

Exhibit 67

[DRAFT/WIP] Research Synthesis for Core Supporting Narrative (CSN) on Well-being (#7)

Last Updated: May 31, 2022

POCs: [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED]

Annotated List of Key Documents: [HYPERLINK

"https://docs.google.com/document/d/1bLiPbISqek6-UQ5BK5sskHXlrUN1HoizXkENDyGX7po/edit" \h]

Detailed Research Framework: [HYPERLINK "https://docs.google.com/document/d/1A-u4nKVu9POoUQtt-znoRr67dpSH1o7jVgvEFvCd4e8/edit" \l "heading=h.orra6t97d526" \h]

The Well-being Core Supporting Narrative

Core idea to convey: We know connecting people is core to well-being.

Primary points to land:

1. **Value:** Relationships are not trivial. They are core to what makes us human. We design and build our products to reflect that principle.
2. **Balance:** Humanity is messy. While outcomes of bringing people together will never be 100% positive, our products are a net benefit to people's well-being.
3. **Leadership:** No company can be perfect, but we lead the industry in how we research and manage the impact of our products on well-being.

TLDR

[REDACTED]'s rif on TLDR flow:

1. Audiences agree that connections are core to well-being
 - a. Cite something from clinician's study
2. Audiences agree that connections is a key value proposition of Meta and some even think we should lean into it more.
 - a. This presents a viable path to landing the WB narrative
3. However, there are blockers in the path: Where we fail to make the connection is that connections on Meta are good for well-being. This is for a few reasons, both of which were fueled by FH-leaks:
 - a. Youth are exceptional in people's minds
 - i. Moral panic
 - ii. People think about youth differently
 - b. Our biz model doesn't align

Commented [1]: example: <https://docs.google.com/document/d/1Wwua3d6KGsKWorl29AMbDOTQTfpzGgGQ63JjAY96Ycc/edit#heading=h.1zm58uf7lcmc>

Commented [2]: @ [REDACTED]@fb.com -- one other thing i'd add to this TLDR are links to data sources for each substantive point.

Commented [3]: @ [REDACTED]@fb.com: As promised, i took a quick read to see if anything jumped out to me as missing. To that end, there might be a few things worth incorporating:

- 1) Should we talk about the fall-out of the WSJ Facebook Files/leaks? I'm not 100% sure to what end, but it seems like we might want to give a nod to how that event really brought (youth) Well-being to the fore of people's minds. Perhaps we can highlight how the narrative became politicized a bit (congressional and parliamentary hearings) as motivation for why political insiders are important stakeholders. And/or discuss the main narratives that we'll have to push back on in a post-Haugen world.
- 2) I think we have evidence that policy insiders DO want FB to focus on Connections and see it as part of the company's core value prop. The qual study that [REDACTED] and I did with Policy Insiders in 2020 revealed that people did believe that Connections/community was a core value proposition of FB. I think it's worth calling that out here and there are some good quotes in the qual deck about how FB needs to get back to it's roots: https://docs.google.com/document/d/12ZAFIDCFtpxUmjdZBqNepjxC2C4GYOXHaN7hE_YhKag/edit
- 3) similarly to #2, US and UK policy insiders rate "connections" in their top 10 issues that FB should focus on.
- 4.) we should also call out somewhere in here the point that [REDACTED] raised about prior research noting that FB was a slight net negative on WB (not sure it should be a focus, but worth mentioning somewhere as a point that not all internal research would necessarily support the "balance" point)

Commented [4]: Thanks! These all make sense to me -- really appreciate it.

