table B2 presents the full table, including two additional variables: feeling very sad and committing self harm within the previous 30 days. The index of poor mental health is obtained by adding the standardized versions of all of the variables above and standardizing the resulting variable. The coefficient of interest is the interaction of a student's fraternity or sorority membership and an indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. All columns include college-semester fixed effects and controls (age, gender, race, grade, international student status, sexual orientation, height, and BMI). We present the results for all students in panel A, for male students only in panel B, and for female students only in panel C. For detailed variable definitions, see Supplemental Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level.



FIGURE 5. EFFECT OF TINDER'S INTRODUCTION ON THE INDEX OF POOR MENTAL HEALTH FOR FEMALE STUDENTS

Notes: This event-study figure plots the coefficients for Greek membership interacted with semester indicators estimated using equation (2). It illustrates the evolution of mental health issues for female Greek life members relative to their female peers within the same school and semester. The outcome variable is the overall index of poor mental health, constructed by summing all standardized mental health variables from the last 30 days and restandardizing the index. Spring 2013 is the baseline. No controls beyond school and semester fixed effects. The upper and lower lines represent 95 percent confidence intervals. Standard errors are clustered at the college level.

et al. 2016; Jung et al. 2019). For instance, a student from Elon College said the following about her experience using Tinder in 2014: "It is a huge ego boost. You get complimented a lot. You get matched a lot. I have a lot of matches and that's really fun."[44]

In summary, our findings indicate that the introduction of Tinder had a positive impact on the relative mental health of Greek students, in comparison to their non-Greek peers, within the same college and semester. The estimates appear to be more robust for female students as compared to male students. The estimates also suggest that this effect is not driven by increased sexual activity and instead aligns more with the possibility of Tinder enhancing students' self-image.

VI. Robustness Checks

We now present a battery of exercises that probe the robustness of our baseline results. Specifically, we first address concerns related to (i) spillover effects, (ii) selection into the Greek system, (iii) issues of misreporting, and (iv) any crackdowns on Greek organizations occurring around the release of Tinder. Following that, we present estimates derived from an alternative college-level specification, which serves to tackle the concerns of within-college spillovers and the potential nonrepresentativeness of Greek students compared to the overall student population.

[44] See https://jpetrocchi.wordpress.com/2014/04/09/the-growing-popularity-of-tinder-on-college-campuses.

A. *Spillovers*

A key challenge facing our research design is the possibility of spillovers between Greek and non-Greek students. The identification of causal estimates in the difference-in-differences framework requires the SUTVA. This assumption can be violated in our setting if Tinder usage by Greek students had meaningful effects on non-Greek students in the same college. Such spillovers can manifest through a variety of distinct channels. For instance, there may be greater adoption of Tinder among non-Greek students with close contact with Greek life due to social influence. Alternatively, the usage of Tinder by Greek students may impose externalities on non-Greek students, even absent actual adoption by the latter group. Ultimately, depending on the directionality of these spillover effects and whether they align with the impact on Greek students, the estimated effects may be attenuated toward zero or upwardly biased.

To assess the seriousness of this issue, we design a test that probes the sensitivity of our baseline estimates to the presence of spillovers. Specifically, we present the results of our baseline specification after sequentially removing non-Greek-affiliated students in colleges with increasingly lower levels of Greek presence from the sample. This approach reduces potential contamination of the control group because it allows us to assess the counterfactual using non-Greek students who are less subject to spillovers. Importantly, this method requires no assumption on the form or direction of spillover effects and is based on the natural premise that the extent of spillover should be proportional to the share of Greek students on college campuses.

The results from this exercise are shown in Supplemental Appendix Table A13, with four different sample restrictions illustrated in distinct panels. In panel A, we begin with the original sample and all students. The only modification we make from the baseline specification is omitting college-semester fixed effects to facilitate an apples-to-apples comparison with the subsequent models.[45] In panel B, we exclude non-Greek students from colleges above the seventy-fifth percentile in terms of students involved in Greek life. Then we lower that threshold to the fiftieth percentile in panel C and finally remove non-Greek students from colleges above the twenty-fifth percentile in the bottom panel.

As we systematically eliminate spillovers from our identifying variation from panel A through panel D of Supplemental Appendix Table A13, the coefficients remain stable in both magnitude and statistical significance. This is notable given that in panel D, the control group consists of non-Greek students at college campuses where on average only approximately 2 percent of the student body is Greek, and as a result, the impact of spillover should be minimal. Yet our point estimates remain essentially unchanged as compared to panel A. This provides strong evidence that spillovers do not drive our main findings.

The remarkable stability of our results across these different subsamples suggests that while spillovers undoubtedly take place, the magnitude of such effects may be surprisingly modest. We explore this in more depth in Section VII, where

[45] We cannot include college-semester fixed effects once we begin trimming the control group and excluding non-Greek students belonging to certain colleges.

we attempt to quantify the exact impact of Tinder's full-scale launch on non-Greek students and the student body at a college more generally.

B. *Selection*

Our identification strategy relies on comparing Greek and non-Greek students, which raises the concern that our results could be driven by certain characteristics or traits of Greek students that led to increased sexual activity in the post-Tinder-introduction environment rather than by their differential usage of Tinder. We have already established that there was no significant aggregate shift in the proportion of Greek students, nor were there changes in their demographic composition following Tinder's full-scale launch (see Supplemental Appendix Figure A4 and Table A4). Nevertheless, to further address the concern of selection, we conduct three additional sets of robustness tests.

First, we control for interaction terms between all our baseline student-level controls and a post-Tinder-introduction indicator. This allows for the possibility that the influence of individual student characteristics on sexual activity might have changed following the release of the app. Because Greek students are more likely to partake in alcohol use and live on campus, we also include controls for the interactions between the post indicator and students' estimated blood alcohol content at the time of the survey and between the post indicator and an indicator for on-campus living. Supplemental Appendix Table A14 replicates our main results with these additional controls, suggesting that the varying importance of students' personal attributes does not explain our findings.

Second, although the above exercise uses a rich set of individual characteristics, one may still be worried that a nonlinear combination of these factors could jointly affect sexual behavior (or even hookup propensity) and contaminate our estimates. To assuage these concerns, we use a LASSO procedure to predict an individual's propensity for sexual activity based on their characteristics,[46] then we control for the interaction between the post-Tinder-introduction indicator and the LASSO-predicted sexual activity instead.

As shown in Supplemental Appendix Table A15, our baseline estimates remain robust to controlling for the resulting LASSO-predicted number of sex partners interacted with the post indicator. In fact, our estimates remain remarkably consistent in magnitude as compared to our baseline specification.[47]

[46] We train the LASSO model based on students' age, gender, race, BMI categories, sexual orientation, and international status. However, our results remain similar if we include other variables and exclude some of the ones mentioned here. Supplemental Appendix Figure A7 shows that the LASSO model performs well on both the pre-Tinder and the post-Tinder data, providing fair explanatory power in both in-sample and out-of-sample predictions.

[47] This result may be surprising if we thought that Tinder usage would be wider among non-Greek students with higher LASSO-predicted values relative to non-Greek students with lower LASSO-predicted values. The estimates' stability suggests that the LASSO-predicted number of sex partners does not seem to serve as a good proxy for Tinder use. One possibility is that highly "attractive" students had less incentive to use Tinder because they already had a satisfactory romantic life. In other words, it is Greek students who used the app more, and not "attractive" students more broadly.

Third, we use the same LASSO procedure to predict whether students were members of Greek organizations based on their observable characteristics. We then control for the interaction between the post indicator and the LASSO-predicted Greek status. Supplemental Appendix Table A16 presents the result; our findings remain robust to this exercise as well.

Collectively, these checks alleviate the concern that the differential outcomes of Greek and non-Greek students to Tinder could be driven by differences in individual characteristics that *correlate* with Greek membership rather than Greek membership per se.

C. *Misreporting*

Misreporting is a critical issue shared by studies that rely on self-reported survey data. For instance, in our case one may be concerned that respondents may have lied about having more sex in order to improve their self-image. However, we argue that reporting bias is unlikely to drive the results in this paper, for several reasons.

First, the NCHA survey is administered anonymously, thus reducing any incentive for respondents to lie due to concerns of stigma. There were no individually assigned enumerators, and students typically completed the survey in a large classroom or on their own (ACHA 2000–2019).

Second, because we use student-level variation in treatment, any changes in campus culture related to the willingness to discuss certain topics at a specific college during a specific semester would be absorbed by the college-semester fixed effects and would need to affect Greek students disproportionately in order to impact our estimates.

Third, our results are cross validated between distinct sets of questions. For instance, if the Greek students had started to differentially inflate their responses regarding sexual activity, it is unlikely that the same group of respondents would also have started to wrongfully claim to have had STDs or experienced sexual assault if self-image were the cause of misreporting. The conjunction of the positive results on sexual activity as well as the increase in negative consequences associated with sex suggests that the relationship is genuine.

Finally, we also show that nonresponse rates on questions related to our outcomes remain qualitatively unchanged following Tinder's full-scale launch. Specifically, Supplemental Appendix Table A17 presents the difference-in-differences estimates using nonresponse rates as outcomes. We observe that point estimates are nearing zero, and while two of the coefficients are statistically significant, the effect sizes are minuscule and cannot explain our main findings. The coefficient signs also point in different directions, contradicting the narrative of an overall shift in levels of stigma.

D. *Crackdown on Greek Organizations*

Another concern could be that in the latter half of our sample, certain colleges started cracking down on Greek life, even suspending some Greek organizations altogether.[48]

[48] "Fraternity Crackdown: Universities Are Clamping Down Hard, but Do Bans Work?," NBC News, March 10, 2015. https://www.nbcnews.com/news/us-news/scrutiny-fraternities-prompts-crackdowns-greek-life-n320211.

These actions could have altered the share and composition of fraternity and sorority membership and affected Greek students' dating activity in those colleges. We find no evidence of an aggregate shift in the share of Greek students or changes in their demographic composition (see Supplemental Appendix Figure A4 and Table A4). We also see no evidence of discontinuities in the popularity of search terms related to Greek system crackdowns, such as "hazing" and "Greek life," around the time of Tinder's full-scale launch (see Supplemental Appendix Figure A8). Still, we conduct an additional check to assuage this concern. Specifically, we calculate the average share of Greeks in each college before and after Tinder's launch, then we calculate the difference between the two measures, and then we estimate our baseline results for colleges that experienced neither a large drop in Greek share (below 2.8 percentage points, or the fifth percentile of the change distribution) nor *any* reduction in Greek share. The results, presented in Supplemental Appendix Table A18, stay robust in both cases, indicating that crackdowns on Greek life are unlikely to drive our estimates.[49]

E. *Alternative Question*: *Issues Affecting Academic Performance*

We corroborate our main findings through an alternative NCHA question, which asks whether a student reported that their academic performance was negatively affected by relationship difficulties, sexual assault, STDs, depression, anxiety, stress, ADHD, or an eating disorder.

Our results, presented in Table 7, indirectly confirm our earlier findings. For instance, consistent with the absence of an impact from Tinder on relationship formation or problems, we detect no differential change in the share of students claiming that their academic performance was affected negatively by relationship difficulties following Tinder's release. Similarly, column 2 shows a significant increase in the proportion of students indicating that their academic performance suffered due to experiences of sexual assault. At the same time, consistent with our findings on mental health earlier, fewer Greek students reported that mental health issues had an adverse effect on their academic performance. This includes a decline in the importance or prevalence of eating disorders (column 8), suggesting potential improvements in body image and self-esteem more broadly (Stice et al. 2017).[50] Notably, when broken down by gender in panels B and C, these mental health improvements are again concentrated among female students. These results reinforce our baseline findings on Tinder's impact on relationship quality, sexual assault, and mental health.[51]

[49] It is also possible that crackdowns changed the types of activities that Greek organizations engaged in. However, for such changes to explain our results, they would need to have led to an increase in sexual activity. Instead, most narratives about changes in the Greek system during that period suggest the opposite—fewer social events and reduced partying, which would likely result in less sexual activity.

[50] The estimate on eating disorders grows in magnitude and becomes significant at the 1 percent level once we change the coding to whether a student experienced the issue, whether or not it negatively impacted their academic performance.

[51] Additional analysis in Supplemental Appendix Table A19 reveals no significant differential impact on students' self-reported approximate GPA. This may reflect positive effects through improved mental health and negative effects through increased sexual assault incidence potentially offsetting each other.

