Tennessee v. Meta
Case No. 23 1364 V
PX-03160

Why caring about well-being is important for Facebook and how we might best implement it in product

An opinion piece by ["ex-academic"] Anneke Buffone
with Rebecca [redacted] [Navigation], Judy [redacted] [Foundational Well-Being], Sean [redacted] [DS], Carlos [redacted] [CDS], and Scott [redacted] [News Feed]

These days, well-being is a hot topic in the tech industry. Most major companies have put out their own time control features, from Google & YouTube's tools, to Tik Tok's well-being settings, and, my personal favourite, Pinterest's well-being activities. And it is not only us researchers who feel intrigued by topics like "mindful use" and helping users achieve "digital well-being". Engineers, designers, PMs, and data scientists alike now think about digital well-being and how to avoid threats to it in product. This interest is only surpassed by the media and public discourse, where social media is quickly demonised as bad for "well-being" or worse for "mental health". There are also now are various design ethicists warning of the many dangers of social media to society, and to individuals. Design ethicists like Tristan Harris, beyond a doubt smart and experienced experts in their fields, point out the danger of social media's architecture and the inherent 'design for attention'. Tristan argues that "social media is designed to bring out the worst in us" and that social media generally feels "disempowering". He claims that social media use is a public health crisis akin to the dangers of cigarette smoking.

In part inspired by this thinking there now are actual cigarette box style warning labels, warning that "social media is bad for your mental health". I have seen them on an airplane to Buffalo, NY, stuck to the back of teenagers' cellphones...I think it is safe to say that the sentiment has gone mainstream if it has arrived in the Buffalo Bills' country.

IMAGE: Cigarette- style warning label for cellphones "Social media is bad for mental health.

Mixed academic evidence for ill effects of social media on well-being

Claims about the the dangers of social media are further fueled by various academic papers arguing that social media use is associated with negative well-being or mental health effects. Interestingly though, the message from my former fellow academics is much less clear, because for every paper finding evidence for the negative mental health effects of social media, there is a paper that is unable to replicate the finding, often finding a null association between social media use and well-being. In this way, social media has been claimed to predict depression in Teens and Adolescents in a cross-sectional study, but later systematic research has found that in longitudinal research this association does not hold up. Deactivating Facebook right before the last major US presidential election was shown to predict higher well-being and more time spent with friends and family offline, even reduced polarization compared to controls in a well-respected Stanford study. Next came an even more respected study by Oxford researchers featured in the renown journal Nature Human Behavior showing that the effect size of any negative effect of social media on well-being is negligible, on par with negative effects of "eating potatoes". In a nutshell, even academics don't agree on whether and when tech in general, and social media in particular, are good or bad for well-being, and based on the current evidence it is assumed that the effect is so small that we definitely cannot [yet?] claim a "crisis". I do want to note that more consensus exists for excessive use being a major issue; most of those who have studied "problematic use" have found evidence for a sub-group of users who are truly suffering because they cannot control their social media use, and that there is at least some responsibility for tech companies to address the issue [more: here] . In sum, based on the so far gathered evidence, most experts agree that if there is any overall effect of social networking on well-being outside of problematic use, it likely is somewhere between negative and small and non-existent.

I want to warn, that this should not yet be taken as conclusive evidence that social media does not negatively affect well-being. It took decades for research on tobacco consumption to get conclusive data on long-term effects of smoking. There are generations who grow up with social media, changing much of the fabric of how caregivers relate to them, how much of their lives is documented online, and how they will perceive and live normal communication as they grow. The verdict is still out in many other ways as well: there is much less research on effects of social media use on adults than there is on Teens, many studies do not use all of the appropriate controls (e.g., negative life events, time spent, age, gender, etc.), most studies are conducted in a US sample introducing a strong Western bias to our understanding, and studies might be biased by the media debate on how social media affects well-being rather than the reality of the user experience. Continued research, especially longitudinal research, meta-analyses, and twin studies will help us get closer to the truth of how social media affects health and well-being. I also want to encourage my academic and industry colleagues not to go into this research with too strongly formed opinions on what to expect for the relationship between social media use and well-being. For example, in a recent decently powered unbranded study [see: here] with all appropriate controls included, Judy & I found time spent on Facebook to actually be slightly positively associated with well-being, even though this effect only held up in some countries but not in others. That is, even if there are no negative effects of social media on well-being, there still is a wealth of untapped potential to set up social media in a way that promotes and enhances well-being.

Given the currently available [though limited] mixed evidence on the relationship between social media and well-being, there is no reason to panic that we are slowly killing the joie de vivre of our users or ruining their mental health. In many ways, the negative and positive effects of social media still need years of research to be adequately understood.

> This means, we have great potential to make the story of social media and well-being a success story through offense, meaning efforts to increase well-being with our products, and defense, meaning efforts to reduce threats to well-being. As a company that is a one-stop shop for so many needs (e.g., connecting with family, friends, earning an income, learning, etc.) we are uniquely positioned to positively influence well-being for billions of users.

Should we increase investment in digital well-being?

My answer is a resounding yes.

> Yes, because we have an ethical responsibility to try to set up our platform to maximize user well-being.
>
> Yes, because it is in our best interest: If users come to the conclusion that the time they spend with us is mindless, not valuable, and not well-spent, short if the time they spend with us is "low quality", they will eventually leave.
>
> Yes, because there is a large population of users who have problematic use (an estimated 10- 12 percent of the global user population, with highest numbers in PH, IN, and MX) who experience severe negative life impact because they cannot control their Facebook use.
>
> Yes, because low agency & immersive experiences and polarization likely go hand in hand, and polarization is a significant threat.
>
> Yes, because if we manage to make Facebook positive for well-being, we may very well be rewarded with more engagement and improved sentiment.

Yes, because we have an ethical responsibility

We have an ethical responsibility to set up our platform to maximize user well-being. Our mission is to give people the power to build community and bring the world closer together. If we want to EMPOWER users we have to, by definition, give them agency and control to do so. This means that not prioritizing user agency and control goes directly against our mission. Most of the things that we want to do for our user community is helping them do the kinds of things more effectively that should enhance well-being:

- stay connected to friends and family, even if as a result of modern life they now live far away
- grow a small business
- learn about a topic of interest or a hobby from experts
- find support for a condition or hardship in Groups
- lift mood through funny content, games, or other entertainment
- stay informed about current news to make informed decisions

If we make sure that our users can do these things effectively in an environment that allows them to direct their attention in a self-determined way, in a way that maximizes agency, then we will fulfill this responsibility.

Also, when it comes to our ethical responsibility, we do have to be concerned about how social media use affects kids and adolescents. While I don't believe that allowing kids to use social media use is like handing them a pack of cigarettes, I do think that Tristan and other design ethicists have a point. We have to teach kids mindful use of technology, in part by being a good role model in our own use. While there is no good evidence for social media's mental health effects, there is evidence that too much screen time - no matter whether traditional television, Netflix, or YouTube videos, or phone games - are problematic for children's development. The verdict is also still out on whether early heavy use of technology may predispose kids to addictive patterns later in life. Thus, we need to design our products in a way that allows easy transitions in and out of experiences and promotes agency while using our products.