Commented [5]: work in some of the product changes

Commented [6]: no one really cares if you are above 18; mods to business model are meant to protect young people

- c. We have a transparency problem (We suffer a deficit of trust with demands for more transparency, data sharing, and engagement.)
4. We have a number of upcoming press/public moments that are going to make it harder to overcome these roadblocks:
- The surgeon general offered an advisory on teen mental health that is likely to arise in reporting and among insiders.
 - MR
 - US2020?
1. All audiences agree that connecting with others is core to well-being, and that connections is a core strength of Meta. However, but not all agree that the way Meta facilitates connections is a net benefit to well-being. We have rarely provided proof points for the core value proposition of our products: it is unclear how messaging proof points based solely on connecting people would land.
- Users, experts, and policy insiders all agree that connecting people is a core value proposition of Meta, suggesting there is a viable path to win on well-being open a viable path.
 - However, there are common concerns to overcome from the general proposition. Specifically are (1) concern of algorithmic manipulation and/or; (2) connecting through social media or text is somehow less meaningful.
2. There has been persistent concern about the negative about negative influences of social media on youth wellbeing (often meaning bullying, problematic use, and negative social comparison)—Haugen leaks and the Wall Street Journal's Facebook Files [HYPERLINK "https://www.wsj.com/articles/the-facebook-files-11631713039"] fueled these narratives.
- This is a complex issue with complex influences: more willingness to discuss mental health, increasing academic pressure, limited access to mental health, risk behaviors (drug & alcohol use), digital media, and generational stressors like rising income inequality, racism, gun violence, and climate change.
 - "Wellbeing" is an open-ended term that means very different things in different contexts. In academic research and news reports it is often unclear what specifically is being mentioned. In relation to youth, common concerns both pre- and post-Haugen leaks are similar: bullying, SSI, inappropriate content, problematic use, social comparison.
 - While concerns pre- and post-leak were similar, the Haugen leaks seem to have intensified concern. We should anticipate cycles of concern and intensity over time.
3. Meta's business model is at odds with gamering trust in the well-being space. A common claim from critics, government actors, and even the general public is that an ads business model and algorithms are fundamentally mis-aligned with wellbeing; negative associations with wellbeing and Instagram are commonly explained by social performance and social comparison.

Formatted: Font: Bold

Formatted: Normal, Outline numbered + Level: 2 +
Numbering Style: a, b, c, ... + Start at: 1 + Alignment:
Left + Aligned at: 0.75" + Indent at: 1"

Commented [7]: I would reframe a bit - existing wb messaging has not focused on connection as the single beneficial outcome, the core value proposition for meta, however some initial results suggest that insiders and consumers are more receptive to messages about connection, opening a viable path to winning on wb.

its messy but something like this?

Commented [8]: I see what you're saying. I'll revise.

Commented [9]: @ [REDACTED]@fb.com - how is that?

Commented [10]: I agree with [REDACTED]'s framing. I like [REDACTED] update, and made some suggested modifications of my own.

Commented [11]: assuming this is what you meant. Just trying to distinguish them from "experts"

Commented [12]: I wonder if it's worth calling out that this was pre-FH, which then raises the question of whether this still holds.

Commented [13]: WHY did it fuel new narratives? Because it produced new information? Or because the leaks provided people with a way to think more simplistically about a complex topic? See my comment below on 2a, but what I'm thinking here is that the point should be something like,
- "There's been a persistent concern, in part, because social media is an easy scapegoat for youth mental health concerns."
- "This was fueled by the leaks"
- Also add something about [REDACTED] "moral panic" paper, noting that new technology gets blamed on a generational basis.

Commented [14]: [REDACTED]@fb.com -- I think this needs a reframe. It's not that point #2 is complex. But rather than youth well-being is complex, right? If that's the case, I might rephrase to something like,

"While social media gets the most attention in the ...

Commented [15]: This might not be the best paraphrase, so feel free to update/change. ...

Commented [16]: Maybe a more appropriate title is, "Meta's business model is at odds with garnering trust in the well-being space; we'll need to be strategic abc ...

Commented [17]: @ [REDACTED]@fb.com - do you recall seeing anything like this in a genpop sample? I'll look through it.

Commented [18]: Not among the Gen Pop. The algorithm piece of research that I'm aware of is this one from the DC Insider tracker (note this is an external ...