Table 7—Issues Affecting Academic Performance

	Did this issue negatively affect student's academic performance in the previous year?							
	Relationship difficulties	Sexual assault	STD	Depression	Anxiety	Stress	ADHD	Eating disorder
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Panel A. All students								
Fraternity/sorority	−0.000	0.003	0.000	−0.006	−0.005	−0.006	0.000	−0.002
× post	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.001)
College-semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,013,866	1,012,271	1,013,627	1,011,962	1,013,315	1,014,217	1,013,647	1,013,927
Mean of dep. var.	0.103	0.012	0.004	0.146	0.227	0.316	0.055	0.013
SD of dep. var.	0.304	0.108	0.065	0.353	0.419	0.465	0.229	0.115
Panel B. Males								
Fraternity/sorority	0.005	0.003	0.002	0.005	0.002	−0.003	0.002	0.001
× post	(0.004)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.001)
College-semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	330,441	330,062	330,691	330,100	330,440	330,698	330,728	330,621
Mean of dep. var.	0.092	0.005	0.005	0.117	0.165	0.251	0.064	0.008
SD of dep. var.	0.289	0.071	0.068	0.322	0.371	0.434	0.245	0.092
Panel C. Females								
Fraternity/sorority	−0.002	0.003	0.000	−0.012	−0.010	−0.008	0.001	−0.002
× post	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.001)
College-semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	681,814	680,598	681,323	680,255	681,268	681,909	681,306	681,695
Mean of dep. var.	0.108	0.015	0.004	0.159	0.256	0.348	0.051	0.016
SD of dep. var.	0.311	0.121	0.062	0.366	0.437	0.476	0.220	0.124

Notes: This table presents the estimates for whether the issues affected by the introduction of Tinder had any downstream implications for students' academic performance. The outcome variables are indicators for whether a student reported that any of the following issues had negatively affected their academic performance within the previous 12 months: relationship difficulties, sexual assault, STDs, depression, anxiety, stress, ADHD, and eating disorders. The coefficient of interest is the interaction of a student's fraternity or sorority membership and an indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. All columns include college-semester fixed effects and controls (age, gender, race, grade, international student status, sexual orientation, height, and BMI). We present the results for all students in panel A, for male students only in panel B, and for female students only in panel C. For detailed variable definitions, see Supplemental Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level.

F. *Unbalanced Sample of Colleges*

We make sure that our results are not driven by colleges that appear in the data infrequently and thus may be different from the rest of the sample—e.g., due to peculiarities of their data collection processes. Supplemental Appendix Table A20 shows that our main results remain robust to exclusion of colleges that appear in the data fewer than the median number of semesters.

VII. College-Level Results

Our difference-in-differences strategy allows us to estimate the causal effect of Tinder's introduction on fraternity and sorority students associated with greater

adoption and use of the app. However, to the extent that Greek students may differ from other students in ways that are either observable or unobservable to the econometrician, it remains an open question whether our estimates generalize to the overall student population. In other words, even in a counterfactual world where Tinder had been as widely diffused among non-Greek students as Greek students, we cannot be certain that non-Greek students would have derived the same benefits.

To overcome these empirical challenges and better approximate what may be the true treatment effect for the general student population, we devise a secondary research design. Specifically, we utilize a college-level treatment based on the share of undergraduate students involved in Greek life. The underlying logic of this design is the strong network effects of Tinder adoption: The greater the share of students active on the app, the greater the incentive for other students to join. This is consistent with the rationale behind Tinder's launch strategy described in Section I, which was to take advantage of possible spillover effects from socially influential Greek students onto the rest of the student body, and with our first-stage results in Section IV.

Formally, we estimate the following equation:

$$y_{ct} = \beta \times Post_t \times GreekShare_{ct} + \mathbf{X_{ct}}\gamma + \alpha_{\mathbf{c}} + \delta_{\mathbf{t}} + \varepsilon_{\mathbf{ct}}, \tag{3}$$

where α_c and δ_t represent the college and survey-wave (semester) fixed effects, respectively, and $GreekShare_{ct}$ is the share of undergraduate students at college c in semester t who participated in Greek life. Here, we organize our analysis at the college-semester level and thus consider the college-level analogs of the student-level outcomes. Specifically, for each college and survey-wave pair, we compute the average number of sex partners per student and the share of students engaged in sexual activity, and then we similarly aggregate all other main outcomes. We also include a vector of college-semester-level controls, $\mathbf{X_{ct}}$, which is again constructed based on aggregated student-level characteristics.

The coefficient of interest, β, captures the difference in average student outcomes before and after the release of Tinder and across colleges with high and low Greek life participation. To the extent that students at colleges with greater Greek life activity gained more exposure to Tinder due to Tinder's targeted marketing toward Greek students, and to the extent that their outcomes would have evolved along parallel trends otherwise, β reflects the causal effect of Tinder's introduction on US colleges. Since many American colleges are located in remote, isolated college towns, spillovers across colleges in this specification should be negligible.

Baseline College-Level Results.—The results presented in Table 8 demonstrate that while some of our baseline findings on the effects of Tinder generalize to the overall student population, others do not or do so with a caveat. Columns 1 and 2 report a differential increase in sexual activity in colleges with a greater Greek presence following Tinder's full-scale launch. Columns 5 and 6 show that Tinder's impact on the incidences of HIV testing and chlamydia also hold at the college level.

Table 8—Alternative Specification: College-Level Estimates

		Share of students			Share of students		
	Average number of sex partners	Sex previous 30 days	Cohabiting	Average index poor mental health	Chlamydia	HIV test	Sexual assault
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Greek share × post	0.340	0.057	0.044	−0.010	0.011	0.048	0.009
	(0.099)	(0.019)	(0.012)	(0.064)	(0.004)	(0.016)	(0.013)
College FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
College-level controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644
Mean of dep. var.	1.482	0.512	0.113	0.071	0.013	0.238	0.086
SD of dep. var.	0.341	0.084	0.086	0.171	0.008	0.071	0.033

Notes: This table presents the college-level estimates of the impact of Tinder's introduction on main outcomes using a college-wide share of Greek students as a treatment intensity. Each observation is a college and survey-wave pair. The outcome variables are (i) the average number of sexual partners per student within the previous 12 months, (ii) the share of students who had sex within the previous 30 days, (iii) the share of students in a cohabiting relationship, (iv) the average value of the index of poor mental health among students, (v) the share of students who had been diagnosed with or treated for chlamydia within the previous 12 months, (vi) the share of students who ever tested for HIV, and (vii) the share of students who reported experiencing sexual assault within the previous 12 months. The coefficient of interest is the interaction of the percentage of students who were a part of Greek life organizations and an indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. All specifications include college and survey-wave fixed effects. College-level controls are created by taking the mean value of individual-level indicator controls (gender, race, grade, international student status, and sexual orientation) and the median value of individual-level continuous controls (age, height, and BMI). Supplemental Appendix Table A21 presents these results broken down by student gender. For detailed variable definitions, see Supplemental Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level.

At the same time, column 3 shows that the impact on cohabitation incidence is positive and significant for the overall student population. In other words, on college campuses with greater Greek life activity, students become significantly more likely to be in a cohabitating relationship following the full-scale launch of Tinder. Column 4 shows a relative decline in mental health issues for the overall student body, but it is now smaller and not statistically significant. Furthermore, column 7 indicates that there is no significant increase in the likelihood of sexual assault for the overall student population. These results suggest that the effect on of Tinder on relationship formation, mental health, and sexual assault may be heterogeneous across the student population and may be different for non-Greek students; we investigate this possibility in more depth in the next subsection.[52,53]

Impact on Non-Greek Students.—A benefit of the college-level strategy is that it allows us to estimate the effect of Tinder on the non-Greek student population specifically. Understanding Tinder's impact on non-Greek students is potentially

[52] See Supplemental Appendix Table A21 for the breakdown of these estimates by gender. The results generally confirm the results obtained at the individual level. The impact on mental health is more positive for female students, and the estimates for negative outcomes related to sexual activity are mostly similar across genders. For males, the impact on the incidence of sex in the past 30 days and cohabiting status is slightly larger than for females.

[53] Supplemental Appendix Table A22 presents results from an alternative version of the college-level specifications using quartiles of the share of Greek-affiliated students interacted with the post indicator. The coefficients follow an expected pattern. For most outcomes, the coefficients change monotonically with the greater share of Greek students, and for some outcomes, they become significant at the top quartile.

informative about both the generalizability of our findings and the extent of spillover effects from Greek to non-Greek affiliated students, further clarifying the discussion in Section VIA.

To implement this analysis, we employ the same college-level specification as above but compute all college-semester variables using only the non-Greek students within each college and semester cell. The resulting difference-in-differences estimator captures changes in average non-Greek student outcomes at colleges with varying levels of Greek life activity before and after the full-scale launch of Tinder.[54]

The results are shown in Supplemental Appendix Table A23. We find that non-Greek students at highly Greek colleges experienced a differential increase in the number of sex partners and the likelihood of sexual encounters following the full-scale release of Tinder. This may be surprising given that our analysis in Section VIA shows that estimated effect sizes for Greek students remain fairly stable when we exclude sources of spillover from the estimation. However, these twin findings become perfectly consistent once we recognize that the average share of students involved in Greek organizations at a college is only approximately 10.4 percent (the median is 8.16 percent). Consequently, the implied spillover effects are actually quite modest. For instance, consider the effect on the number of sex partners for non-Greek students, where the point estimate in Supplemental Appendix Table A23 is 0.233; this suggests that the impact observed for non-Greek students is relatively small at the mean $(0.233 \times 0.104 = 0.0242)$. The same calculation yields similarly negligible effect sizes for the sex within the previous 30-days outcome. As a result, despite the significant gains in sexual relations among non-Greek students at colleges with large Greek presence after 2013, our individual-level estimates of Tinder's impact on Greek students are not significantly altered and attenuated by these spillovers.[55]

While the effect on sexual activity generalizes to the non-Greek student population, the results on relationship formation and mental health do not. In particular, we find that non-Greek students at high-Greek colleges become more likely to be in cohabiting relationships after the introduction of Tinder. The significant increase in relationship formation for non-Greek students stands in sharp contrast to the absence thereof for their Greek counterparts, suggesting that the impact of Tinder on dating behavior may be distinct for the two student groups. The statistically insignificant results on mental health for non-Greek students are also notable and suggest that

[54] An important caveat to this empirical approach is that we are only able to identify marginal changes in Tinder usage among non-Greek students associated with spillover from Greek students. If there is a baseline level of Tinder adoption that is invariant to Greek influences, then that would be missed in our estimation.

[55] To further shed light on the differences in magnitudes of our individual- and college-level estimates, we also conduct a simple but illustrative simulation. For this simulation, we assume that (i) spillovers on non-Greeks take a linear form as in Supplemental Appendix Table A23, and (ii) the number of sex partners before Tinder's full-scale launch was 2 for Greek students and 1.42 for non-Greek students, reflecting the averages in our data (also reflected in Figure 2). The rest of our data remain the same. We then show that in this setup, a homogeneous increase of 0.252 in Greek students' number of partners fully rationalizes our individual-level estimate of 0.224 in Table 2. This confirms that the spillovers in Supplemental Appendix Table A23 indeed have a limited impact on our main estimates. Finally, we find that this approach gives us a college-level estimate of 0.383 (for both Greek and non-Greek students), which aligns well with the actual estimate of 0.340 in Table 8. As such, this simple simulation illustrates that our individual- and college-level estimates are fully in line with each other, despite apparent differences in coefficients.

the impact on mental health may be heterogeneous across the student population. However, due to the lower precision of the college-level estimates, we cannot definitively rule out improvements in mental health that could be comparable in magnitude to those observed at the individual level.

Magnitudes Scaled by Tinder Adoption.—We conclude the paper with a crucial discussion of magnitudes. Our difference-in-differences estimates are intent-to-treat (ITT) in the sense that they capture both the actual treatment effect and the difference in Tinder take-up between Greek and non-Greek students. While our baseline individual-level identification strategy has many benefits, one of its drawbacks is that we lack precise information on individual-level Tinder adoption rates to fully back out the treatment effect on Greek students. Using the best available estimate—a 40 percentage point higher adoption rate of Tinder among Greek students compared to non-Greek students, as reported by a Tinder representative at Tufts University (see Section I)—we estimate that the students' adoption of Tinder led to a 0.19 standard deviation increase in the number of sexual partners, a 0.08 standard deviation improvement in mental health,[56] and a 0.132 standard deviation rise in reported chlamydia cases. However, these magnitudes should be interpreted with caution, as they rely on a single ballpark figure.