Yes, because it is in our best interest

If users come to the conclusion that the time they spend with us is mindless, not valuable, and not well-spent, short if the time they spend with us is "low quality", they will eventually leave. Even if social media is not "bad" for people, if the time people spend feels mindless, people will eventually find better things to do with their time, be it another app where they perceive their time to be spent more meaningfully, or an offline activity. Worse if people feel that the time they spend with us makes them feel bad: be it feeling badly about themselves due to social comparison when their childhood friend posts the third tropical vacation that year, be it the negativity in political commenting that makes users feel isolated and distant from others or worse, like losing faith in humanity, or be it the loneliness experienced when seeing the colorful image of your friends getting together for a celebration without you after you have moved to a new city for work. In several studies, we have observed a link between poor well-being, experiencing problematic use, and thoughts about deactivation and deletion. If people feel bad when they are on our app, how can we expect them to stay? And fair warning, I do think the public narrative of "social media is bad" matters here. We see it come out frequently as a user complaint in social listening research, and there are countless articles about the topic online, even Instagram accounts that promote digital well-being by encouraging users to take "social media breaks". If privacy has taught us anything so far, it is that media-fueled vague concerns, even if untrue, can powerfully influence negative sentiment. And while there is no conclusive evidence about a behavioral link [there is no data conclusively linking privacy concerns or well-being concerns to actual reduced engagement or deactivation], we cannot be certain that such an effect may not occur over time.

Yes, because around 12 % of the user population report severe negative life impact from Facebook, especially in emerging markets

There is a significantly large population of users who have problematic use - an estimated 10- 12 percent of the global user population, with highest numbers in PH, IN, and MX. As a result of their problematic use, these people report severe negative life impact. I have written extensively about this topic, but the TL;DR is that there are a significant proportion of users who are perceiving both an inability to control their social media use and feel that this is severely negatively impacting their relationships, their ability to get the sleep they need, their relationships with their children, and their productivity. For these people, Facebook causes poor well-being by being addictive, reducing agency and control, and manipulating users into an endless loop of meaningless engagement. We have a responsibility of addressing these issues in product. Though time controls like 'Your Time on Facebook' are a great start, we must go well beyond on this. We need to create pause points in immersive experiences (e.g., in Stories and autoplay video experiences). We need to help guide users' attention in a sustainable and agentic way. And we need to be mindful whenever we actively try to get users through notifications or badging.

Yes, because low agency & immersive experiences and polarization likely go hand in hand, and polarization is a significant threat.

The negative impact of social media on well-being is often due to an inability to disengage from content. This can arise from an intentional design architecture or the incentive structures that hijack human psychology. And these same structures also facilitate polarization. The following is based on this excellent video and influential social psychology research. Experts on the topic of polarization warn that divisive content and toxic conversation are more engaging for people. This means that, when our design prioritizes content based on engagement, we take advantage of these negative aspects of human psychology to keep users on the app, in turn facilitating polarization and misinformation. This is exacerbated by the fact that a few loud, polarizing voices have greater influence when inserted into large groups, leading to a normative shift towards more extreme opinions. On the internet, polarization that also happens naturally offline, happens faster and at scale. Add human psychology again where people naturally gravitate towards perceiving themselves as part of a group and perceiving said group as more worthy than other groups, and you provide the ground where dehumanization of other groups and equating people with their opinion can grow. Again, we are not causing this, but we are facilitating it. Some may think that this is an integrity, not a well-being problematic. I strongly disagree with this. Integrity issues are closely intertwined with well-being issues. Hating, anger, and aggressive discourse threaten well-being. Integrity issues like polarization breed negative emotions and thus poor well-being, they breed fear when one sees members of other groups as the enemy, they breed social isolation when family members refuse to spend time together or simply feel less close than before after a heated political debate online, they can threaten the ability to grow a business, they could even threaten physical safety when online arguments move offline, and if a radical political system gets a hold of a society, the well-being of large populations will suffer. While integrity issues go far beyond well-being, well-being detriments are an important consequence of them.

Importantly, the solutions to combat integrity suggested by experts, are just as intertwined with well-being. The most important first step experts suggest is to dehumanize groups that disagree with us, facilitated by building empathy and trust. The first step is helping people see common ground with members of the political, racial, or social outgroup. The way to do this is to facilitate trust, notably a well-being dimension. It is done by facilitating open dialogue, sometimes even moderated. Then people can re-learn to see the other as a person, a person they can relate to, with an opinion they may disagree with. After trust, comes empathy for the other group when people come to see why the other holds the beliefs they do. Empathy and generosity are important facilitators of positive well-being. What personal experiences have made them convinced of their strongly held beliefs and what new experiences may help them change. Deep connections, rather than shallow ones, are best at facilitating bridges between polarized groups. In a nutshell, the means and solutions to improve polarization also facilitate good well-being

Yes, because if we manage to make Facebook positive for well-being, we might be rewarded with more engagement and improved sentiment

If we can build experiences that maximize user well-being and openly embrace a commitment to well-being in the public, we may see users engage more with our product because we fulfill real needs and provide meaningful experiences. If we aim for this in all of our products, and prioritize meaningful over shallow engagement, user well-being and engagement will go hand in hand.

But what exactly is digital well-being and how can a company achieve it?

Well-being has many predictors and there is no one magic button to make it happen, not for an individual person and even less for a group of people.
We can't fix well-being on Facebook simply by addressing just problematic use, not by just encouraging meaningful interactions, not by just focusing on loneliness - we need to do all of these things, and focus on delivering quality experiences that leave the user feeling fulfilled, inspired, and more often positive than negative. T

This means that our well-being strategy must be aimed at long-term rather than short term gained and must be measured and patient: We cannot shift our strategy too quickly from problematic use, to loneliness, to social comparison, onto the next hot well-being topic that is debated in academia or the press.
Improving well-being has to occur slowly, by setting the right conditions across multiple teams and products and sustained efforts to tackle the most important threats to well-being and expand the most important well-being benefits.

The surrounding environment makes a huge difference for an individual's well-being: How high or low your well-being is is partially determined by your community and the opportunities in your environment [or lack thereof].
For example, a strong predictor of well-being is socio-economic status. However how happy you are with your income depends on your neighbors. If you make less than your neighbors you will feel worse about your SES even if you're objectively wealthy and if you are objectively poor but richer than your neighbors, you will feel fine. We need to empower communities and do our part in helping people reach out to one another, while overcoming prejudice and other blockers to community action.

Offense is at least as important as defense when it comes to improving well-being.
Combatting problems has long been the default in psychology. Clinical psychology, understanding mental disorders and helping those affected, has a lot of attention and much better funding compared to social and personality psychology which is focused on individual differences and the interaction between person and environment. This has created a paradigm making it seem as though fixing what is broken is more important than expanding on what works well. A focus on deficits rather than strengths. That being said, successful interventions for mental disorders are very hard to achieve while creating conditions that make it easier for all people to make the right choices to maximize benefits for individuals and their community are not necessarily more difficult and might even have the potential to reach a much larger number of people.

