Message

From: Kyle Andrews [/O=THEFACEBOOK/OU=EXCHANGE ADMINISTRATIVE GROUP (FYDIBOHF23SPDLT)/CN=RECIPIENTS/CN=[redacted]
Sent: 9/20/2021 11:54:19 PM
To: Lori [redacted]@fb.com]; Kyle Andrews [redacted]@fb.com]
Subject: Message summary [{"otherUserFbId":100021642675928,"threadFbId":null}]

Kyle Robert Andrews (9/20/2021 16:44:00 PDT):
>Hi Lori! Wanted to raise something with you--was going to post this as a reply on Pratiti's post sharing Nick's letter, but decided to provide the feedback privately instead. I wonder if this is something we can raise with our comms team (or whoever writes those public-facing statements).
>
>While I don't disagree with the intent or accuracy of the text from Nick's letter (snippet below), I wonder if we could work to be more specific going forward in theses types of responses? Pre-FB I spent a lot of time working on public health and environmental issues, and this sounds eerily similar to what tobacco companies and climate change deniers say. Uncertainty/doubt is a key component of the scientific method, but it can also be weaponized to push back on critics (e.g., "...but this one scientist thinks cigarettes don't cause cancer," "we need more research to know for sure whether climate change is man made," "evolution is just a theory," etc etc). I don't think that's what Nick was trying to do, but when we use language like this it puts us in very bad company....
>
>"The truth is that research into the impact social media has on people is still relatively nascent and evolving, and social media itself is changing rapidly. Some researchers argue that we need more evidence to understand social media' s impact on people. Each study has limitations and caveats, so no single study is going to be conclusive."

Lori [redacted] (9/20/2021 16:45:43 PDT):
>thanks so much for the feedback Kyle! Can you share an example of what you mean by "work to be more specific"?

Kyle Robert Andrews (9/20/2021 16:46:50 PDT):
>Like, providing a synopsis of what we think our internal research says, and what areas legitimately need more research.

Kyle Robert Andrews (9/20/2021 16:49:17 PDT):
>I could imagine a one paragraph summary of Daisy--teens say IG makes certain aspects of well-being worse, but when we run experimental tests of different features, etc., we don't see stat sig changes in well-being measures, indicating to us that we can't point to anything specific in the product, etc

Lori [redacted] (9/20/2021 16:49:41 PDT):
>gotcha. I get your point. I don't know that we feel certain about wha the internal research says but I do get your point :)

Kyle Robert Andrews (9/20/2021 16:51:37 PDT):
>Yeah lots of legit disagreement internally in how to interpret the data. I know we wouldn't do this, but would be fascinating to sponsor a point-counterpoint newsroom articles. Evidence for and against the idea that IG is bad for teens

Lori [redacted] (9/20/2021 16:53:47 PDT):
>Our research is more nuanced and shows both good and challenging experiences for different people at diff times. I' ll share the feedback if that' s ok (prob more to Kristin and comms for future). Interestingly I didn' t see nick' s post before it went out

Kyle Robert Andrews (9/20/2021 16:54:19 PDT):
>sounds good, thanks!

PX-00043, Page 1 of 1

Tennessee v. Meta
Case No. 23-1364-IV
PX-00043