In contrast, while college-level analysis relies on stricter assumptions, it provides a much more suitable setting for scaling up the estimates, as we can combine the results in Table 8 with the college-level first-stage Tinder usage patterns from Supplemental Appendix Table A7. A back-of-the-envelope calculation suggests that moving a college from the twenty-fifth percentile to the median of Tinder use increases the average number of sex partners at a college by 0.16, the share of students in cohabiting relationships by 2.1 percentage points, and the share diagnosed with chlamydia by 0.5 percentage points. Average mental health improves (if the statistically insignificant coefficient is taken literally) by 0.03 standard deviations. We note, however, that these calculations should also be taken cautiously, as the shift in Greek share necessary to generate the 25 percentage point gain in Tinder usage is large relative to the range of shares observed in the data.[57] Nevertheless, both of these sets of estimates provide useful benchmarks for interpreting Tinder's potential impact.

VIII. Conclusion

Choosing a suitable partner is one of the most consequential decisions a person can make in their life. For more than half a century, since Becker's seminal paper (Becker 1973), economists have held an interest in the workings and operations of

[56] This estimated positive impact on mental health is approximately half the long-term improvement in depression scores achieved through psychotherapy on a sample of depressed adults in India (Bhat et al. 2022) and is comparable in magnitude to the decline in mental health caused by Facebook's introduction in US colleges (Braghieri, Levy, and Makarin 2022).

[57] An increase in average daily Tinder use from the twenty-fifth percentile to the median amounts to 0.285 percentage points. According to the estimate in column 4 of Supplemental Appendix Table A7, this is equivalent to the college-level Greek share increasing from 0 percent to 47 percent, with 47 percent representing the ninety-ninth percentile of the Greek shares observed in our data.

the marriage market. Dating, as the precursor to long-term relationships and marriage, is fundamental to this process. The sweeping changes to the dating landscape brought about by the growing popularity of online dating—and of dating apps in particular—raise important theoretical and empirical questions.

In recent years, possible sociological and psychological effects associated with the mass adoption of dating apps have been heavily speculated on in the popular press.[58] Yet despite the substantial attention paid to this topic, credible evidence on the causal impact of dating apps remains scarce.

We provide the first estimates for the causal effects of online dating apps by studying the impact of Tinder, the world's most popular dating app, on college students.[59] We focus on this particular age group for two primary reasons. First, thanks to Tinder's unique launch strategy—targeting students involved in Greek life—we can devise a credible identification strategy that allows us to estimate Tinder's impact on this population. Second, college-age adults were, more broadly, the demographic directly targeted by Tinder; we show that based on survey evidence, Tinder can indeed be credited for normalizing online dating specifically for this age group.

Our identification strategy exploits a critical, well-documented feature of Tinder's launch campaign, which involved targeting college campuses and, more specifically, fraternity or sorority members. We provide both anecdotal and quantitative evidence to verify the fact that Tinder was more commonly used by Greek students and in colleges with high Greek life participation. These twin facts motivate the empirical strategy we pursue, which is a difference-in-differences design that considers Greek students and colleges with large Greek presence as treated units.

We find that Tinder's introduction substantially altered the dating-market equilibrium on college campuses. The use of Tinder led to an increase in the frequency of sexual activity across the entire student population but had only limited success in fostering the formation of long-term relationships. These results are consistent with theoretical predictions suggesting that by reducing search costs, online dating apps would increase search duration and turnover in romantic couplings (Antler, Bird, and Fershtman 2022, 2023). It is also possible that Tinder may have altered societal norms not through its use but by shifting signaling and coordination equilibria. Yet our heterogeneity analysis indicates that search-cost reduction is likely a crucial channel.

We characterize the downstream impact of these changes in terms of students' mental and physical health. Intriguingly, we find that Tinder did not worsen students' average mental health status and may even have had a positive impact on mental health for some students. At the same time, the changes to dating norms

[58] See, e.g., "Tinder and the Dawn of the Dating Apocalypse," *Vanity Fair*, August 6, 2015 (https://www.vanityfair.com/culture/2015/08/tinder-hook-up-culture-end-of-dating/), and "How Online Dating Has Changed the Way We Fall in Love," *The Guardian*, February 13, 2022 (https://www.theguardian.com/lifeandstyle/2022/feb/13/how-online-dating-has-changed-the-way-we-fall-in-love/).

[59] One potential limitation of our study is that we study only Tinder rather than the universe of all dating apps. However, according to any measure, Tinder has been the dominant leader in this market. Also, Tinder's closest competitor, Bumble, pursued a strategy similar to Tinder's vis-à-vis Greek students; therefore, our estimate may be capturing the combined impact of both apps in the medium-to-long run. Also, to the extent that all dating apps reduce search costs and alleviate information friction and to the extent that these core features are what's driving our estimates, our results are likely to generalize to other dating apps.

associated with the introduction of Tinder also led to greater incidences of STDs as well as the increased prevalence of sexual assault.

We conclude with some important caveats. First, our results speak to the short-term effects of Tinder on a particular demographic—college-age students—following the initial release of the app. Focusing on this subgroup and Tinder's targeted promotional strategy provides a causal lens to estimate effects on a wide range of outcomes. Further, understanding the impact of dating apps on issues such as poor mental health and sexual assaults among college students is of substantive intrinsic interest given the prevalence of these problems on college campuses and the efforts to mitigate them. Nevertheless, understanding the longer-run impact of dating apps across the entire age distribution and in other time periods and settings is a promising direction for future research.

Second, since Tinder's launch, numerous other online dating apps have emerged, seeking to capitalize on the growth of this new market. These entrants may differ significantly from Tinder in terms of design, user interfaces, and target demographics. For example, some apps emphasize serious relationships over casual hookups. As such, it may be natural to question whether our findings on Tinder's impact generalize to all other dating apps.

However, ever since its full-scale launch, Tinder has consistently remained the most popular dating app among young adults, making it valuable to document the unique impact of this particular app. Moreover, insofar as the hypothetical impact of any dating app stems from the reduction in search costs and learning frictions, our results remain informative of those broader effects. Nevertheless, further research is necessary to determine the precise external validity of our findings with respect to other dating apps.

REFERENCES

Abolfathi, Niloofar, and Simone Santamaria. 2020. "Dating Disruption—How Tinder Gamified an Industry." *MIT Sloan Management Review* 61 (3): 7–11.

Abramova, Olga, Annika Baumann, Hanna Krasnova, and Peter Buxmann. 2016. "Gender Differences in Online Dating: What Do We Know So Far? A Systematic Literature Review." *2016 49th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences* (*HICSS*): 3858–67. https://doi.org/10.1109/HICSS.2016.481.

ACHA. 2008–2019. *American College Health Association-National College Health Assessment* (*ACHA-NCHA*) *Spring 2008–2019 Reference Group Data Report* (*Abridged*). *Journal of American College Health*. https://www.acha.org/ncha/data-results/survey-results/ (accessed January 7, 2022).

Adachi, Hiroyuki. 2003. "A Search Model of Two-Sided Matching Under Nontransferable Utility." *Journal of Economic Theory* 113 (2): 182–98.

Allcott, Hunt, Luca Braghieri, Sarah Eichmeyer, and Matthew Gentzkow. 2020. "The Welfare Effects of Social Media." *American Economic Review* 110 (3): 629–76.

Allcott, Hunt, Matthew Gentzkow, and Lena Song. 2022. "Digital Addiction." *American Economic Review* 112 (7): 2424–63.

Antler, Yair, Daniel Bird, and Daniel Fershtman. 2022. "Learning in the Marriage Market: The Economics of Dating." CEPR Discussion Paper 17065.

Antler, Yair, Daniel Bird, and Daniel Fershtman. 2023. "Search, Dating, and Segregation in Marriage." CEPR Discussion Paper 17965.

Aridor, Guy, Rafael Jiménez Durán, Ro'ee Levy, and Lena Song. 2024. "The Economics of Social Media." Preprint, SSRN. http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4708840.

Banerjee, Abhijit, Esther Duflo, Maitreesh Ghatak, and Jeanne Lafortune. 2013. "Marry for What? Caste and Mate Selection in Modern India." *American Economic Journal: Microeconomics* 5 (2): 33–72.

Bapna, Ravi, Jui Ramaprasad, Galit Shmueli, and Akhmed Umyarov. 2016. "One-Way Mirrors in Online Dating: A Randomized Field Experiment." *Management Science* 62 (11): 3100–22.

Becker, Gary S. 1973. "A Theory of Marriage: Part I." *Journal of Political Economy* 81 (4): 813–46.

Bellou, Andriana. 2015. "The Impact of Internet Diffusion on Marriage Rates: Evidence from the Broadband Market." *Journal of Population Economics* 28 (2): 265–97.

Bhargava, Saurabh, and Ray Fisman. 2014. "Contrast Effects in Sequential Decisions: Evidence from Speed Dating." *Review of Economics and Statistics* 96 (3): 444–57.

Bhat, Bhargav, Jonathan de Quidt, Johannes Haushofer, Vikram H. Patel, Gautam Rao, Frank Schilbach, and Pierre-Luc P. Vautrey. 2022. "The Long-Run Effects of Psychotherapy on Depression, Beliefs, and Economic Outcomes." NBER Working Paper 30011.

Bhuller, Manudeep, Tarjei Havnes, Edwin Leuven, and Magne Mogstad. 2013. "Broadband Internet: An Information Superhighway to Sex Crime?" *Review of Economic Studies* 80 (4): 1237–66.

Bonilla-Zorita, Gabriel, Mark D. Griffiths, and Daria J. Kuss. 2021. "Online Dating and Problematic Use: A Systematic Review." *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction* 19 (6): 2245–78.

Braghieri, Luca, Ro'ee Levy, and Alexey Makarin. 2022. "Social Media and Mental Health." *American Economic Review* 112 (11): 3660–93.

Bursztyn, Leonardo, Thomas Fujiwara, and Amanda Pallais. 2017. "'Acting Wife': Marriage Market Incentives and Labor Market Investments." *American Economic Review* 107 (11): 3288–319.

Büyükeren, Berkeren, Alexey Makarin, and Heyu Xiong. 2026. *Data and Code for: "The Impact of Dating Apps on Young Adults: Evidence from Tinder."* Nashville, TN: American Economic Association; distributed by Inter-university Consortium for Political and Social Research, Ann Arbor, MI. https://doi.org/10.3886/E218862V1.

Callaway, Brantly, and Pedro H. C. Sant'Anna. 2021. "Difference-in-Differences with Multiple Time Periods." *Journal of Econometrics* 225 (2): 200–30.

Chiappori, Pierre-André. 2020. "The Theory and Empirics of the Marriage Market." *Annual Review of Economics* 12: 547–78.

Choi, Edmond Pui Hang, Janet Yuen Ha Wong, and Daniel Yee Tak Fong. 2018. "An Emerging Risk Factor of Sexual Abuse: the Use of Smartphone Dating Spplications." *Sexual Abuse* 30 (4): 343–66.

Ciacci, Riccardo, and Maria M. Sviatschi. 2022. "The Effect of Adult Entertainment Establishments on Sex Crime: Evidence from New York City." *Economic Journal* 132 (641): 147–98.

Complementics. 2017–2018. *Mobile App Usage and Location Panel Data.* https://www.complementics.com/mobile-audiences-targeting/location-analytics/ (accessed January 22, 2024).

Cunningham, Scott, Gregory DeAngelo, and John Tripp. 2024. "Did Craigslist's Erotic Services Reduce Female Homicide and Rape?" *Journal of Human Resources* 59 (1): 280–315.

Egebark, Johan, Mathias Ekström, Erik Plug, and Mirjam van Praag. 2021. "Brains or Beauty? Causal Evidence on the Returns to Education and Attractiveness in the Online Dating Market." *Journal of Public Economics* 196.

Ellison, Glenn, and Sara Fisher Ellison. 2018. "Match Quality, Search, and the Internet Market for Used Books." NBER Working Paper 24197.

Enikolopov, Ruben, Alexey Makarin, and Maria Petrova. 2020. "Social Media and Protest Participation: Evidence from Russia." *Econometrica* 88 (4): 1479–514.

Even, William E., and Austin C. Smith. 2022. "Greek Life, Academics, and Earnings." *Journal of Human Resources* 57 (3): 998–1032.

Fedina, Lisa, Jennifer L. Holmes, and Bethany L. Backes. 2018. "Campus Sexual Assault: A Systematic Review of Prevalence Research from 2000 to 2015." *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse* 19 (1): 76–93.

Fisman, Raymond, Sheena S. Iyengar, Emir Kamenica, and Itamar Simonson. 2006. "Gender Differences in Mate Selection: Evidence from a Speed Dating Experiment." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 121 (2): 673–97.