Positive psychology argues that fixing a problem can occur in two distinct ways:

> Focusing and fixing deficits. This is an important strategy but has its limits. If you don't enjoy meetings and strategic discussions and are more of an introvert it will be an uphill battle to train yourself into a good manager.
>
> Understanding and expanding on strengths. You might be successful at work by a focus on honing your strengths and expanding your superpowers or trying to fix your deficits. In the people op space at Facebook we have understood this for a long time which is why we value ICs as much as managers and offer parallel career tracks. While deficits may only be fixable to a certain degree we all have things that we are good at, things we can expand to true super powers. Add the power of a good team (or a community) and you can really push some boundaries.

Belonging and connection are essential for well-being and trust is a necessary precondition to reap these benefits.
Well-being is hard to achieve without feeling meaningfully connected, loved and cared for. This requires trust, so that one can allow oneself to be vulnerable without fear of being taken advantage of. Our products aimed at connection will be essential in our mission towards greater well-being.

Generosity and helping are ways to increase well-being are readily available options to improve well-being and opportunities for this are available to almost anyone.
Paradoxically, giving social support can be more important for health and well-being than receiving it. There are many ways to help others that are readily available: providing advice on a topic, lending an ear to someone in need, or comforting a friend in distress, up to donating money to charity. Such actions can provide powerful boosts to well-being and even increase longevity.

Stress [aside from positive stress or "eustress"] is one of the major negative forces to well-being.
Stress is a well-being killer and if we create environments where users are stressed by alerts and notifications unable to pursue what they came to do or worse, what they aimed to do in their real life, we threaten well-being. Similarly, we threaten well-being when the social interactions on Facebook become sources of stress.

How might we take a holistic approach to well-being that relies more on 'offense' rather than 'defense'?

The basis of taking a more offensive and holistic approach is by solid foundational research, as facilitated by our well-being teams at Facebook, led by Iona Badea and Jennifer Guadagno, and Instagram, led by Sal Becerra and Lori Malahay. Foundational research is the most important foundation of taking an offensive and holistic approach to well-being. We need to invest in this work, widely share its results, and make sure it influences key decision-making around the company. The foundation of incorporating well-being into the fabric of how our community is structured, is understanding how Facebook affects well-being in positive and negative ways. We need a bird's eye view [foundational research team] in order to guide team and product specific understanding.

An important piece are to develop adequate sentiment measures and goaling metrics to measure and move well-being related sentiment.
The closer sentiment measures can get to more deep [value, meaningfulness, trust, worth my time] measures from more shallow [positive/negative sentiment, broad feelings about our product], the better. We need systematic goaling metrics to avoid that we goal in ways that actively undermine well-being. These should be evaluated alongside of engagement metrics to carefully calibrate risks and opportunities. Whenever it is not too big of an effort, teams should assess relevant measures proactively.

On the offense side, I feel very excited about the FAV metric, focused on a more meaningful form of sentiment.
On the defense side, I feel excited about our problematic use metric. Both survey and a first draft of a metric are now available for teams to test whether their product may facilitate problematic use.
On the holistic assessment side, I am very excited about new efforts to help users evaluate quality at the session level: the development of a good vs. bad sessions metric. Well-being is not just determined at the post-level or even experience level, but also by how the user is left feeling as a result of an entire session. Thus we need holistic ways to evaluate quality at the session level which incorporate well-being. In order to understand well-being, we have to be able to understand how the variety of experiences a user has in a session jointly contribute to their perception of the quality of their experience, of which well-being is an important piece.

Some more practical tips as you think about how to incorporate well-being in your team's roadmap

- User agency matters a great deal for well-being, but control settings are not always the answer. They are often difficult to find and hard to understand. Tips and campaigns may be important tools to show users that we care about their well-being and to give them advice on how to use Facebook in a way that maximizes agency. Think about how you can facilitate agency beyond complicated and difficult to locate settings, such as through intuitive navigation which you have user tested on populations of varying tech literacy and cultural backgrounds.

- Privacy & trust matter greatly for well-being: When users do not feel safe with regard to their data and information, in their relationships to others on platform, and when they are uninformed (who has access to which of my data when) we sacrifice psychological safety. Without psychological safety, a lot of the things that foster well-being are hindered: opening up and receiving support, making and nurturing connections to others, finding a supportive community on Facebook. Collaborate with the privacy and integrity team to ensure psychological safety in the context of your product.

- We need systematic education of teams about not just responsible design, but also the well-being impact of designs and experiences on Facebook. How do I make sure that my product is a good experience for different kinds of users? What might be unintended consequences of the product experience? Invite our internal well-being experts, or external academics to join you for a team meeting or talk and learn from their expertise.
- We should have a close eye on all services and types of engagement that have the potential to feel shallow: videos with low meaning, irrelevant ads, spammy suggestions --> Shallowness is the foundation for evaluating time as not well spent. Depth of experience matters. When evaluating your product, ask users what parts feel shallow and why and help reduce such experiences for the user.
- We should continue to invest in our well-being superpowers: groups, entertainment & commerce (a small business being someone"s livelihood). If you work on a topic where you can make a connection to user well-being, make it and embrace it. Make the connection in your advertising, in your research, and reflect this in your roadmap priorities.
- Don't prematurely change your well-being related strategy and avoid changing areas of focus within well-being too often. There are many areas within Facebook's possible well-being impact that your team could tackle: Problematic use, loneliness, suicide prevention, social comparison, mental health, meaning, social connection, access to quality information or local resources. All of them will take a long term effort to be successful. This means years. Be patient as you conduct user research and develop product, try different things, and don't get discouraged if you don't find the right solution right away. Reward the process in PSCs, rather than the successful outcome. Moving fast and well-being should never be as much as used in the same sentence

We are a company that cares deeply about well-being, from top leadership up to many, if not most, employees. All we need to do is commit, bottom up up, not just top down

Facebook leadership frequently takes the time to listen to our research and PoV with regard to well-being topics, but there is no good way to direct the incorporation of positive well-being top down. What facilitating well-being means will vary greatly for each product team, as will what threatens it.

To really make well-being matter and facilitate it in product, we have to incorporate it from the bottom up. I believe we can learn a lot from Instagram on how this can be done. As a start, at Instagram, well-being related questions and safeguard are considered as one aspect of facilitating engagement.

We already have the most important factor to make this happen, you, our employees, are already invested. The internal dogfooding event for our one well-being product, Your Time on Facebook, had employees come out in record numbers to test the tools and show their support. Over the last year where I worked on well-being at Facebook, I had many teams reach out, most of them teams that work in spaces that are not primarily focused on well-being, and were worried that an aspect of their product could threaten well-being. We are at the ground, we see and understand the risks to well-being within our space and are the ones ethically responsible to fix them, and best equipped to do so. It all begins with a first step, a pilot user research study, an exploratory design, a PM with a good idea.

The good news is that there is no crisis, but instead a world of opportunity.

