PewResearchCenter

presents

MILLENNIALS
A PORTRAIT OF GENERATION NEXT

February 24, 2010

Moderated by:
Judy Woodruff, Senior Correspondent, *PBS NewsHour*

11:00 - 12:30
Panel 2: Millennials, Media and Information
Experts on media and technology examine how Millennials
are seeking, sharing and creating information.

Opening Presentation:
Tom Rosenstiel, Director,
Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism

Panelists:
danah boyd, Social Media Researcher, Microsoft Research New England, and
Fellow, Harvard University's Berkman Center for Internet and Society

Dylan Casey, Product Manager, Google

Amanda Lenhart, Senior Research Specialist,
Pew Internet & American Life Project

JUDY WOODRUFF: I want to welcome you back to the second of three panel discussions we're doing today centered on new surveys and analysis by the Pew Research Center on the Millennials, the generation of teens and twenty-somethings who, as we know, are turning out to be distinctly different from the younger generations that preceded them.

One of the things that most distinguishes them, some say, defines them, is technology. Their use of cell phones, laptop computers, and not only the internet, but social networking sites to communicate with each other and to learn about what's happening in the rest of the world.

When I first linked up with the Pew Research Center about five years ago on that reporting project for PBS and NPR to tell the story of this younger generation, I found young people eager to talk about how they interact with new media and how they get information. Here's just a minute's worth of what we heard. Please look at the screen.

(Begin video segment.)

Millennials Interviewee 1: I get New York Times delivered daily on email, so I check – I usually do the internet news.

Millennials Interviewee 2: Now, what do I do here? Videogames or law school? Videogames – (laughter) – law school.

(Music.)

Millennials Interviewee 2: Videogames are kind of – it's a new medium. It's going to be to the 21st century what film was to the 20th century.

Millennials Interviewee 3: I feel like our generation kind of has ADD in terms of you can't just sit down and you know, let's relax. OK, you know? I'd say quick, fast, in a hurry is pretty much our motto. We want it and we want it now.

(End video segment.)

MS. WOODRUFF: Just a small sampling of what we heard. And to elaborate on Millennials media and information, we have another superb panel joining us. And I'm going to call them up one by one.

The panel consists of, first, **danah boyd**, please come up. She is a social media researcher with Microsoft Research. She's also a fellow at Harvard University's Berkman Center for Internet and Society. She has specialized in studying social media, Twitter, blogging and social network sites like Facebook. She studied at MIT. She recently earned her Ph.D. at the University of California at Berkeley.

Dylan Casey, please come up. Where are you? Hi. Dylan is search product manager for Google. After a successful career as a professional cyclist, including competing on the U.S. Olympic Team, Dylan joined Google in 2002, working on building products for Google's search, and he recently launched its real-time search. Ninety-nine percent of the world is grateful to you, Dylan. (Laughter.) I don't know about the other one percent.

Amanda Lenhart, please come up. She's senior research specialist for the Pew Internet & American Life Project, which lives under the wings of the Pew Research Center. She directs the project's research on teens, children and families. Her other research specialties include education, gaming and network communication tools like mobile phones, social networks and blogging.

And finally, the person who will present Pew's findings on this topic, **Tom Rosenstiel**. Tom, founding director of the Pew Research Center's Project for Excellence in Journalism. The project specializes in studying the performance of the press, appropriately so, since for 20 years, Tom was a reporter for the

Los Angeles Times and for Newsweek. He co-wrote a book on the elements of journalism that has become a bible for journalism schools and for journalists across this country.

Now, after Tom's presentation, the panel is going to trade comments among ourselves for about 45 minutes, and then we're going to take questions from you in the audience. Tom Rosenstiel, the floor is yours. And if you'd rather come up here, if you feel this is easier for you, come on up, or you can do it from your chair.

TOM ROSENSTIEL: I don't think I can come up.

MS. WOODRUFF: All right, you're chained to your chair, so do it there.

MR. ROSENSTIEL: I'm tethered. I am where I am. (Laughter.) I am who I am. And I'm glad that I'm the oldest person on this panel so that we have more points of view here. What I'm going to do for just a few minutes is talk a little bit about media use and news consumption of Millennials that we can infer from the survey data and from other data that we look at.

We look at a lot of stuff – a lot of data at the Pew RC. First of all, Millennials, I think, as I pour through this stuff, are the leading edge of the sphere. They're doing things with technology, and older generations, I think, are following. And we see this over time that they'll do things, and we think that's nuts. That makes no sense; that's crazy. I'd never do that. And then two or 3 years later, we do that. (Laughter.) How many of the Boomers are now on Facebook in this room?