Fisman, Raymond, Sheena S. Iyengar, Emir Kamenica, and Itamar Simonson. 2008. "Racial Preferences in Dating." *Review of Economic Studies* 75 (1): 117–32.

Goodman-Bacon, Andrew. 2021. "Difference-in-Differences with Variation in Treatment Timing." *Journal of Econometrics* 225 (2): 254–77.

Google Trends. 2008–2020. *Google Trends Search Data*. https://trends.google.com/trends/ (accessed March 19, 2023).

Greenwood, Brad N., and Ritu Agarwal. 2016. "Matching Platforms and HIV Incidence: An Empirical Investigation of Race, Gender, and Socioeconomic Status." *Management Science* 62 (8): 2281–303.

Hitsch, Günter J., Ali Hortaçsu, and Dan Ariely. 2010a. "Matching and Sorting in Online Dating." *American Economic Review* 100 (1): 130–63.

Hitsch, Günter J., Ali Hortaçsu, and Dan Ariely. 2010b. "What Makes You Click?—Mate Preferences in Online Dating." *Quantitative Marketing and Economics* 8 (4): 393–427.

Holtzhausen, Nicol, Keersten Fitzgerald, Ishaan Thakur, Jack Ashley, Margaret Rolfe, and Sabrina Winona Pit. 2020. "Swipe-Based Dating Applications Use and Its Association with Mental Health Outcomes: A Cross-Sectional Study." *BMC Psychology* 8 (1): 1–12.

Huber, Gregory A., and Neil Malhotra. 2017. "Political Homophily in Social Relationships: Evidence from Online Dating Behavior." *Journal of Politics* 79 (1): 269–83.

Jung, JaeHwuen, Ravi Bapna, Jui Ramaprasad, and Akhmed Umyarov. 2019. "Love Unshackled: Identifying the Effect of Mobile App Adoption in Online Dating." *MIS Quarterly* 43 (1): 47–72.

Koenig, Felix. 2023. "Technical Change and Superstar Effects: Evidence from the Rollout of Television." *American Economic Review: Insights* 5 (2): 207–23.

McClain, Colleen, and Risa Gelles-Watnick. 2023. "From Looking for Love to Swiping the Field: Online Dating in the US." *Pew Research Center*, February 2. https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2023/02/02/from-looking-for-love-to-swiping-the-field-online-dating-in-the-u-s/.

Moazed, Alex, and Nicholas L. Johnson. 2016. *Modern Monopolies: What It Takes to Dominate the 21st Century Economy*. St. Martin's Press.

Mosquera, Roberto, Mofioluwasademi Odunowo, Trent McNamara, Xiongfei Guo, and Ragan Petrie. 2020. "The Economic Effects of Facebook." *Experimental Economics* 23 (2): 575–602.

Nexis Uni for Academic Research. 2013–2016. *College Newspaper Articles.* LexisNexis. https://www.lexisnexis.com/en-us/products/nexis-uni.page (accessed February 1, 2022).

Neyt, Brecht, Sarah Vandenbulcke, and Stijn Baert. 2019. "Are Men Intimidated by Highly Educated Women? Undercover on Tinder." *Economics of Education Review* 73 :101914.

Pew Research Center. 2013. *Internet & American Life Poll: Online Dating, 2013* [*Dataset*]. Princeton Survey Research Associates International. Roper #31096204, Version 2. https://libguides.princeton.edu/az/roper-ipoll-survey-database (accessed January 7, 2022).

Pew Research Center. 2015. *Tracking Survey 2015* [*Dataset*]. Princeton Survey Research Associates International. Roper #31096297, Version 2. https://libguides.princeton.edu/az/roper-ipoll-survey-database (accessed January 7, 2022).

Rosenfeld, Michael J., Reuben J. Thomas, and Sonia Hausen. 2019. "Disintermediating Your Friends: How Online Dating in the United States Displaces Other Ways of Meeting." *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 116 (36): 17753–58.

Rosenfeld, Michael J., Reuben J. Thomas, and Sonia Hausen. 2023. *How Couples Meet and Stay Together 2017–2020–2022 Combined Dataset*. Stanford University. https://data.stanford.edu/hcmst2017 (accessed January 18, 2024).

Rosen, Sherwin. 1981. "The Economics of Superstars." *American Economic Review* 71 (5): 845–58.

Shapiro, Gilla K., Ovidiu Tatar, Arielle Sutton, William Fisher, Anila Naz, Samara Perez, and Zeev Rosberger. 2017. "Correlates of Tinder Use and Risky Sexual Behaviors in Young Adults." *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking* 20 (12): 727-34 .

Smith, Aaron. 2016. "15% of American Adults Have Used Online Dating Sites or Mobile Dating Apps." *Pew Researh Center*, February 11. https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2016/02/11/15-percent-of-american-adults-have-used-online-dating-sites-or-mobile-dating-apps/.

Smith, Aaron W., and Maeve Duggan. 2013. *Online Dating and Relationship*. Pew Research Center.

Stice, Eric, Jeff M. Gau, Paul Rohde, and Heather Shaw. 2017. "Risk Factors That Predict Future Onset of Each DSM–5 Eating Disorder: Predictive Specificity in High-Risk Adolescent Females." *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 126 (1): 38.

Twenge, Jean M., A. Bell Cooper, Thomas E. Joiner, Mary E. Duffy, and Sarah G. Binau. 2019. "Age, Period, and Cohort Trends in Mood Disorder Indicators and Suicide Related Outcomes in a Nationally Representative Dataset, 2005–2017." *Journal of Abnormal Psychology* 128 (3): 185–199.

Twenge, Jean M., and Heejung Park. 2019. "The Decline in Adult Activities among U.S. Adolescents, 1976–2016." *Child Development* 90 (2): 638–54.

Zhuravskaya, Ekaterina, Maria Petrova, and Ruben Enikolopov. 2020. "Political Effects of the Internet and Social Media." *Annual Review of Economics* 12: 415–38.

Online Appendix for "The Impact of Dating Apps on Young Adults: Evidence From Tinder"

Appendix A. Additional Tables and Figures

Figure A1: Online and Mobile Dating by Age Group, 2013 and 2015



Notes: The figure illustrates the rapid, disproportionate growth in the share of young adults using dating websites or apps following Tinder's full-scale launch in the summer of 2013. The data come from the Pew Internet and American Life Survey conducted April 17 to May 19, 2013, and from the Pew Tracking Survey conducted June 10 to July 12, 2015.

Figure A2: Google Trends for "Tinder" in the United States From 2008 to 2020



Notes: This figure shows the search intensity for the app "Tinder" on Google from January 2008 to January 2020 (roughly matching the time coverage of the NCHA data). The black dashed line indicates the release of the swipe feature on the app.

Figure A3: The Average Number of Sex Partners Between Greek and Non-Greek Members, by College-Level Greek Activity



Notes: This figure presents the evolution of the average number of sexual partners in the previous 12 months for Greek and non-Greek members across semesters, with the latter group split by whether a non-Greek member was at a college where its share of Greek students was above the 90th percentile in the sample. The data source is the NCHA survey; the sample is restricted to undergraduate students.

Figure A4: Evolution of the Share of Undergraduate Students Involved in Greek Life



Notes: This figure presents the evolution of the share of undergraduate students who were involved in Greek life. It presents the estimates of a college-semester-level specification, regressing the share of students in Greek organizations on the semester fixed effects, taking Spring 2013 as the baseline period. The upper and lower lines represent 95% confidence intervals.

Figure A5: Share of Colleges With Newspaper Articles Mentioning Tinder



Notes: The top figure illustrates the evolution of the share of colleges with at least one article containing the keyword *Tinder* in a given month, separately for colleges with and without Greek life, from January 2013 through December 2016. The bottom figure shows the same trend for colleges in the bottom quartile of Greek-life participation versus colleges in the top quartile. Data on the college newspapers come from LexisNexis; data on Greek organizations are from the Common Data Set.

Figure A6: Colleges With Newspaper Articles Mentioning Tinder, Difference-in-Differences Estimates



Notes: The figures present the difference-in-differences equivalents of the data patterns presented in Figure A5, illustrating that colleges with more-active Greek life were more likely to have newspapers publish articles mentioning Tinder. Specifically, we estimate $Y_{ct} = \alpha_c + \sum_{t=Jan2013}^{Dec2016} \beta_t \times Greek_c + \varepsilon_{ict}$ where Y_{ct} stands for the indicator of whether newspapers in college c had at least one article containing the keyword *Tinder* in a given month t, and α_c and β_t are the college and year-month fixed effects, respectively. For the top figure, $Greek_c$ takes the value of 1 if college c has Greek life and 0 otherwise. For the bottom figure, $Greek_c$ takes the value of 1 if the share of Greek students at college c is in the top quartile and takes the value of 0 if it is in the bottom quartile. The figures display the coefficients β_t. January 2013 is the baseline period. Standard errors are clustered at the college level. Data on the college newspapers come from LexisNexis; data on Greek organizations are from the Common Data Set.

Figure A7: Relationship Between the LASSO-Predicted and Actual Number of Sex Partners



Notes: This figure explores the relationship between our LASSO-predicted number of sex partners and the actual number of sex partners a student reported having in the previous year. Specifically, for each ventile of our LASSO-predicted number of sex partners, the figure plots the average predicted number of sex partners against the average actual number of sex partners. See Section **??** for details of the LASSO procedure. The left panel presents data from the period before Tinder's full-scale launch; the right panel presents data from the period after Tinder's full-scale launch. Since the LASSO algorithm is trained on pre-period data, the left figure shows in-sample predictions, whereas the right figure shows out-of-sample predictions. The figure also displays correlation coefficients between the LASSO-predicted and actual number of sex partners.

Figure A8: Google Trends for Greek Life Related Words From 2008 to 2020



(a) "Hazing" (b) "Greek Life"

Notes: These figures show the search intensity for "hazing" and "Greek life" on Google from January 2008 to January 2020 (roughly matching the time coverage of the NCHA data). The black dashed line indicates the release of the swipe feature on the app.

Table A1: Top 30 Cities in Terms of Google Search Intensity for Tinder: 2013 and 2014

2013				2014			
City	Nearby Colleges	Student Pop.	Total Pop.	City	Nearby Colleges	Student Pop.	Total Pop.
Provo, UT	BYU	35k	116k	Brookline, MA	Northeastern, BU, BC	62k	63k
Somerville, MA	Tufts, Harvard	31k	81k	Santa Monica, CA	UCLA, LMU	56k	93k
Amherst, MA	UMass Amherst	32k	39k	Berkeley, CA	UC Berkeley	45k	124k
Boulder, CO	CU Boulder	36k	108k	Somerville, MA	Tufts, Harvard	31k	81k
Beverly Hills, CA	UCLA	46k	33k	Morro Bay, CA	–	–	11k
Brookline, MA	Northeastern, BU, BC	62k	63k	Bloomington, IN	IU Bloomington	45k	88k
Superior, WI	UW-Superior	3k	26k	Hoboken, NJ	Stevens IT	8k	60k
Santa Monica, CA	UCLA, LMU	56k	93k	East Lansing, MI	MSU	50k	49k
East Lansing, MI	MSU	50k	49k	State College, PA	Penn State	47k	42k
Stanford, CA	Stanford	19k	21k	Mount Pleasant, MI	Central Michigan	12k	89k
Wellesley, MA	Wellesley College	2k	29k	Provo, UT	BYU	35k	116k
Athens, GA	U of Georgia	40k	215k	Cheswold, DE	–	–	1k
Blacksburg, VA	Virginia Tech	37k	45k	Santa Barbara, CA	UCSB	26k	90k
Cambridge, MA	Harvard, MIT	31k	117k	Wilmington, NC	UNC Wilmington	19k	116k
State College, PA	Penn State	47k	42k	Davis, CA	UC Davis	39k	69k
Harrisonburg, VA	James Madison	22k	52k	Carrboro, NC	UNC Chapel Hill	32k	21k
Fairfield, CT	Fairfield	6k	62k	Iowa City, IA	U of Iowa	28k	75k
Waltham, MA	Brandeis	6k	65k	Arlington, TX	UT Arlington	46k	401k
College Park, MD	U of Maryland	41k	35k	Gainesville, FL	U of Florida	54k	135k
Hoboken, NJ	Stevens IT	8k	60k	Troy, MI	–	–	84k
Annapolis, MD	Naval Academy	5k	41k	Superior, WI	UW-Superior	3k	26k
Bloomington, IN	IU Bloomington	45k	88k	SeaTac, WA	–	–	29k
Columbia, MO	U of Missouri	31k	126k	Cambridge, MA	Harvard, MIT	31k	117k
College Station, TX	Texas A&M	73k	124k	Goldsby, OK	–	–	3k
Evanston, IL	Northwestern	22k	75k	Brighton, MI	–	–	8k
Burlington, VT	U of Vermont	13k	45k	Ann Arbor, MI	UMich	47k	124k
Boston, MA	Northeastern, BU	50k	676k	Boston, MA	Northeastern, BU	50k	676k
Fort Collins, CO	Colorado State	33k	176k	Fullerton, CA	CSU Fullerton	40k	141k
Tempe, AZ	ASU	135k	192k	Carlsbad, CA	–	–	115k
Arlington, TX	UT Arlington	46k	401k	Roseville, CA	–	–	149k

Notes: This table lists the 30 cities with the highest Google search intensity for the app *Tinder* in 2013 and 2014. The data source is Google Trends. The student population and total population columns are in thousands. The cities that don't have colleges nearby are denoted with "–".