Background: Anneke Buffone has been a well-being researcher for over a decade. She obtained a master's degree in sociology and political science from Justus-Liebig-University in Giessen, Germany, where she learned to never underestimate the power of the social-cultural and political environment on human decision making (agency) and their ability to positively influence their own pursuit of the good life (well-being). While completing her PhD at SUNY Buffalo, Anneke researched a broad spectrum of well-being topics from the individual psychosocial and societal burdens of caregivers of dementia patients, to experiments on empathy-fueled aggression, to physiological markers of adaptive and maladaptive forms of emphatic responding, up to trust and generosity, including the strong relationship between trust and subjective well-being. Upon graduating with her PhD she joined a startup-like effort at the University of Pennsylvania, the World Well-Being Project, as their Lead Research Scientist, to study the well-being and trust of large populations via their language in social media. On the more applied side, Anneke has spent nights counseling individuals in crisis and providing anything from suicide intervention and counseling, to referring homeless individuals to shelters, taught seminars on tolerance and inclusion to hundreds of high school and college-aged exchange students in large people-to-people exchange organisations (e.g., Youth for Understanding; AIESEC), and completed internships in a drug rehab and a closed psychiatric ward. Anneke has always been passionate about deeply understanding what makes individuals flourish. One of the things she has become convinced of in her work is that flourishing is maximal when individuals are embedded in flourishing communities. If people perceive abundance (e.g., feel that there are enough resources for everyone to live the good life), freely trust others in the community (within reason), and actively help them flourish, as well, everyone's well-being improves. Anneke's mission as a researcher is to help Facebook strive towards becoming such a community through research, advocacy, and strategic partnerships.
Contact Support

Conversation History

Quipbot#23 left the thread Sep 16 at 9:27 am

Quipbot#23 Sep 16 at 9:22 am

=====IMPORTANT=====

This Quip file has been copied to Google Workspace (https://docs.google.com/document...) as part of the Quip2Google migration efforts. Quip is moving to Read-Only. Please work in the new Google file moving forward.

Learn more

https://fb.workplace.com/groups...

Questions?

Visit the Quip2Google Migration Feedback Group (https://fb.workplace.com/groups...).

Note

New edits in this Quip file will NOT be automatically synced to Google Workspace.

Quipbot#23 added Quipbot#23 to the thread Sep 16 at 9:27 am

Quipbot#23 added you to a document Sep 16 at 9:22 am

Anneke Buffone edited Jan 10, 2020 at 4:09 am
hgbkttkrvliifbgdiebtbtcniviuhkev in In part inspired by this thinking there now are actual cigarette box style warning labels, warning that "social media is bad for your mental health" .....I think it is safe to say that the sentiment has gone mainstream if it has arrived in the Buffalo Bills' country.

Judy [redacted] Jan 10, 2020 at 12:57 am

All we need to do is commit, bottom up and top down.

Judy [redacted] edited Jan 10, 2020 at 12:57 am

Judy [redacted] Jan 10, 2020 at 12:30 am

☒ roll

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 10:26 pm

Would be good to connect back to our metrics - e.g., how we are revamping the MSI metric to better capture the "meaningful" piece. Could mention Quality Sessions

---

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 10:24 pm

I think this mostly summarizes what you have above. I'd recommend using the 1-2 sentence summary of what you're saying in this paragraph, and then connect it back to Facebook - e.g., this suggests that our mission of building meaningful interactions is important, including with people who we may not have previously viewed as "close friends." You could then connect it to the MSI, meaningful people, and other similar workstreams.

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 10:20 pm

Do you mean humanize?

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 10:19 pm

The relationship between integrity issues and well-being issues seems like an important point that you may want to discuss in its own paragraph.

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 10:18 pm

We could be causing it in some instances tho, right?

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 10:18 pm

Not sure if this is needed; would shorten or remove

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 10:15 pm

I might phrase it as, "... when our design prioritizes content based on engagement alone, we risk boosting divisive, toxic content that negatively impact well-being." You may want to chat with the integrity folks about this - they probably have a lot to say about it and can provide some data. E.g., Rottem [redacted] and Derek [redacted]

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 10:11 pm

Which structures?

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 10:09 pm

May want to be more specific

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 10:07 pm

May want to define well-being at the outset.

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 10:06 pm

A lot of "and"s in this title :)

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 10:05 pm

People may not know what this means

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 10:05 pm

What do you mean by "get users"? I'm also wondering if you can go beyond "be mindful" and possibly give some concrete examples or ideas? For example, how you did with the creation of pause points.

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 10:03 pm

Difficult word

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 10:02 pm

Is this data-driven from causal studies?

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 10:00 pm

cite

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 9:58 pm

This is an interesting finding. I might expand on this more and discuss how these things are connected, and how this directly affects FB as a company. If you do, you could probably shorten up the remainder of the paragraph a bit.

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 9:52 pm

Lot of detail; may want to make shorter

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 9:50 pm

Feel a little redundant with the previous sentence.

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 9:50 pm

Would remove

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 9:49 pm

Not sure what this means

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 9:48 pm

May want to cite here, if possible

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 9:47 pm

could shorten to "irrespective of the medium (e.g., television, Netflix, YouTube)"

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 9:46 pm

May want to clarify "mental health effects". Is this a sub-category of well-being? Is it that there's no good evidence or that the evidence is currently unclear, as you discussed in the first paragraph?

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 9:45 pm

We as adults or as FB employees?

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 9:44 pm

Maybe could phrase more simply? E.g., "... effectively and with a sense of control, then..."

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 9:42 pm

would remove

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 9:42 pm

Sentence is a bit confusing for me

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 9:42 pm

Feels somewhat redundant with previous section

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 9:40 pm

You may also want to add a brief sentence that links sentiment to the long-term health/success of the company (e.g., ..., which can improve the long-term health and success of Facebook [cite])

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 9:38 pm

Some people may not know what this means

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 9:37 pm

This phrase is probably not needed

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 8:27 pm

I'm not sure what this means :)

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 8:26 pm

I might say this as, "This indicates that social media (and Facebook in particular) has the potential to actually promote and enhance well-being if implemented strategically."

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 8:21 pm

This is an interesting finding - may want to specify "... some countries (e.g., BR, US), but had no association in others (e.g., IN, ID). Is there a deck on this you can cite?

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 8:19 pm

It seems like the key here is doing more studies that are more causal, rather than just correlational?

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 8:18 pm

May change to "well-powered, unbranded study"

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 8:18 pm

For brevity, I might remove this and just say, "with too strongly formed opinions out the outset."

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 8:16 pm

This seems to be different than the previous point and is more about how the research is being conducted than the long-term effects. As this paragraph is a bit on the lengthy side, you might consider removing this sentence, or including a briefer version of it in the previous paragraph when you talk about the conflicting research.

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 8:13 pm

Not clear what this means

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 6:16 pm

Would break the responsibility piece into a separate sentence since it's a little confusing as to whether there is evidence for it (rather than a belief among experts) with the way it's currently worded

---

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 6:14 pm

Would change to "slightly negative" instead of "negative and small"

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 6:12 pm

Do you mean this is what is believed by the majority of academics?

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 6:11 pm

Are there any studies that show positive effects on well-being, or are we just arguing about negative vs. neutral?

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 6:11 pm

Is it that academics don't agree with one another (i.e. prominent academic X says it's terrible, prominent academic Y says it's not) or that they acknowledge that different studies show different things and it's a complex, nuanced issue that needs further study?