- a. Policy insiders and academics ~~very~~ commonly presume that an ads-based business model with algorithmic ranking that optimizes engagement ~~is at odds with optimizing for well-being~~; this is highlighted succinctly in the US Surgeon General's advisory: "there can be tension between what's best for the technology company and what's best for the individual user or for society. Business models are often built around maximizing user engagement as opposed to safeguarding users' health."
 - b. There is a significant amount of external research on wellbeing – though these slip between topics, small negative correlations are not uncommon.
 - c. There are two academic affiliated vocal critics (Jean Twenge and Jonathan Haidt) that actively and in real time evaluate research, including our blog posts and statements (their reviews are in open source google docs of 284 pages).
 - d. Messages focusing on arguments with research alone did not resonate well with insiders. Instead insiders often rely on intuition and personal experience.
- 4. We suffer a deficit of trust with demands for more transparency, data sharing, and engagement.**
- a. Academics (and some insiders) debate the influence of social media on teen mental health. Expect critics to argue that Meta has data and research about this negative association (relying primarily on research in the WSJ), but has not, or will not, share the data. These critics argue for sharing and external evaluation of this information.
 - b. Some insiders/elites see efforts at data sharing is in tension with some privacy narratives (CSN-7), and do not think academics (or especially the government) should have access to some social media data.
- 5. The surgeon general offered an advisory on teen mental health that is likely to arise in reporting and among insiders.**
- a. The report is not focused on social media, but advises about the rise in rates of certain mental health issues among youth. The report notes that this is a complex issue, and there is not good causal evidence about social media's impact relative to other issues (e.g. rising inequality, increased academic pressures, pandemic, climate change, racism, school shootings).
 - b. The report does provide a call to action for tech companies, including: (1) prioritization of well-being during product development; (2) transparency and data sharing; (3) building tools to help adolescents/teens; (4) promoting equality..
- 6. Our external messaging approaches in response have been siloed across four dimensions** (1) a "drumbeat" of products, 2) quarterly transparency reports, 3) work with experts through safety policy, 4) ad hoc peer review research. For external messaging, these strategies are rarely combined (though our community standards).

Commented [19]: We should link to the full advisory.

Commented [20]: through? or maybe the parenthetical wasn't finished?

- a. Our product teams (especially on Instagram) have built a number of products related to safety and wellbeing -- including teen safety and well-being. There are 28 product proof points identified, some of which (like parental controls) are in flight. These products often have low awareness.
- b. Our quarterly transparency reports provide information on enforcement of community standards, which are often related to teen well-being concerns (e.g. bullying and harassment), but do not break out reports by age.
- c. Our work with experts through safety policy arises in contexts related to specific areas and my highlight particular areas of work (e.g. SSI, bullying and harassment).

7. Alternative frameworks for consideration.

- a. We have not significantly tested positive well-being messages post Facebook Files. There is evidence that social media can provide positive impacts for some youth, by connecting them with others; helping express themselves; giving an outlet; or providing support.
- b. Teen well-being is a broad and open-ended category -- in some areas, like bullying, we can take stronger stances both based on empirical evidence and theoretical impact; in other areas, questions on impact matter more --
- c. There is tension between voice/balance and wellbeing; articulations related to CSN4 and/or good for the world may interact with well-being narratives in beneficial ways, and we should explore other ways of proceeding.
- d. Teen wellbeing works through various pathways with multiple stakeholders. We have not closely worked with some stakeholders (e.g. schools), invested in certain areas (e.g. sleep), or deepened cross-industry areas.

Avenues for further research:

A more comprehensive framework of research questions is in [HYPERLINK

"https://docs.google.com/document/d/1A-u4nKVu9POoUQt-znoRr67dpSH1o7jVgvEFvCd4e8/edit" \ "heading=h.orra6t97d526" \h]. A high-level summary of

high-priority questions is outlined below:

1. What is the best approach for enhancing trust in our efforts? What messaging is best to help address parent concerns for youth?
2. How do we combine and coordinate the significant efforts we've undertaken over the past several years (especially on Instagram)?
3. How do we engage with messaging on research, with calls for transparency and also meet high standards for rigor, regulatory, and legal scrutiny? Who can/should we partner with?

Commented [21]: I gave [REDACTED] the same advice, but I would make it clear that these are the questions that research WILL be prioritizing.

Commented [22]: worth adding a screenshot of the gantt chart?