Table A2: Variables: Definitions, Constructions, and Associated NCHA Survey Questions

Variable	Description
Treatment Variables	
Post Tinder introduction	Coding: 1 = Tinder had already been fully launched by the time the respondent took the survey (after the summer of 2013); 0 = Tinder had not been introduced by the time the respondent took the survey.
Greek-life involvement (individual)	Question: "Are you a member of a social fraternity or sorority?"; Coding: 1 = Yes; 0 = No.
Greek-life involvement (college-level)	The share is the ratio of students who are part of Greek life over all students.
Sexual Outcomes	
Number of sex partners	Question: "Within the last 12 months, with how many partners have you had oral sex/vaginal intercourse/anal intercourse?"; Numeric open response.
Sex previous 12 months	Question: "Within the last 12 months, with how many partners have you had oral sex/vaginal intercourse/anal intercourse?"; Numeric open response. Coding: 1 = {any number above zero}; 0 = {zero}.
Sex previous 30 days	Question: "Within the last 30 days, did you have: Oral sex/Vaginal intercourse/Anal intercourse?" Scale: 1 = No, never done; 2 = Have done, not last 30 days; 3 = Yes. Coding: 1 = {3}; 0 = {1,2}.
Number of sex partners (cond. on >0)	Question: "Within the last 12 months, with how many partners have you had oral sex/vaginal intercourse/anal intercourse?"; Numeric open response. Coding: replace zeroes with missing values.
Relationship-Quality Outcomes	
Cohabiting	Question: "What is your relationship status?"; Scale: 1 = Not in a relationship; 2 = In a relationship but not living together; 3 = In a relationship and living together. Coding: 1 = {3}; 0 = {1,2}.
In relationship	Question: "What is your relationship status?"; Scale: 1 = Not in a relationship; 2 = In a relationship but not living together; 3 = In a relationship and living together. Coding: 1 = {2,3}; 0 = {1}.
Abusive relationship	Question: "Within the last 12 months, have you been in an intimate (coupled/partnered) relationship that was emotionally/physically or sexually abusive?"; Coding: 1 = Yes; 0 = No.
Difficult relationship	Question: "Within the last 12 months, have any of the following been traumatic or very difficult for you to handle?: Intimate Relationships"; Coding: 1 = Yes; 0 = No.
Relationship problems	Question: "Within the last 12 months, have any of the following affected your academic performance? Scale: 1 = Not happened to me, not applicable; 2 = Experienced but academics not negatively affected; 3 = Lower grade on exam/project; 4 = Lower grade in course; 5 = Incomplete or dropped course; 6 = Significant disruption in thesis, dissertation, research, or practicum work. Coding: 1 = {2,3,4,5,6}; 0 = {1}.
Negative Sex-Related Outcomes	
Sexual assault	Question: "Within the last 12 months, have you been subject to sexual abuse (sexually touched without consent/sexual penetration attempted without consent/sexually penetrated without consent)?"; Coding: 1 = Yes; 0 = No.
Chlamydia	Question: "Within the 12 months, have you been diagnosed or treated by any professional for Chlamydia?"; Coding: 1 = Yes; 0 = No.
HIV test	Question: "Have you ever been tested for Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) infection?"; Scale: 1 = No; 2 = Yes; 3 = Don't know. Coding: 1 = {2}; 0 = {1,3}.

Table A2: Variables: Definitions, Constructions, and Associated NCHA Survey Questions (cont.)

Variable	Description
Poor Mental Health Symptoms	
Hopeless	Question: "Have you ever: Felt things were hopeless?"; Scale: 1 = Never; 2 = No, not in last 12 months; 3 = In the last 2 weeks; 4 = In the last 30 days; 5 = In the last 12 months. Coding: 1 = {3,4}; 0 = {1,2,5}
Overwhelmed	Question: "Have you ever: Felt overwhelmed by all you had to do?"; Scale and coding: same as above.
Exhausted (not physically)	Question: "Have you ever: Felt exhausted (not from physical activity)?"; Scale and coding: same as above.
Very lonely	Question: "Have you ever: Felt very lonely?"; Scale and coding: same as above.
Very sad	Question: "Have you ever: Felt very sad?"; Scale and coding: same as above.
Severely depressed	Question: "Have you ever: Felt so depressed that it was difficult to function?"; Scale and coding: same as above.
Overwhelming anxiety	Question: "Have you ever: Felt overwhelming anxiety?"; Scale and coding: same as above.
Overwhelming anger	Question: "Have you ever: Felt overwhelming anger?"; Scale and coding: same as above.
Self-harm	Question: "Have you ever: Intentionally cut, burned, bruised or otherwise injured yourself?"; Scale and coding: same as above.
Considered suicide	Question: "Have you ever: Seriously considered suicide?"; Scale and coding: same as above.
Index for Mental Health Variables	
Index poor mental health	The index is constructed in the following way: (i) For the pretreatment period, all *symptoms of poor mental health* variables have been standardized to have a mean equal to 0 and a standard deviation equal to 1; (ii) An equally weighted average of the standardized variables has been derived; (iii) For the pretreatment period, the equally-weighted average is standardized again to have a mean equal to 0 and a standard deviation equal to 1.
Downstream Academic Performance	
Relationship difficulties (academic)	Question: "Within the last 12 months, have any of the following affected your academic performance?: Relationship Difficulties"; Scale: 1 = Not happened to me, 2 = Experienced but academics not negatively affected, 3 = Lower grade on exam/project, 4 = Lower grade in course, 5 = Incomplete or dropped course, 6 = Significant disruption in thesis, dissertation, research, or practicum work; Coding: 1 = {3,4,5,6}; 0 = {1,2}.
Sexual assault (academic)	Question: "Within the last 12 months, have any of the following affected your academic performance?: Assault (sexual)." Scale and coding as above.
STD (academic)	Question: "Within the last 12 months, have any of the following affected your academic performance?: Sexually transmitted disease/infection (STD/I)." Scale and coding as above.
Depression (academic)	Question: "Within the last 12 months, have any of the following affected your academic performance?: Depression." Scale and coding as above.
Anxiety (academic)	Question: "Within the last 12 months, have any of the following affected your academic performance?: Anxiety." Scale and coding as above.
Stress (academic)	Question: "Within the last 12 months, have any of the following affected your academic performance?: Stress." Scale and coding as above.
ADHD (academic)	Question: "Within the last 12 months, have any of the following affected your academic performance?: Attention Deficit and Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD)." Scale and coding as above.
Eating disorder (academic)	Question: "Within the last 12 months, have any of the following affected your academic performance?: Eating disorder/problem." Scale and coding as above.

Table A2: Variables: Definitions, Constructions, and Associated NCHA Survey Questions (cont.)

Variable	Description
Student Characteristics	
Female	Question: "What is your gender?"; Coding: 1 = female; 0 = not female.
Height	Question: "What is your height in feet and inches?"
Weight	Question: "What is your weight in pounds?"
White	Question: "How do you usually describe yourself? (Mark all that apply)"; Coding: 1 if chose "White"; 0 otherwise.
Black	Question: "How do you usually describe yourself? (Mark all that apply)"; Coding: 1 if chose "Black or African American"; 0 otherwise.
Hispanic	Question: "How do you usually describe yourself? (Mark all that apply)"; Coding: 1 if chose "Hispanic or Latino/a"; 0 otherwise.
Asian	Question: "How do you usually describe yourself? (Mark all that apply)"; Coding: 1 if chose "Asian or Pacific Islander"; 0 otherwise.
Native American	Question: "How do you usually describe yourself? (Mark all that apply)"; Coding: 1 if chose "American Indian, Alaskan Native, or Native Hawaiian"; 0 otherwise.
Other race	Question: "How do you usually describe yourself? (Mark all that apply)"; Coding: 1 if chose "Other"; 0 otherwise.
International	Question: "Are you an international student?"; Scale: 1 = Yes; 0 = No.
Age	Question: "How old are you?" This variable has been winsorized by cutting off 0.5% at the right tail. This has been used within regressions as separate indicators.
College grade	Question: "What is your year in school?"; Scale: 1 = 1st year undergraduate; 2 = 2nd year undergraduate; 3 = 3rd year undergraduate; 4 = 4th year undergraduate; 5 = 5th year or more undergraduate. We keep only undergraduate students in our sample.
Gay/Lesbian	Question: "What is your sexual orientation?"; Scale: 1 = Asexual; 2 = Bisexual; 3 = Gay; 4 = Lesbian; 5 = Pansexual; 6 = Queer; 7 = Questioning; 8 = Same-Gender Loving; 9 = Straight/Heterosexual; 10 = Another identity (please specify). Coding: 1 = {2,3,4}; 0 otherwise. We use this variable and coding as opposed to broader categories due to the inconsistency of the available answer options across years.
Body Mass Index (BMI)	Calculated by the ACHA following the standardized formula, weight (in kg) per height (in m) squared.
Overweight	Based on the BMI categories variable in the NCHA, which splits the data into brackets identified by the World Health Organization; Scale: 1 = Underweight, 2 = Healthy Weight, 3 = Overweight, 4 = Class I Obesity, 5 = Class II Obesity, 6 = Class III Obesity. Coding: 1 = {3,4,5,6}; 0 otherwise.
High Blood Alcohol Content (BAC)	Estimated blood alcohol content at the time of the survey is above 0.08. Estimated by ACHA based on the reported number of drinks and number of hours for the last time students partied/socialized, weight, as well as estimates for total body water weight and the average rate of alcohol metabolism. Follows the formula provided by the U.S. Department of Transportation.
On-campus living	Question: "Where do you currently live?"; Scale: 1 = Campus residence hall; 2 = Fraternity or sorority house; 3 = Other college/university housing; 4 = Parent/guardian's home; 5 = Other off-campus housing; 6 = Other. Coding: 1 = {1,2,3}; 0 = {4,5,6}.
GPA	Question: "What is your approximate cumulative grade average?"; Scale: 1 = A; 2 = B; 3 = C; 4 = D/F; 5 = N/A; Coding varies depending on the type of analysis and is indicated in the text.

Table A2: Variables: Definitions, Constructions, and Associated NCHA Survey Questions (cont.)

Variable	Description
Other Variables	
Region	The region where the campus is located; Scale: 1 = Northeast, 2 = Midwest, 3 = South, 4 = West.
Large college	Based on total enrollment; Scale: 1 = Less than 2,500 students, 2 = 2,500–4,999 students, 3 = 5,000–9,999 students, 4 = 10,000–19,999 students, 5 = 20,000 or more students. Coding: 1 = {5}; 0 = {1,2,3,4}.
Research institution	Based on the Basic Carnegie Classification; Scale: 1 = Associates Colleges, 2 = Baccalaureate Colleges, 3 = Masters Colleges and Universities, 4 = Research Institutions, 5 = Special Focus Institutions, 6 = Miscellaneous/Not Classified. Coding: 1 = {4}; 0 = {1,2,3,5,6}.
Southern college	Based on the region classification above. Coding: 1 = {3}; 0 = {1,2,4}.
Small city college	Based on where the campus is located; Scale: 1 = Very large city (population over 500,000), 2 = Large city (250,000–499,999), 3 = Small city (50,000–249,999), 4 = Large town (10,000–49,999), 5 = Small town (2,500–9,999), 6 = Rural Community (<2,500). Coding: 1 = {4,5,6}; 0 = {1,2,3}.
Religiously-affiliated college	Based on ACHA-NCHA Reference Group files; Scale: 1 = Yes, 2 = No.