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 6:09 pm

I might avoid saying it's even more respected since it's subjective :)

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 6:05 pm

Would change to "For example,"

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 6:04 pm

One thing you may want to clarify - is it that people are conducting direct replications and they aren't replicating, or that different studies with slightly different experimental designs seem to find different things, indicating the relationship is much more complex and nuanced than it is made out to be. Or both.

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 6:02 pm

May want to put one or two citations here. You could use numbers and have a little references section at the end. Not a big deal but I'm personally interested in further reading :)

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 6:02 pm

May want to put one or two citations here

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 6:01 pm

You may want to say something like, "On the other hand, there are numerous academic papers that indicate no association between social media use and well-being."

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 5:57 pm

A little academic, would change to 'finding no association'

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 5:54 pm

Great intro overall! You may want to end this paragraph by giving a very brief outline of what you will be addressing in the remainder of the note e.g., In this note, I will provide the most up-to-date findings on the effects of social media on well-being, discuss... "

Scott [redacted] Jan 9, 2020 at 5:51 pm

Looks like unikey rules again!

Scott [redacted] edited Jan 9, 2020 at 10:25 pm

These days, well-being is a hot topic in the tech industry. Most major companies have put out their own time control features,... only surpassed by the media and public discourse, where social media is quickly demonised as bad for "well-being" or worse for "mental health". There are also now are various design ethicists warning of the many dangers of social media to society, and to individuals. Design ethicists like Tristan... that social media generally feels "disempowering". He claims that social media use is a public health crisis akin to the dangers of cigarette smoking.

Claims about the the dangers of social media are further fueled by various academic papers arguing that social media use is associated with negative well-being... we definitely cannot [yet?] claim a "crisis". I do want to note that more consensus exists for excessive use being a major issue - ; most of those who have studied "problematic use" have found evidence for a group sub-group of users to exist [more: here] that who are truly suffering because they cannot control their social media use, and that there is at least some responsibility for tech companies to address the issue [more: here] . In sum, based on the so far gathered evidence, most experts agree that if there is any overall effect of social networking on well-being outside of problematic use, it likely is somewhere between negative and small and non-existent.

I want to warn, that this should not yet be taken as conclusive evidence that social media does not negatively affect well-being. It... is documented online, and how they will perceive and live normal communication as they grow. The verdict is still out in many other ways also as well: there is much less research on effects of social media use on adults than there is on Teens, many studies do not use... positively associated with well-being, even though this effect only held up in some countries but not in others. That is, even if there is are no negative effects of social media on well-being, there still is a wealth of untapped potential to set up social media in a way... their mental health. In many ways, the negative and positive effects of social media still need years of research to be adequately understood.

> This means, we have great potential to make the story of social media and well-being a success story through offense, meaning efforts to increase well-being with our products, and defense, meaning efforts to reduce threats to well-being. As a company that is a one stop one-stop shop for so many needs (e.g., connecting with family, friends, earning an income, learning, etc.) we are uniquely positioned to positively influence well-being for billions of users.
>
> > Yes, because we have an ethical responsibility to try to set up our platform to maximize user well-being.
> >
> > Yes, because it... well-spent, short if the time they spend with us is "low quality", they will eventually leave.
> >
> > Yes, because there is a significantly large population of users who have problematic use, an (an estimated 10- 12 percent of the global user population, with highest numbers in PH, IN, and MX, MX) who experience severe negative life impact because they cannot control their Facebook use.
> >
> > Yes, because low agency & immersive experiences and...
> >
> > , because if we manage to make Facebook positive for well-being, we may very well be rewarded with more engagement and improved sentiment.

We have an ethical responsibility to set up our platform to maximize user well-being. Our mission is to give people the power to build... users we have to, by definition, give them agency and control to do so. This means that not prioritizing user agency and control means to go goes directly against our mission. Most of the things that we want to do for our user community is helping them do the kinds of things more effectively that should enhance well-being:

- stay connected to friends and family, even if as a result of modern life they now live far away
- grow their a small business
- learn about a topic of interest, or a hobby from experts

If we make sure that our users can do these things effectively in an environment that allows them to direct their attention in a self-determined way, in a way that maximizes agency, then we will fulfill this responsibility.

Also, when it comes to our ethical responsibility, we do have to be concerned about how social media use affects kids and adolescents... in part by being a good role model in our own use. While there is no good evidence for social media's mental health effects, the there is evidence that too much screen time - no matter whether traditional television, Netflix, or YouTube videos, or phone games, - are problematic for children's development. The verdict is also still out on whether early heavy tech use of technology may predispose kids for respective to addictive patterns later in life. In this way Thus, we need to design our products in a way that allows easy transitions in an and out of experiences and promotes agency while using our products.

If users come to the conclusion that the time they spend with us is mindless, not valuable, and not well-spent, short if... meaningfully, or an offline activity. Worse if people feel that the time they spend with us makes them feel bad: be it feeling badly about themselves due to social comparison when their childhood friend posts the third tropical vacation that year, be it the negativity in political commenting... your friends getting together for a celebration without you after you have moved to a new city for work. In several studies, we have seen observed a link between poor well-being and , experiencing problematic use, and thoughts about deactivation and deletion. If people feel bad when they are on our app, how can we expect them to stay... privacy concerns or well-being concerns to actual reduced engagement or deactivation], we cannot be certain that such an effect may not occur over time.

Yes, because there are around 12 % of the user population who perceive report severe negative life impact of from Facebook, especially in emerging markets

There is a significantly large population of users who have problematic use, - an estimated 10- 12 percent of the global user population, with highest numbers in PH, IN, and MX, who experience . As a result of their problematic use, these people report severe negative life impact because they cannot control their Facebook use. I have written extensively written about the this topic here, but the TL;DR is that there are a significant proportion of users who are perceiving both an inability to control their social media use and feel that this is severely negatively impacting their relationships, their ability to get the sleep they need, their relationship to relationships with their children, or and their productivity. For these groups people, Facebook causes poor well-being and the kinds of designs ethicists have mentioned of by being addictive, of reducing agency and control, and manipulating users into an endless loop of relatively meaningless engagement is actual reality. We have a great responsibility of addressing these issues in product. And we have to go beyond just with Though time controls like Your 'Your Time on Facebook, even though these Facebook' are a great start, we must go well beyond on this. We need to create pause points in immersive experiences like (e.g., in Stories and autoplay video experiences experiences). We need to help guide users users' attention in a sustainable and agentic way. We And we need to be mindful whenever we actively try to get users through notifications or badging.

Negative well-being effects are The negative impact of social media on well-being is often around due to an inability to disengage from content or . This can arise from the app due to the an intentional design architecture of the design or the incentive structures that hijack human psychology. And these same structures also facilitate polarization. The following is based on this excellent video, that is worth a watch, as well as respective research in and influential social psychology research. Experts on the topic of polarization warn that divisive content, and toxic conversation is are more engaging for people. This part is human psychology. But means that, when our design prioritizes content based on engagement, we take advantage of these negative aspects of human psychology to keep users on the app, in turn facilitating polarization and misinformation. This is exacerbated by the fact that a few loud, polarizing voices have greater effect influence when inserted into large groups, leading everyone's norms to to a normative shift to perceive such towards more extreme opinions as more okay. On the internet, polarization that also happens naturally offline, happens faster and at scale. Add human psychology again where people naturally… , the well-being of large populations will suffer. While integrity issues go far beyond well-being, well-being detriments are an important consequence of them.