As I look through the data, I think that Millennials are what I would call on-demand grazers for news. They look for what they want, when they want it, and they graze across lots of different sources, although I think a limited number of sources, but they don't rely on a main source for news, I think.

They share, they network. They're mobile; they're connected when they're away from home. And as I look through the data, I think they're already changing their behavior, and I think danah can talk about what she's seen in that regard. I'm old enough now that I can't actually see that very clearly. (Laughter.)

MS. WOODRUFF: Neither can I.

MR. ROSENSTIEL: As you can see from this slide, a lot of people think that technology makes life easier. Millennials are a little more likely to feel that way, but this doesn't really define them, I don't think. But one thing where they do jump out more is in the idea that it's a good thing to share all these pictures, to post things about themselves, to say I'm doing my laundry now while they're on Facebook or whatever. I'm betraying some of my own biases here. I shouldn't do that.

Look at the difference in terms of Millennials being cell-only. Now, will that change once they buy houses and want to have, potentially, other phones? Who knows? But right now, no. They're twice as likely to be as Gen-Xers and a lot more likely than others. They are connected wirelessly when they're away from home through laptops, through cell phones, to the internet. And I was trying to take the Millennials quiz on my phone earlier, but – (laughter) – I don't really know how to work the thing. (Laughter.)

MS. WOODRUFF: I don't know that you should have admitted that, but go ahead.

MR. ROSENSTIEL: It's okay, it's all right. I'm not going to talk about my kids like Paul did. (Laughter.) This, to me, is interesting because look at the change in behavior. Millennials are less likely – a lot less likely to blog than they were in 2007. So I think this is a caution to us that what we see people doing now with technology may not be, necessarily, what they're going to be doing later.

I think the technology – well, I'll talk about this in a second – it doesn't define them as much as reflect them. Millennials are more likely to be on social networks, to use cell and text, but I suspect that the rest of us are moving up – are following them in that regard. They're also more likely to post video, to tweet,

but these numbers are not huge. OK? Not everybody is doing this all the time, even in the youngest generation.

I wonder what it will be like if we had my 13-year-old daughter on there, but never mind. I wasn't going to talk about my kids. Now, we get into where people get their news. Interesting, television – this is both cable and broadcast and local that's in this number. So they're watching television, actually, a little more than Gen-Xers, but certainly less than older generations.

The internet, clearly more. Newspapers, somewhat less, and I think there may be some noise in that lowest number. Radio, interestingly, is something that everybody uses and the numbers aren't changing a lot over time on radio. So where are people going for news when they are online?

Well, the young – this generation is – those who are online at all, 81 percent are online daily for news. So young people who are connected and who get – who are online get news online a lot. And I think that one of the things that's so fascinating to me as I watched this research over the years is the idea that young people were not interested in the outside world, I think, was wrong.

The idea that young people were not interested in the old delivery systems, in appointment viewing, in having to consume your news at breakfast only. That's what was going on. Now that they have a delivery system that meets their behavior, their needs, their personality, they're avid consumers.

And the data – I don't have a slide on this, but during the election, this generation was as informed about politics as any other generation, less so now that politics is working so beautifully here in Washington that they don't have to pay attention. (Laughter.) Where are they going online for news?

This slide, to me is really interesting. They're going to aggregators – Yahoo, CNN, which is a site that's got a lot of material that's not CNN's, Google, MSN, but you look on the right side of that slide at key brands like the New York Times or Fox or any of them, those are not places that people describe as their main news source.

They see the Internet as a news source and what are the options that are available there. In other words, they really are grazers. And we've got research that I'm not – that will be released later that's not part of this report that indicates how widely they graze or not graze. I think they graze, but I don't think they graze everywhere. I don't think any of us do.

So in sum, I would say that as I look at the data, but I'm really intrigued to hear what our panels have to say. Technology reflects the personality of this generation, I think, rather than defines them. But predictions about them are very difficult to make. One reason is because I think Millennials are already changing because as they, you know, because the technology's changing, because their personalities are changing.

The other thing, and this is significant – the landscape is so different that actually asking Millennials or any other generation what their media use is like versus what previous generations did is impossible to do because tweeting and a lot of these technologies didn't exist. We don't know what Gen-Xers did when they were 18 in terms of tweeting. We didn't have tweeting then.

So some of the data that we can look at in other areas about religious attitudes, about morality, about a host of other things that we can do longitudinally, we can't do when it comes to media use. So I think that we're going to have to turn to other researchers for that kind of thing, which tees up, I think, the rest of our group.