Table A3: Online Dating Patterns Among the College-Student Population

Survey	Year(s)	Question	Relevant Respondents	Sample Size	Response
Pew Internet and American Life Project Polls[1]	2005 and 2009	Do you ever use an online dating website? (Yes)	Full-time students aged 18–24	33	3.1%
Pew Research Center Poll: Generation Next[2]	2006	Have you ever gone on a date with someone you met online? (Yes)	College undergraduates aged 18–24	24	8.3%
Online College Social Life Survey[3]	2005–2011	Where did you first meet your last (romance, hookup, date)? (Personal ad/dating service or "Other response" mentions the internet)	College Undergraduates from 22 different US colleges/universities	24,131	3.58%
Pew Internet & American Life Poll[4]	2013	Have you ever used an online dating site or a dating app on your cell phone? (Yes)	Adults with a high school or college degree aged 18–24	211	9.5%
Pew Research Center: Tracking[5]	2015	Have you ever used an online dating site or a dating app on your cell phone? (Yes)	College undergraduates aged 18–24	55	29%
Pew Research Center: American Trends Panel[6]	2019	Have you ever used an online dating site or dating app? (Yes)	Adults with some college or a college degree aged 18–29	731	49.7%

Notes: This table presents the shares of college-educated young adults who reported using dating websites or apps from 2005 through 2019. The surveys were identified by searching the Roper Center iPoll database for surveys from the years 2000–2020 containing the keyword *online dating.* Surveys that had questions related to the use of online dating, as well as questions on education level and age, were kept.
1: Only internet users were surveyed. The 2009 survey has only nine respondents who fit the age and education criteria, so their responses are merged with the 2005 survey.
2: Only internet users were surveyed.
3: The indicator for meeting via the internet is equal to 1 if an individual indicated that they met their most recent romance, hookup, or date through a personal ad/dating service or if they chose the "other" category and their response contained one or more of the following strings: *internet, online, Facebook, Myspace, Craigslist, eHarmony, .com*; otherwise, the indicator is equal to 0.
4: The variable is constructed as equal to 1 if an individual answered yes to ever using a dating website or app. The former question was put to internet users, and the latter question was asked of users of mobile phone apps.
5: The variable is constructed in the same way as for the 2013 survey.
6: The sample is restricted to individuals aged 18–29 (finer age categories are not available) and with the highest education level being either a bachelor's degree or one or more years of college.

Table A4: Changes in Composition of Greek Students Relative to Overall Student Population

	Pre-Non-Greek		Pre-Greek		Post-Non-Greek		Post-Greek		P-value for (Pre-/Post-Greek - Pre-/Post-Non-Greek)
Variable	N	Mean/SD	N	Mean/SD	N	Mean/SD	N	Mean/SD	N
Male	506	0.33	503	0.33	538	0.30	527	0.30	0.979
		(0.00)		(0.01)		(0.00)		(0.01)	
Age	506	21.57	503	21.77	538	21.42	527	21.83	0.402
		(0.10)		(0.14)		(0.09)		(0.16)	
White	506	0.72	503	0.73	538	0.71	527	0.73	0.528
		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)	
Black	506	0.08	503	0.09	538	0.08	527	0.07	0.152
		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.00)		(0.01)	
Hispanic	506	0.10	503	0.10	538	0.12	527	0.12	0.409
		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)	
Asian	506	0.10	503	0.08	538	0.11	527	0.09	0.992
		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)	
Native American	506	0.02	503	0.03	538	0.02	527	0.03	0.694
		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)	
Other Race	506	0.03	503	0.03	538	0.02	527	0.03	0.705
		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)	
International	506	0.07	503	0.17	538	0.05	527	0.09	0.000***
		(0.00)		(0.01)		(0.00)		(0.01)	
GPA	506	1.87	503	1.85	538	1.79	527	1.77	0.935
		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)	
Freshman	506	0.30	503	0.22	538	0.30	527	0.22	0.694
		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)	
Sophomore	506	0.24	503	0.26	538	0.24	527	0.24	0.118
		(0.00)		(0.01)		(0.00)		(0.01)	
Junior	506	0.22	503	0.24	538	0.22	527	0.25	0.308
		(0.00)		(0.01)		(0.00)		(0.01)	
Height	506	66.80	503	66.81	538	66.47	527	66.54	0.308
		(0.04)		(0.06)		(0.04)		(0.08)	
Weight	506	156.45	503	158.72	538	157.81	527	160.77	0.597
		(0.41)		(0.66)		(0.42)		(0.88)	
BMI	506	24.56	503	24.88	538	25.04	527	25.54	0.386
		(0.06)		(0.10)		(0.07)		(0.15)	
Gay/Lesbian	506	0.03	503	0.02	538	0.03	527	0.02	0.372
		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)		(0.00)	
Living on campus	506	0.47	503	0.52	538	0.51	527	0.53	0.401
		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)		(0.01)	

Notes: This table presents the average characteristics of Greek and non-Greek students across colleges before and after Tinder's full-scale launch. The p-values in the last column correspond to the difference-in-differences regressions of each characteristic on Post×Greek using aggregate college-by-post-by-Greek data. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A5: Newspaper Articles—First-Stage Results

	College Has Article on Tinder, 2013–2016				Number of Articles on Tinder, 2013–2016			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
College has Greek life	0.138***				0.999***			
	(0.046)				(0.375)			
Share of students in fraternities above median		0.112**				1.244**		
		(0.045)				(0.571)		
Share of students in sororities above median			0.113**				1.448**	
			(0.045)				(0.562)	
Share of students in Greek life				0.435**				4.205**
				(0.202)				(2.050)
Total articles	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	540	530	530	530	540	530	530	530

Notes: This table presents the relationship between the presence of Greek life and the intensity of Tinder mentions in associated college newspapers. The outcome variables in columns (1)–(4) are indicators for whether a college had at least one article mentioning Tinder published in any of its newspapers from 2013 through 2016; the outcome variables in columns (5)–(8) are the numbers of articles mentioning Tinder in any newspaper at a given college from 2013 through 2016. All estimates control for the total number of articles published by newspapers from 2013 through 2016. Data on the college newspapers come from LexisNexis; data on Greek organizations are from the Common Data Set. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A6: Google Trends—First-Stage Results

	Google Top 100 "Tinder" Search Intensity			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
College has Greek life	0.052**			
	(0.021)			
Share of students in fraternities above median		0.042*		
		(0.022)		
Share of students in sororities above median			0.060***	
			(0.022)	
Share of students in Greek life				0.234**
				(0.114)
Observations	540	530	530	530
Mean of dep. var.	0.070	0.072	0.072	0.072
SD of dep. var.	0.256	0.258	0.258	0.258

Notes: This table presents the relationship between the presence of Greek life at a college and an indicator for whether a city or town where the college is located ranks in the top 100 in terms of Google search intensity for *Tinder* in 2013–2014. Each observation is a college. Data on search intensity come from Google Trends; data on Greek organizations are from the Common Data Set. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A7: App-Usage Data—First-Stage Results

	Average Daily Use of Tinder During AY 2017–2018			
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
College has Greek life	0.003***			
	(0.001)			
Share of students in fraternities above median		0.004***		
		(0.001)		
Share of students in sororities above median			0.003***	
			(0.001)	
Share of students in Greek life				0.006*
				(0.003)
Observations	466	458	458	458
Mean of dep. var.	0.012	0.012	0.012	0.012
SD of dep. var.	0.011	0.011	0.011	0.011

Notes: This table presents the relationship between the presence of Greek life at a college and and the average daily usage rate of Tinder within the college's zip codes. The daily usage rate is calculated as the number of devices using Tinder in a given day divided by the total number of devices for which one of college's zip codes is the most frequently appearing location during that day. We analyze this relationship for the earliest academic year that the data on Tinder use became available, from September 21, 2017, through May 15, 2018. Each observation is a college. Data on app usage and device location come from Complementics; data on Greek organizations are from the Common Data Set. Observations are weighted by the logarithm of the total number of devices most frequently appearing in the college's main zip code. Robust standard errors are in parentheses. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A8: Distribution of Sexual Activity, By Student Gender

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
	>0 Partners	>1 Partners	>2 Partners	>3 Partners	>4 Partners	>5 Partners	>6 Partners	>7 Partners	>8 Partners	>9 Partners	>10 Partners
Panel A: Males											
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	0.047***	0.048***	0.053***	0.040***	0.035***	0.026***	0.018***	0.013***	0.010***	0.007***	0.005**
	(0.006)	(0.007)	(0.007)	(0.006)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	329,739	329,739	329,739	329,739	329,739	329,739	329,739	329,739	329,739	329,739	329,739
Mean of dep. var.	0.664	0.289	0.190	0.125	0.087	0.060	0.044	0.036	0.028	0.025	0.017
SD of dep. var.	0.472	0.453	0.392	0.330	0.282	0.237	0.206	0.185	0.165	0.156	0.130
Panel B: Females											
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	0.029***	0.029***	0.030***	0.024***	0.017***	0.013***	0.011***	0.009***	0.006***	0.005***	0.003***
	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	680,290	680,290	680,290	680,290	680,290	680,290	680,290	680,290	680,290	680,290	680,290
Mean of dep. var.	0.679	0.249	0.145	0.087	0.055	0.034	0.023	0.016	0.012	0.009	0.006
SD of dep. var.	0.467	0.433	0.353	0.282	0.228	0.181	0.149	0.126	0.107	0.096	0.076

Notes: This table presents the estimates of the impact of Tinder's introduction on student sexual activity. Panel A displays the results for male students only, and Panel B displays the results for female students only. The outcome variable is an indicator for whether a student had more than the given number of sex partners (ranging from strictly over 0 to strictly over 10) within the previous 12 months. The coefficient of interest is the interaction of a student's fraternity or sorority membership and an indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. All columns include college-semester fixed effects and controls (age, gender, race, grade, international student status, sexual orientation, height, and BMI). For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A9: Heterogeneity By Student- and College-Level Characteristics

	Outcome: Number of Sex Partners in Previous 12 Months												
	Student Characteristic X:								College Characteristic X:				
	Male	White	Black	Hispanic	Asian	Gay/Lesbian	Freshman, Sophomore or Junior	Overweight	Large College	Research Institution	Southern College	Small City College	Religiously Affiliated College
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)	(12)	(13)
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	0.224***	0.159**	0.201***	0.219***	0.207***	0.220***	0.133***	0.228***	0.154***	0.148***	0.262***	0.238***	0.219***
	(0.030)	(0.063)	(0.029)	(0.031)	(0.031)	(0.030)	(0.044)	(0.032)	(0.037)	(0.042)	(0.038)	(0.037)	(0.033)
Fraternity/Sorority × Post × X	0.095	0.050	0.317	-0.076	-0.019	0.185	0.106**	-0.027	0.129*	0.104*	-0.157***	-0.080	-0.057
	(0.070)	(0.067)	(0.196)	(0.095)	(0.106)	(0.347)	(0.053)	(0.056)	(0.066)	(0.059)	(0.059)	(0.064)	(0.078)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Post × X	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,051,472	1,057,077	1,055,998	1,055,867	1,055,792	1,048,184	1,057,717	1,039,838	1,057,717	1,057,717	1,057,717	1,057,717	1,057,717
Mean of dep. var.	1.495	1.497	1.497	1.496	1.496	1.497	1.498	1.497	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498	1.498
SD of dep. var.	2.970	2.986	2.986	2.983	2.984	2.974	2.988	2.944	2.988	2.988	2.988	2.988	2.988

Notes: This table explores the heterogeneity of the baseline estimates for the impact of Tinder's introduction on sexual activity with respect to various student- and college-level characteristics. Each column presents the results of a modified baseline specification where we interact the indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch with the indicator for a student's fraternity or sorority membership and with the various indicators of interest. All columns include college-semester fixed effects and the interaction between the indicator of interest and the indicator after Tinder's full-scale launch. For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A10: Negative Outcomes Related to Sexual Activity, By Student Gender

	Sexual Assault		Chlamydia		HIV Test	
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Panel A: Males						
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	0.016***	0.016***	0.006***	0.006***	0.015***	0.016***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.006)	(0.005)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls		✓		✓		✓
Observations	333,819	333,819	331,961	331,961	318,054	318,054
Mean of dep. var.	0.042	0.042	0.010	0.010	0.197	0.197
SD of dep. var.	0.201	0.201	0.097	0.097	0.397	0.397
Panel B: Females						
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	0.019***	0.019***	0.007***	0.007***	0.018***	0.015***
	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.004)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls		✓		✓		✓
Observations	686,133	686,133	684,106	684,106	647,222	647,222
Mean of dep. var.	0.109	0.109	0.015	0.015	0.286	0.286
SD of dep. var.	0.311	0.311	0.120	0.120	0.452	0.452