Importantly, the solutions to combat integrity suggested by experts, are just as intertwined with well-being. The most important first step experts suggest is to dehumanize groups that disagree with us, facilitated by building empathy and trust. The first step is helping people to see common ground with members of the political, racial, or social outgroup. The way to do this is to facilitate trust,… made them convinced of their strongly held beliefs and what new experiences may help them change. Deep connections, rather than shallow ones, are deemed best at facilitating bridges between polarized groups. In a nutshell, the means and solutions to improve polarization also facilitate good well-being

If we can build experiences that maximize user well-being and openly embrace a commitment to well-being in the public, we may see users engage… we fulfill real needs and provide meaningful experiences. If we aim for this in all of our products, and prioritize meaningful over shallow engagement, user well-being and engagement can will go hand in hand.

Anneke Buffone renamed Why caring about 'digital' well-being is important for Facebook and how we might best implement it in product to Why caring about well-being is important for Facebook and how we might best implement it in product Jan 8, 2020 at 9:26 pm

---

Anneke Buffone Jan 8, 2020 at 9:00 pm

pu considered. pu wrt wb - pos neg approaches

Anneke Buffone edited Jan 8, 2020 at 9:21 pm

Why caring about 'digital' well-being is important for Facebook and how we might best implement it in product

These days, well-being is a hot topic in the tech industry. Most major companies have put out their own time control features, from Google & YouTube's tools, to Tik Tok's well-being settings, and, my personal favorite favourite, Pinterest's well-being activities. And it is not only us researchers who feel intrigued by topics like "mindful use" and helping users achieve... how to avoid threats to it in product. This interest is only surpassed by the media and public discourse, where social media is quickly demonized demonised as bad for "well-being" or worse for "mental health". There also now are various design ethicists warning of the many dangers of social media... that social media generally feels "disempowering". He claims that social media use is a public health crisis akin to the dangers of cigarette smoking.
Perhaps hgbkttkrvliifbgdiebtbtcniviuhkev in part inspired by this thinking there now are actual cigarette box style warning labels, warning that "social media is bad for your mental... ...I think it is safe to say that the sentiment has gone mainstream if it has arrived in the Buffalo Bills' country.
The closer sentiment measures can get to more deep [value, meaningfulness, trust, worth my time] measures from more shallow [positive/negative sentiment,... engagement metrics to carefully calibrate risks and opportunities. Whenever it is not too big of an effort, teams should assess relevant measures proactively.
On the offense side, I feel very excited about the FAV metric, focused on a more meaningful form of sentiment.
On the defense side, I feel excited about our problematic use metric. Both survey and a first draft of a metric are now available for teams to test whether their product may facilitate problematic use.
On the holistic assessment side, I am very excited about new efforts to help users evaluate quality at the session level: the development of a good vs. bad sessions metric. Well-being is not just determined at the post-level or even experience level, but also by how the user is left feeling as a result of an entire session. Thus we need holistic ways to evaluate quality at the session level which incorporate well-being. In order to understand well-being, we have to be able to understand how the variety of experiences a user has in a session jointly contribute to their perception of the quality of their experience, of which well-being is an important piece.

On the offense side, I feel very excited about the FAV metric, focused on a more meaningful form of sentiment.
On the defense side, I feel excited about our problematic use metric. Both survey and a first draft of a metric are now available for teams to test whether their product may facilitate problematic use.
On the holistic assessment side, I am very excited about new efforts to help users evaluate quality at the session level: the development of a good vs. bad sessions metric. Well-being is not just determined at the post-level or even experience level, but also by how the user is left feeling as a result of an entire session. Thus we need holistic ways to evaluate quality at the session level which incorporate well-being. In order to understand well-being, we have to be able to understand how the variety of experiences a user has in a session jointly contribute to their perception of the quality of their experience, of which well-being is an important piece.

Ioana [redacted] opened your conversation with Scott [redacted], Anneke Buffone, Nadine [redacted], Jennifer Guadagno, Carlos [redacted], Judy [redacted], Anne [redacted], Chandra [redacted], Rebecca [redacted] and Sean [redacted] Jan 6, 2020 at 10:12 pm

---

Anneke Buffone added Ioana Badea to the thread Jan 6, 2020 at 6:54 pm

---

Anneke Buffone added you to a document Jan 6, 2020 at 6:48 pm

---

Jennifer Guadagno opened your conversation with Scott [redacted], Anneke Buffone, Nadine [redacted], Ioana [redacted], Carlos [redacted], Judy [redacted], Anne [redacted], Chandra [redacted], Rebecca [redacted] and Sean [redacted] Jan 6, 2020 at 6:21 pm

---

Anneke Buffone renamed Should we care about 'digital' well-being and if so how should we implement it in product? to Why caring about 'digital' well-being is important for Facebook and how we might best implement it in product Jan 6, 2020 at 5:28 pm

---

Anneke Buffone edited Jan 6, 2020 at 7:43 pm

Should we care Why caring about 'digital' well-being is important for Facebook and if so how should we might best implement it in product?

An opinion piece by ["ex-academic"] Anneke Buffone
Perhaps in part inspired by this thinking there now are actual cigarette box style warning labels, warning that "social media is bad for your... the back of teenagers' cellphones...I think it is safe to say that the sentiment has gone mainstream if it has arrived in the Buffalo Bills' country.
IMAGE: Cigarette- style warning label for cellphones "Social media is bad for mental health.
Claims about the the dangers of social media are further fueled by various academic papers arguing that social media use is associated with negative well-being... , even academics don't agree on whether and when tech in general, and social media in particular, are good or bad for well-being, but likely and based on the current evidence it is assumed that the effect is so small that we definitely cannot [yet?] claim a "crisis". I do want to note that more consensus exists for excessive use being a major issue - most of those who have studied "problematic use" have found evidence for a group of users to exist [more: here] that are... suffering because they cannot control their social media use, and that there is at least some responsibility for tech companies to address the issue. Still In sum, based on the so far gathered evidence, most experts agree that if there is any overall effect of social networking on well-being outside of problematic use, it likely is somewhere between negative and small and non-existent. In that sense, perhaps social media is perhaps, if anything, closer to alcoholic beverages. For some, it enhances life's flavour, for most it makes no big difference either way, but for some, it is a substance that causes addiction and ruins lives.
Of course the I want to warn, that this should not yet be taken as conclusive evidence that social media does not negatively affect well-being. It took decades for research on tobacco consumption to get conclusive data on long-term effects of smoking. There are generations who grow up with social media, changing much of the fabric of how caregivers relate to them, how much of their lives is documented online, and how they will perceive and live normal communication as they grow. The verdict is still out in many other ways also: there is much less research on effects of social media use on adults than there is on Teens, many studies do not use... on Facebook to actually be slightly positively associated with well-being, even though this effect only held up in some countries but not in others. That is, even if there is no negative effects of social media on well-being, there still is a wealth of untapped potential to set up social media in a way that promotes and enhances well-being.

Given all of this the currently available [though limited] mixed evidence on the relationship between social media and well-being, there is no reason to panic that we are slowly killing the joie de vivre of our users or ruining their mental health. In many ways, the negative and positive effects of social media still need years of research to be adequately understood.

> This means, we have great potential to make the story of social media and well-being a success story through offense, meaning efforts to increase well-being with our products, and defense, meaning efforts to reduce threats to well-being. As a company that is a one stop shop for so many needs (e.g., connecting with family, friends, earning an income, learning, etc.) we are uniquely positioned to positively influence well-being for billions of users.

So should Should we still care about increase investment in digital well-being?

> Yes, because we have an ethical responsibility to try to set up our platform to maximize user well-being.

Yes, because we have an ethical responsibility

We have an ethical responsibility to set up our platform to maximize user well-being. Our mission is to give people the power to build community and bring the world closer together. If we want to EMPOWER users we have to, by definition, give them agency and control to do so. This means that not prioritizing user agency and control means to go directly against our mission. Most of the things that we want to do for our user community is helping them do the kinds of things more effectively that should enhance well-being:
Our mission is to give people the power to build community and bring the world closer together. If we want to EMPOWER users we have to, by definition, give them agency and control to do so. This means that not prioritizing user agency and control means to go directly against our mission. Most of the things that we want to do for our user community is helping them do the kinds of things more effectively that should enhance well-being:

> Yes, because it is in our best interest: If users come to the conclusion that the time they spend with us is mindless, not valuable, and not well-spent, short if the time they spend with us is "low quality", they will eventually leave.

Yes, because it is in our best interest

If users come to the conclusion that the time they spend with us is mindless, not valuable, and not well-spent, short if the time they spend with us is "low quality", they will eventually leave. Even if social media is not "bad" for people, if the time people spend feels mindless, people will eventually find better things to do with their time, be it another app where they perceive their time to be spent more meaningfully, or an offline activity. Worse if people feel that the time they spend with us makes them feel bad: be it feeling about themselves due to social comparison when their childhood friend posts the third tropical vacation that year, be it the negativity in political commenting that makes users feel isolated and distant from others or worse, like losing faith in humanity, or be it the loneliness experienced when seeing the colorful image of your friends getting together for a celebration without you after you have moved to a new city for work. In several studies, we have seen a link between poor well-being and problematic use and thoughts about deactivation and deletion. If people feel bad when they are on our app, how can we expect them to stay? And fair warning, I do think the public narrative of "social media is bad" matters here. We see it come out frequently as a user complaint in social listening research, and there are countless articles about the topic online, even Instagram accounts that promote digital well-being by encouraging users to take "social media breaks". If privacy has taught us anything so far, it is that media-fueled vague concerns, even if untrue, can powerfully influence negative sentiment. And while there is no conclusive evidence about a behavioral link [there is no data conclusively linking privacy concerns or well-being concerns to actual reduced engagement or deactivation], we cannot be certain that such an effect may not occur over time.

Even if social media is not "bad" for people, if the time people spend feels mindless, people will eventually find better things to do with their time, be it another app where they perceive their time to be spent more meaningfully, or an offline activity. Worse if people feel that the time they spend with us makes them feel bad: be it feeling about themselves due to social comparison when their childhood friend posts the third tropical vacation that year, be it the negativity in political commenting that makes users feel isolated and distant from others or worse, like losing faith in humanity, or be it the loneliness experienced when seeing the colorful image of your friends getting together for a celebration without you after you have moved to a new city for work. In several studies, we have seen a link between poor well-being and problematic use and thoughts about deactivation and deletion. If people feel bad when they are on our app, how can we expect them to stay? And fair warning, I do think the public narrative of "social media is bad" matters here. We see it come out frequently as a user complaint in social listening research, and there are countless articles about the topic online, even Instagram accounts that promote digital well-being by encouraging users to take "social media breaks". If privacy has taught us anything so far, it is that media-fueled vague concerns, even if untrue, can powerfully influence negative sentiment. And while there is no conclusive evidence about a behavioral link [there is no data conclusively linking privacy concerns or well-being concerns to actual reduced engagement or deactivation], we cannot be certain that such an effect may not occur over time.

Yes, because there are around 12 % of the user population who perceive severe negative life impact of Facebook, especially in emerging markets

There is a significantly large population of users who have problematic use, an estimated 10- 12 percent of the global user population, with highest numbers in PH, IN, and MX, who experience severe negative life impact because they cannot control their Facebook use. I have extensively written about the topic here, but the TL;DR is that there are a significant proportion of users who are perceiving both an inability to control their social media use and feel that this is severely negatively impacting their relationships, their ability to get the sleep they need, their relationship to their children, or their productivity. For these groups, Facebook causes poor well-being and the kinds of designs ethicists have mentioned of being addictive, of reducing agency, and manipulating users into an endless loop of relatively meaningless engagement is actual reality. We have a great responsibility of addressing these issues in product. And we have to go beyond just with time controls like Your Time on Facebook, even though these are a great start. We need to create pause points in immersive experiences like Stories and autoplay video experiences. We need to help guide users attention in a sustainable and agentic way. We need to be mindful whenever we actively try to get users through notifications or badging.

I have extensively written about the topic here, but the TL;DR is that there are a significant proportion of users who are perceiving both an inability to control their social media use and feel that this is severely negatively impacting their relationships, their ability to get the sleep they need, their relationship to their children, or their productivity. For these groups, Facebook causes poor well-being and the kinds of designs ethicists have mentioned of being addictive, of reducing agency, and manipulating users into an endless loop of relatively meaningless engagement is actual reality. We have a great responsibility of addressing these issues in product. And we have to go beyond just with time controls like Your Time on Facebook, even though these are a great start. We need to create pause points in immersive experiences like Stories and autoplay video experiences. We need to help guide users attention in a sustainable and agentic way. We need to be mindful whenever we actively try to get users through notifications or badging.

Yes, because low agency & immersive experiences and polarization likely go hand in hand, and polarization is a significant threat.

> Yes, because if we manage to make Facebook positive for well-being, we may very well be rewarded with more engagement and improved sentiment.

Yes, because if we manage to make Facebook positive for well-being, we might be rewarded with more engagement and improved sentiment

How might we take a

more offensive and

holistic approach to well-being that relies more on ‘offense’ rather than ‘defense’?

We are a company that cares deeply about well-being, from top leadership up to many, if not most, employees. All we need to do is commit, bottom up up, not just top down

.

Anneke Buffone Jan 6, 2020 at 5:19 pm

OH BOY!! Yes!

Anne [redacted] Jan 6, 2020 at 5:03 pm

I know that you are referring to taking the approach of offense versus defense, but my first reading read the other meaning of this word, may be good to re-word.