Notes: This table presents the estimates of the impact of Tinder's introduction on negative outcomes related to sexual activity. Panel A displays the results for male students only, and Panel B displays the results for female students only. The outcome variables are reported experiences of sexual abuse within the previous 12 months, having been diagnosed with or treated for chlamydia within the previous 12 months, and having ever tested for HIV. The coefficient of interest is the interaction of a student's fraternity or sorority membership and an indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. All columns include college-semester fixed effects and controls (age, gender, race, grade, international student status, sexual orientation, height, and BMI). For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A11: Mental Health (Excluding Sexually Abused Individuals)

	(1) Hopeless	(2) Over-whelmed	(3) Mentally Exhausted	(4) Very Lonely	(5) Very Sad	(6) Severely Depressed	(7) Over-whelming Anxiety	(8) Over-whelming Anger	(9) Self-Harm	(10) Considered Suicide	(11) Index Poor Mental Health (Last 30 Days)
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	-0.010**	-0.014***	-0.012***	-0.012***	-0.009**	-0.012***	-0.013***	-0.010***	-0.002**	-0.005***	-0.040***
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.007)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	926,794	928,700	932,581	928,048	926,901	928,072	927,840	925,665	928,487	928,730	932,581
Mean of dep. var.	0.456	0.686	0.656	0.372	0.391	0.172	0.340	0.203	0.023	0.028	0.052
SD of dep. var.	0.498	0.464	0.475	0.483	0.488	0.377	0.474	0.402	0.151	0.164	0.998

Notes: This table presents the estimates of the impact of Tinder's introduction on student mental health, excluding individuals who reported being victims of sexual assault in the previous year. The outcome variables are feeling hopeless, overwhelmed, mentally exhausted, very lonely, very sad, severely depressed (such that it was difficult to function), overwhelming anxiety, overwhelming anger, self-harm, and considered suicide in the previous 12 months. The index of poor mental health is obtained by adding the standardized versions of all of the variables above and standardizing the resulting variable. The coefficient of interest is the interaction of a student's fraternity or sorority membership and an indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. All columns include college-semester fixed effects and controls (age, gender, race, grade, international student status, height, and BMI). For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A12: Mental Health (Controlling for Sexual Activity)

	(1) Hopeless	(2) Over-whelmed	(3) Mentally Exhausted	(4) Very Lonely	(5) Very Sad	(6) Severely Depressed	(7) Over-whelming Anxiety	(8) Over-whelming Anger	(9) Self-Harm	(10) Considered Suicide	(11) Index Poor Mental Health (Last 30 Days)
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	-0.010**	-0.015***	-0.013***	-0.012***	-0.011***	-0.013***	-0.014***	-0.012***	-0.003***	-0.005***	-0.043***
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.007)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Baseline controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sexual-activity controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	914,082	915,901	919,105	915,315	914,188	915,335	915,109	912,968	915,717	915,974	919,105
Mean of dep. var.	0.457	0.686	0.657	0.373	0.391	0.172	0.340	0.203	0.023	0.028	0.054
SD of dep. var.	0.498	0.464	0.475	0.483	0.488	0.377	0.474	0.402	0.150	0.164	0.995

Notes: This table investigates whether the average positive impact of Tinder's introduction on mental health is driven by increased sexual activity. Specifically, it displays the estimates of the Tinder's impact on mental health controlling for students' number of sexual partners in the previous 12 months and for whether they had sex in the previous 30 days. The outcome variables are feeling hopeless, overwhelmed, mentally exhausted, very lonely, very sad, severely depressed (such that it was difficult to function), overwhelming anxiety, overwhelming anger, self-harm, and considered suicide in the previous 12 months. The index of poor mental health is obtained by adding the standardized versions of all of the variables above and standardizing the resulting variable. The coefficient of interest is the interaction of a student's fraternity or sorority membership and an indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. All columns include college-semester fixed effects and controls (age, gender, race, grade, international student status, height, and BMI). For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A13: Robustness: Exclude Non-Greek Students From Highly Greek Colleges

	(1) # of Sex Partners	(2) Sex Previous 30 Days	(3) Cohabiting	(4) Index Poor Mental Health (Last 30 Days)	(5) Chlamydia	(6) HIV Test	(7) Sexual Assault
Panel A: All Students							
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	0.234***	0.030***	-0.001	-0.033***	0.006***	0.017***	0.019***
	(0.028)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.008)	(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.002)
College FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,011,614	1,017,814	1,021,666	1,023,380	1,017,686	966,806	1,021,582
Mean of dep. var.	1.492	0.520	0.114	0.100	0.013	0.257	0.087
SD of dep. var.	2.912	0.500	0.318	1.028	0.113	0.437	0.282
Panel B: Non-Greek Students Are From Colleges With Greek Share Below 75th Percentile							
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	0.255***	0.033***	0.000	-0.029***	0.007***	0.018***	0.019***
	(0.029)	(0.004)	(0.002)	(0.009)	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.003)
College FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	814,913	819,998	823,200	824,613	819,834	779,748	823,099
Mean of dep. var.	1.511	0.531	0.123	0.099	0.013	0.269	0.087
SD of dep. var.	2.929	0.499	0.329	1.031	0.115	0.443	0.281
Panel C: Non-Greek Students Are From Colleges With Greek Share Below 50th Percentile							
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	0.248***	0.029***	0.001	-0.031***	0.007***	0.017***	0.019***
	(0.032)	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.010)	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.003)
College FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	587,596	591,370	593,745	594,822	591,310	561,823	593,708
Mean of dep. var.	1.531	0.532	0.125	0.105	0.014	0.274	0.089
SD of dep. var.	2.986	0.499	0.331	1.035	0.116	0.446	0.285
Panel D: Non-Greek Students Are From Colleges With Greek Share Below 25th Percentile							
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	0.239***	0.024***	0.001	-0.032**	0.007***	0.011**	0.018***
	(0.038)	(0.006)	(0.003)	(0.014)	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.004)
College FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	350,166	352,463	354,015	354,659	352,273	334,442	353,885
Mean of dep. var.	1.635	0.533	0.113	0.116	0.014	0.269	0.097
SD of dep. var.	3.181	0.499	0.317	1.035	0.118	0.443	0.296

Notes: This table presents the results of a robustness check for whether the baseline results remain stable after sequentially removing non-Greek-affiliated students in colleges with increasingly higher levels of Greek presence from the sample. Panel A presents the baseline estimates with college and semester fixed effects. Panel B presents the results after excluding non-Greek-affiliated students from colleges above the 75th percentile in its share of Greek students. Panels B and C further decrease this threshold to the 50th and 25th percentiles, respectively. All columns include college and semester fixed effects and controls (age, gender, race, grade, international student status, sexual orientation, height, and BMI). For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A14: Robustness: Student Characteristics Interacted With the Post Indicator

	(1) # of Sex Partners	(2) Sex Previous 30 Days	(3) Cohabiting	(4) Index Poor Mental Health (Last 30 Days)	(5) Chlamydia	(6) HIV Test	(7) Sexual Assault
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	0.188***	0.023***	-0.000	-0.036***	0.005***	0.011***	0.012***
	(0.025)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.008)	(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.002)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Controls × Post	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	994,404	999,941	1,003,279	1,004,944	999,763	949,826	1,003,325
Mean of dep. var.	1.482	0.521	0.473	0.094	0.013	0.256	0.086
SD of dep. var.	2.822	0.500	0.499	1.020	0.113	0.437	0.281

Notes: This table presents the results of a robustness check for whether the baseline results remain stable after the inclusion of the interactions of all baseline controls (age, gender, race, grade, international student status, height, and BMI) and the additional controls (living on campus and having high blood alcohol content at the moment of the survey) with the post-Tinder-introduction indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. All columns include college-semester fixed effects. For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A15: Robustness: LASSO-Predicted Sexual Activity Interacted With the Post Indicator

	(1) # of Sex Partners	(2) Sex Previous 30 Days	(3) Cohabiting	(4) Index Poor Mental Health (Last 30 Days)	(5) Chlamydia	(6) HIV Test	(7) Sexual Assault
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	0.219***	0.029***	0.003	-0.032***	0.006***	0.016***	0.020***
	(0.028)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.002)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Baseline controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
LASSO # of sex partners × Post	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,011,613	1,017,813	1,021,665	1,023,379	1,017,685	966,806	1,021,581
Mean of dep. var.	1.492	0.520	0.473	0.100	0.013	0.257	0.087
SD of dep. var.	2.912	0.500	0.499	1.028	0.113	0.437	0.282

Notes: This table presents the results of a robustness check for whether the baseline results remain stable after the inclusion of the interactions of the LASSO-predicted sexual activity of a respondent with post-Tinder-introduction indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. For prediction, we use age, gender, race, BMI categories, sexual orientation, and international status, as well as their square terms and interaction terms. All columns include baseline controls and college-semester fixed effects. For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A16: Robustness: LASSO-Predicted Greek Status Interacted with Post Indicator

	(1) # of Sex Partners	(2) Sex Previous 30 Days	(3) Cohabiting	(4) Index Poor Mental Health (Last 30 Days)	(5) Chlamydia	(6) HIV Test	(7) Sexual Assault
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	0.223***	0.030***	0.003	-0.034***	0.006***	0.015***	0.018***
	(0.029)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.007)	(0.001)	(0.003)	(0.002)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Baseline controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
LASSO Greek status × Post	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,011,613	1,017,813	1,021,665	1,023,379	1,017,685	966,806	1,021,581
Mean of dep. var.	1.492	0.520	0.473	0.100	0.013	0.257	0.087
SD of dep. var.	2.912	0.500	0.499	1.028	0.113	0.437	0.282

Notes: This table presents the results of a robustness check for whether the baseline results remain stable after the inclusion of the interactions of the LASSO-predicted Greek status of a respondent with the post-Tinder-introduction indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. For prediction, we use age, gender, race, BMI categories, sexual orientation, and international status, as well as their square terms and interaction terms. All columns include baseline controls and college-semester fixed effects. For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A17: Robustness: Survey Nonresponse

	Missing Response Rate For:						
	(1) # of Sex Partners	(2) Sex Previous 30 Days	(3) Cohabiting	(4) Any Component of Mental Health Index (Last 30 Days)	(5) Chlamydia	(6) HIV Test	(7) Sexual Assault
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	0.001	0.000	-0.000	-0.001	0.001*	-0.001	-0.000*
	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.000)	(0.001)	(0.000)	(0.002)	(0.000)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Baseline controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,023,379	1,023,379	1,023,379	1,023,379	1,023,379	1,023,379	1,023,379
Mean of dep. var.	0.011	0.005	0.002	0.025	0.006	0.055	0.002
SD of dep. var.	0.107	0.074	0.041	0.156	0.074	0.229	0.042

Notes: This table examines the possible differential changes in misreporting after Tinder's introduction by estimating whether nonresponse rates for our main outcomes change differentially for Greek students and non-Greek students before and after Tinder's full-scale launch. All columns include baseline controls and college-semester fixed effects. For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A18: Robustness: Crackdown on Greek Organizations

	(1) # of Sex Partners	(2) Sex Previous 30 Days	(3) Cohabiting	(4) Index Poor Mental Health (Last 30 Days)	(5) Chlamydia	(6) HIV Test	(7) Sexual Assault
Panel A: Omit Colleges With Large Decline in Greek Share Pre/Post Fall 2013							
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	0.218***	0.033***	-0.002	-0.036***	0.006***	0.017***	0.019***
	(0.033)	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.008)	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.003)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	760,464	765,016	767,895	769,139	764,923	727,448	767,842
Mean of dep. var.	1.506	0.522	0.114	0.097	0.013	0.256	0.087
SD of dep. var.	2.949	0.500	0.318	1.025	0.113	0.436	0.281
Panel B: Omit Colleges With Any Decline in Greek Share Pre/Post Fall 2013							
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	0.210***	0.029***	-0.003	-0.039***	0.007***	0.017***	0.019***
	(0.039)	(0.006)	(0.002)	(0.009)	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.003)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	395,072	397,111	398,573	399,194	396,991	377,245	398,531
Mean of dep. var.	1.577	0.521	0.092	0.085	0.013	0.241	0.091
SD of dep. var.	3.013	0.500	0.290	1.009	0.112	0.428	0.287