Anne [redacted] edited Jan 6, 2020 at 5:03 pm

Anne [redacted] opened your conversation with Scott [redacted], Anneke Buffone, Nadine [redacted], Jennifer Guadagno, Ioana [redacted], Carlos [redacted], Judy [redacted], Chandra [redacted], Rebecca [redacted] and Sean [redacted] Jan 6, 2020 at 12:41 pm

---

Chandra [redacted] opened your conversation with Scott [redacted], Anneke Buffone, Nadine [redacted], Jennifer Guadagno, Ioana [redacted], Carlos [redacted], Judy [redacted], Anne [redacted], Rebecca [redacted] and Sean [redacted] Jan 5, 2020 at 4:19 am

---

Anneke Buffone added Anne [redacted] to the thread Jan 3, 2020 at 7:28 pm

---

Anneke Buffone added you to a document Jan 3, 2020 at 7:17 pm

---

Carlos [redacted] opened your conversation with Scott [redacted], Anneke Buffone, Nadine [redacted], Jennifer Guadagno, Ioana [redacted], Judy [redacted], Anne [redacted], Chandra [redacted], Rebecca [redacted] and Sean [redacted] Jan 3, 2020 at 7:16 pm

---

Scott [redacted] opened your conversation with Anneke Buffone, Nadine [redacted], Jennifer Guadagno, Ioana [redacted], Carlos [redacted], Judy [redacted], Anne [redacted], Chandra [redacted], Rebecca [redacted] and Sean [redacted] Jan 3, 2020 at 5:12 pm

---

Anneke Buffone added you to a document Jan 3, 2020 at 4:41 pm

---

Anneke Buffone Jan 3, 2020 at 4:40 pm

And Scott - if you are interested!

Anneke Buffone added Chandra [redacted] and Scott [redacted] to the thread Jan 3, 2020 at 4:46 pm

---

Anneke Buffone added you to a document Jan 3, 2020 at 4:40 pm

---

Anneke Buffone Jan 3, 2020 at 4:40 pm

same for Sean and Carlos

Anneke Buffone Jan 3, 2020 at 4:35 pm

Judy Rebecca - only if you agree, of course

Anneke Buffone edited Jan 3, 2020 at 4:40 pm
An opinion piece by Anneke Buffone with
with Rebecca [redacted] [Navigation], Judy [redacted] [Foundational Well-Being], Sean [redacted] [DS], Carlos [redacted] [CDS], and Scott [redacted] [News Feed]

Judy [redacted] opened your conversation with Scott [redacted], Anneke Buffone, Nadine [redacted], Jennifer Guadagno, Ioana [redacted], Carlos [redacted], Anne [redacted], Chandra [redacted], Rebecca [redacted] and Sean [redacted] Jan 3, 2020 at 4:24 pm

---

Rebecca [redacted] Jan 3, 2020 at 4:21 pm

would bring this section up to the tldr when you're wrapping up the piece later..

Anneke Buffone Jan 3, 2020 at 4:15 pm

Agreed completely !

Anneke Buffone added Judy Jinn to the thread Jan 3, 2020 at 4:11 pm

---

Anneke Buffone added you to a document Jan 3, 2020 at 4:06 pm

Rebecca [redacted] Jan 3, 2020 at 4:04 pm

love this section

Rebecca [redacted] Jan 3, 2020 at 4:02 pm

perhaps you tackle this next as well, but editing as i go -- for the affecting some and ruining lives section, i see what you mean but I disagree w drawing a comparison where the unit of analysis is the individual vs society and a single topic. As in, yes, alcoholism can ruin lives and those close to the person but the issue w social media is, you could argue, an entire version of reality to interact w (a source of information, perception, truth?, relationships...) whereas something like alcoholism is more confined, so I think it may be a slippery slope to make this association

---

Rebecca [redacted] edited Jan 3, 2020 at 4:21 pm

Rebecca [redacted] Jan 3, 2020 at 3:56 pm

you may speak to this later in the piece, but I think an issue here is interpreting the well-being issue as a dichotomy -- good or bad... if you dont tackle this later in the article, I'd reframe...

Anneke Buffone Jan 3, 2020 at 3:38 pm

So it is usually just mixed evidence - it's not the case that there are tons of papers that show evidence and one that doesn't, but that the systematic longitudinal or meta-analytic papers do not support the evidence that social media has a strong negative effect.

Anneke Buffone Jan 3, 2020 at 3:36 pm

yes!!

Rebecca [redacted] Jan 3, 2020 at 3:34 pm

playing devil's advocate, here i wonder how many studies tried replicating. Is 1 failed attempt at replicating strong enough to call these claims into questions.. again, maybe yes, but something to consider..

Rebecca [redacted] Jan 3, 2020 at 3:33 pm

claiming here is repetitive since you have claim at the beginning too

---

Rebecca [redacted] Jan 3, 2020 at 3:31 pm

would delete people and leave individuals to shorten.

Anneke Buffone edited Jan 3, 2020 at 3:39 pm

Rebecca [redacted] edited Jan 3, 2020 at 3:35 pm

Rebecca [redacted] opened your conversation with Scott [redacted], Anneke Buffone, Nadine [redacted], Jennifer Guadagno, Ioana [redacted], Carlos [redacted], Judy [redacted], Anne [redacted], Chandra [redacted] and Sean [redacted] Jan 3, 2020 at 3:29 pm

---

Anneke Buffone added Nadine [redacted] to the thread Jan 3, 2020 at 3:22 pm

---

Anneke Buffone added you to a document Jan 3, 2020 at 3:16 pm

---

Anneke Buffone edited Jan 3, 2020 at 3:30 pm

Anneke Buffone renamed How to incorporate user well-being into the fabric of Facebook to Should we care about 'digital' well-being and if so how should we implement it in product? Jan 3, 2020 at 1:33 am

---

Anneke Buffone edited Jan 3, 2020 at 2:22 am

Anneke Buffone edited Dec 30, 2019 at 5:50 pm

Anneke Buffone added Jennifer Guadagno to the thread Dec 29, 2019 at 10:32 am

---

Anneke Buffone added you to a document Dec 29, 2019 at 10:26 am

---

Anneke Buffone edited Dec 29, 2019 at 10:40 am

Anneke Buffone renamed How to make user well-being part of the equation at a large company to How to incorporate user well-being into the fabric of Facebook Dec 29, 2019 at 10:30 am

---

Anneke Buffone edited Dec 26, 2019 at 5:11 am

Sean [redacted] opened your conversation with Scott [redacted], Anneke Buffone, Nadine [redacted], Jennifer Guadagno, Ioana [redacted], Carlos [redacted], Judy [redacted], Anne [redacted], Chandra [redacted] and Rebecca [redacted] Dec 24, 2019 at 5:37 pm

---

Anneke Buffone edited Dec 24, 2019 at 6:16 am

Anneke Buffone edited Dec 18, 2019 at 9:28 pm

Anneke Buffone edited Dec 17, 2019 at 11:29 pm

Anneke Buffone added Sear[redacted] to the thread Dec 16, 2019 at 6:36 pm

Anneke Buffone added you to a document Dec 16, 2019 at 6:31 pm

Anneke Buffone edited Dec 16, 2019 at 6:34 pm

Anneke Buffone edited Dec 13, 2019 at 4:13 am

Anneke Buffone added you to a document Dec 12, 2019 at 8:12 pm

Anneke Buffone added Carlos[redacted] and Rebecca[redacted] to the thread Dec 12, 2019 at 8:15 pm

Anneke Buffone added you to a document Dec 12, 2019 at 8:08 pm

Anneke Buffone edited Dec 12, 2019 at 8:15 pm

Anneke Buffone created the document Dec 12, 2019 at 8:08 pm