Notes: This table presents the results of a robustness check for whether the baseline results remain stable after omitting colleges for which the share of Greek students had declined. This addresses a potential concern about certain colleges concurrently cracking down on Greek life. The estimates in Panel A omit colleges for which the share of Greek students had declined by more than 2.8 percentage points before and after the Fall 2013 semester, which is the 5th percentile of the change in Greek student share. The estimates in Panel B omit colleges for which the share of Greek students had declined by any amount. All columns include baseline controls and college-semester fixed effects. For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A19: Impact on Grade Point Average (GPA)

	Student's Approximate GPA		
	A	B	C or lower
	(1)	(2)	(3)
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	-0.004	0.003	0.000
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,019,719	1,019,719	1,019,719
Mean of dep. var.	0.373	0.485	0.123
SD of dep. var.	0.484	0.500	0.329

Notes: This table presents the estimates of the impact of Tinder's introduction on students' self-reported approximate cumulative GPA. The coefficient of interest is the interaction of a student's fraternity or sorority membership and an indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. All columns include college-semester fixed effects and controls for age, gender, race, grade level, international student status, sexual orientation, height, and BMI. For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A20: Robustness: Excluding Colleges Surveyed Fewer Than Four Semesters

	(1) # of Sex Partners	(2) Sex Previous 30 Days	(3) Cohabiting	(4) Index Poor Mental Health (Last 30 Days)	(5) Chlamydia	(6) HIV Test	(7) Sexual Assault
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	0.228***	0.029***	-0.003	-0.032***	0.006***	0.016***	0.019***
	(0.035)	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.008)	(0.001)	(0.004)	(0.003)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	632,245	636,011	638,322	639,305	635,932	604,878	638,246
Mean of dep. var.	1.506	0.517	0.109	0.100	0.013	0.252	0.088
SD of dep. var.	2.949	0.500	0.311	1.021	0.113	0.434	0.283

Notes: This table presents the results of a robustness check for whether the baseline results remain stable after excluding the colleges that appear in the data for fewer than four semesters, which is the median number of times a college appears in the NCHA survey from Fall 2008 through Spring 2019. For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A21: College-Level Specification, By Student Gender

		Share of Students:			Share of Students:		
	Average # of Sex Partners	Sex Previous 30 Days	Cohabiting	Average Index Poor Mental Health	Chlamydia	HIV Test	Sexual Assault
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Panel A: Males							
Greek share × Post	0.252	0.079***	0.054***	0.023	0.007	0.040*	0.014
	(0.225)	(0.028)	(0.016)	(0.062)	(0.006)	(0.023)	(0.011)
College FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
College-level controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,624	1,624	1,624	1,624	1,624	1,624	1,624
Mean of dep. var.	1.756	0.495	0.100	-0.124	0.010	0.186	0.042
SD of dep. var.	0.523	0.086	0.080	0.153	0.008	0.066	0.020
Panel B: Females							
Greek share × Post	0.433***	0.051**	0.040***	-0.054	0.013***	0.054***	0.003
	(0.079)	(0.020)	(0.014)	(0.083)	(0.005)	(0.018)	(0.017)
College FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
College-level controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644
Mean of dep. var.	1.343	0.526	0.119	0.195	0.015	0.268	0.108
SD of dep. var.	0.288	0.091	0.092	0.164	0.009	0.078	0.042

Notes: This table presents the college-level estimates of the impact of Tinder's introduction on the main outcomes using the college-wide share of Greek students as a treatment intensity. Panel A displays the results for male students only, and Panel B displays the results for female students only. Each observation is a college and survey-wave pair. The outcome variables are (i) the average number of sexual partners per student within the previous 12 months, (ii) the share of students who had sex within the previous 30 days, (iii) the share of students in a cohabiting relationship, (iv) the average value of the index of poor mental health among students, (v) the share of students who had been diagnosed with or treated for chlamydia within the previous 12 months, (vi) the share of students who ever tested for HIV, and (vii) the share of students who reported experiencing sexual assault within the previous 12 months. The coefficient of interest is the interaction of the percentage of students who were part of a Greek-life organization and an indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. All specifications include college and survey-wave fixed effects. College-level controls are created by taking the mean value of individual-level indicator controls (gender, race, grade, international student status, and sexual orientation) and the median value of individual-level continuous controls (age, height, and BMI). For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A22: College-Level Specification, By Quartiles of Greek Share

		Share of Students:			Share of Students:		
	Average # of Sex Partners	Sex Previous 30 Days	Cohabiting	Average Index Poor Mental Health	Chlamydia	HIV Test	Sexual Assault
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
2nd-quartile Greek share × Post	0.027	-0.007	-0.000	0.024	0.001	-0.009	0.001
	(0.031)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.019)	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.004)
3rd-quartile Greek share × Post	0.049	-0.008	0.000	0.006	0.003***	-0.006	0.003
	(0.031)	(0.005)	(0.004)	(0.017)	(0.001)	(0.006)	(0.004)
Upper-quartile Greek share × Post	0.132***	0.011**	0.004	0.010	0.004***	0.003	0.005
	(0.029)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.018)	(0.001)	(0.005)	(0.004)
College FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
College-level controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644
Mean of dep. var.	1.482	0.512	0.113	0.071	0.013	0.238	0.086
SD of dep. var.	0.341	0.084	0.086	0.171	0.008	0.071	0.033

Notes: This table presents the estimates of the impact of Tinder's introduction on main outcomes using quartiles of the college-wide share of Greek students as indicators of treatment intensity. Each observation is a college and survey-wave pair. The outcome variables are (i) the average number of sexual partners per student within the previous 12 months, (ii) the share of students who had sex within the previous 30 days, (iii) the share of students in a cohabiting relationship, (iv) the average value of the index of poor mental health among students, (v) the share of students who had been diagnosed with or treated for chlamydia within the previous 12 months, (vi) the share of students who ever tested for HIV, and (vii) the share of students who reported experiencing sexual assault within the previous 12 months. The coefficients of interest are the interactions of the quartiles of the share of students who were part of a Greek-life organization and an indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. Colleges in the first quartile of Greek share serve as an omitted category. All specifications include college and survey-wave fixed effects. College-level controls are created by taking the mean value of individual-level indicator controls (gender, race, grade, international student status, and sexual orientation) and the median value of individual-level continuous controls (age, height, and BMI). For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table A23: College-Level Specification: Impact on Non-Greek-Affiliated Students

		Share of Students:			Share of Students:		
	Average # of Sex Partners	Sex Previous 30 Days	Cohabiting	Average Index Poor Mental Health	Chlamydia	HIV Test	Sexual Assault
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Greek share × Post	0.233*	0.067***	0.055***	-0.003	0.009**	0.030	-0.018
	(0.124)	(0.026)	(0.014)	(0.084)	(0.004)	(0.019)	(0.017)
College FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
College-level controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644	1,644
Mean of dep. var.	1.410	0.506	0.120	0.090	0.012	0.239	0.082
SD of dep. var.	0.330	0.088	0.088	0.168	0.008	0.074	0.032

Notes: This table presents the estimates of the impact of Tinder's introduction on non-Greek-affiliated students using the college-wide share of Greek students as a treatment intensity. Each observation is a college and survey-wave pair. The outcome variables are (i) the average number of sexual partners per student within the previous 12 months, (ii) the share of students who had sex within the previous 30 days, (iii) the share of students in a cohabiting relationship, (iv) the average value of the index of poor mental health among students, (v) the share of students who had been diagnosed with or treated for chlamydia within the previous 12 months, (vi) the share of students who ever tested for HIV, and (vii) the share of students who reported experiencing sexual assault within the previous 12 months. The coefficient of interest is the interaction of the percentage of students who were a part of Greek-life organizations and an indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. All specifications include college and survey-wave fixed effects. College-level controls are created by taking the mean value of individual-level indicator controls (gender, race, grade, international student status, and sexual orientation) and the median value of individual-level continuous controls (age, height, and BMI). For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Appendix B. Full Versions of Tables in Main Text.

Table B1: Distribution of Sexual Activity: Full Version

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(9)	(10)	(11)
	>0 Partners	>1 Partners	>2 Partners	>3 Partners	>4 Partners	>5 Partners	>6 Partners	>7 Partners	>8 Partners	>9 Partners	>10 Partners
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	0.031***	0.032***	0.034***	0.026***	0.021***	0.015***	0.012***	0.009***	0.006***	0.005***	0.003***
	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.001)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,011,613	1,011,613	1,011,613	1,011,613	1,011,613	1,011,613	1,011,613	1,011,613	1,011,613	1,011,613	1,011,613
Mean of dep. var.	0.674	0.262	0.160	0.099	0.065	0.043	0.030	0.023	0.017	0.014	0.010
SD of dep. var.	0.469	0.440	0.367	0.299	0.247	0.202	0.170	0.149	0.129	0.119	0.097

Notes: This table presents the full version of Table 3 in the main text, which estimates of the impact of Tinder's introduction on the distribution of student sexual activity. The outcome variable is an indicator for whether a student had more than a given number of sex partners (ranging from strictly over 0 to strictly over 10) within the previous 12 months. The coefficient of interest is the interaction of a student's fraternity or sorority membership and an indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. All columns include college-semester fixed effects and controls (age, gender, race, grade, international student status, sexual orientation, height, and BMI). Table A8 presents these results broken down by gender. For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.

Table B2: Mental Health: Full Version

	(1) Hopeless	(2) Over-whelmed	(3) Mentally Exhausted	(4) Very Lonely	(5) Very Sad	(6) Severely Depressed	(7) Over-whelming Anxiety	(8) Over-whelming Anger	(9) Self-Harm	(10) Considered Suicide	(11) Index Poor Mental Health (30 Days)
Panel A: All											
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	-0.008**	-0.012***	-0.012***	-0.010**	-0.007*	-0.010***	-0.010***	-0.007**	-0.002*	-0.004***	-0.033***
	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.003)	(0.001)	(0.001)	(0.007)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	1,017,002	1,018,978	1,023,379	1,018,279	1,017,028	1,018,283	1,018,058	1,015,640	1,018,741	1,018,986	1,023,379
Mean of dep. var.	0.466	0.695	0.667	0.390	0.409	0.187	0.356	0.215	0.027	0.033	0.100
SD of dep. var.	0.499	0.461	0.471	0.488	0.492	0.390	0.479	0.411	0.163	0.177	1.028
Panel B: Males											
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	-0.006	-0.013**	-0.016***	-0.016**	-0.006	-0.005	-0.004	-0.007	0.001	-0.001	-0.025**
	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.006)	(0.004)	(0.005)	(0.005)	(0.002)	(0.002)	(0.012)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	332,182	332,600	334,472	332,375	332,183	332,494	332,433	331,789	332,617	332,760	334,472
Mean of dep. var.	0.416	0.574	0.563	0.326	0.316	0.153	0.257	0.189	0.021	0.032	-0.115
SD of dep. var.	0.493	0.494	0.496	0.469	0.465	0.360	0.437	0.392	0.143	0.175	1.004
Panel C: Females											
Fraternity/Sorority × Post	-0.009*	-0.013***	-0.011***	-0.009**	-0.008*	-0.012***	-0.015***	-0.006*	-0.002**	-0.005***	-0.037***
	(0.005)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.003)	(0.004)	(0.004)	(0.001)	(0.002)	(0.009)
College-Semester FE	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Has controls	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Observations	683,197	684,754	687,277	684,283	683,219	684,165	684,001	682,230	684,499	684,601	687,277
Mean of dep. var.	0.491	0.753	0.717	0.421	0.453	0.203	0.404	0.227	0.030	0.033	0.203
SD of dep. var.	0.500	0.431	0.450	0.494	0.498	0.402	0.491	0.419	0.172	0.178	1.023

Notes: This table presents the full version of Table 6, which estimates the impact of Tinder's introduction on student mental health. In addition to the outcome variables in Table 6 (feeling hopeless, overwhelmed, mentally exhausted, very lonely, severely depressed such that it was difficult to function, overwhelming anxiety, overwhelming anger, self-harm, and considering suicide within the previous 30 days), the table also presents two additional outcomes: feeling very sad and conducting self-harm within the previous 30 days. The index of poor mental health is obtained by adding the standardized versions of all of the variables above and standardizing the resulting variable. The coefficient of interest is the interaction of a student's fraternity or sorority membership and an indicator for semesters after Tinder's full-scale launch. All columns include college-semester fixed effects and controls (age, gender, race, grade, international student status, sexual orientation, height, and BMI). We present the results for all students in Panel A, for male students only in Panel B, and for female students only in Panel C. For detailed variable definitions, see Appendix Table A2. Standard errors in parentheses are clustered at the college level. * p<0.1, ** p<0.05, *** p<0.01.