MS. WOODRUFF: Thank you, Tom Rosenstiel. And Amanda Lenhart, I'm going to come to you next because you do study this all the time, the use of technology. What else – what would you add to the picture of this generation, how it uses technology. And if you want to, you know, what we heard earlier is that – I think from Neil Howe – is that you know, they are taking technology and shaping it the way that

they want it to work for them. It's not just that they're being used by technology. They're using it to be what they want it to be. So expand on that.

AMANDA LENHART: Sure. I think that's a great question and certainly, I think, you know, what we've heard today really suggests that you know, teens and Millennials – and again, my focus is generally on teens but Millennials as well –

MS. WOODRUFF: And you can make the distinction there.

MS. LENHART: I will make the distinction. I'll talk a little bit about some of the differences there because if we really were doing a full cohort analysis, we'd be going to kids nine to – we'd be going nine to 29.

So there are some things about teenagers who eventually will sort of roll into this cohort that we can talk about how they're different, how they're not different, though of course, there are always time-of-life issues, particularly with adolescence. And they're more surveilled, their more controlled lives. Their parents are more in charge of their finances and their choices.

But getting back to your question about the technology and how the technology is acting upon young people. I think actually, I'd like to step back from that idea and look more at a kind of a holistic feedback loop, that it's not just that we're acting on the technology because we are and, certainly, users and teens and young adults use the technology in the ways that they want, which is often the ways the designers themselves didn't anticipate.

But you're still using the technology as it's presented in front of you. You're still using – you can only really do what the technology allows you to do. So there's a certain element of the fact that how people are designing the technology, and let's remember, it's also Gen-Xers and Boomers who are designing this technology as well as Millennials.

So it's all of us coming together, using this technology. And so I think you really still are constrained in the way that you're using technology. And one good example of this is the change that we've seen in the blogging numbers. So, you know, blogging has declined for both teens and young adults since 2006, 2007, quite dramatically.

And one of the things we think is a cause of this is the changes in the use of social networks. So back in 2006, MySpace was really ascendant. And on MySpace, blogging was front and center. It was at the top of your profile. It was very easy to do and you saw other people's blogs. They were updated frequently. It was a big part of the MySpace culture.

Fast forward to today, people are moving to Facebook, not necessarily away from MySpace, as some of the data suggest, but moving over to Facebook and its affordances, but Facebook doesn't have blogging. Facebook allows you to do something called notes, but it's not something that the structure of Facebook presents to you. What Facebook presents to you is actually a much shorter status updates. In fact, kind of a micro-blogging, and that's where we see some of teens' and young adult's energies going.

So I think it's a mix. I mean, it's certainly – designers are cognizant of what young people want and design things to fit those needs and niches. But at the same time, your use of that technology is constrained by what the technology can do.

MS. WOODRUFF: OK, and I want to – I see you, danah boyd, nodding, and I'm anxious to have you pick up on any part of what she said. But I'm particularly interested in how young people are using social networks, not just to communicate, but it's their community. It's how they, you know, organize friendships and so forth.

DANAH BOYD: I think first off, what Amanda is saying is dead on. And I think that what we've seen is the rise of social network sites have come out at a time where, starting really with teenagers, they're in a

social situation where they don't have the same kinds of freedom and flexibility that we took for granted in older generations.

And it comes back to what the earlier panel was talking about, issues of a lot of fear. Fear has been unbelievably pervasive in what we've seen with teenagers, and it's continued on into young adults such that a lot of teenagers that I went and interviewed, they weren't allowed to leave their home, right?

This whole thing that we grew up with, you know, be on your bike, get home by dark kind of attitude has pretty much disappeared. And so when – one, is a fear, is a huge component of it. Another big component of it is over-structured time. A lot of – especially more privileged kids in the United States spend morning to night in activity to activity to activity to activity because their parents think that this is good for them.

A lack of geographic mobility, particularly in non-urban environments, where they're reliant on parents for cars. You know, where the geography is such that, you know, being out on your bike is not necessarily a way to find where your friends are because of a lot of school choice and reorganizing of the physical space.

And what this all sort of comes down to is an environment where they're trying to find interstitial spaces where they can simply hang out. And so social media came in at a time where young people were looking for places to hang out, and voila, here it is, here's a place that becomes an online hangout space.

And so a lot of the behaviors that you saw, especially with teenagers but, you know, and it continued, and I'll talk about young adults in a second, teenagers look like what the teenagers were doing whenever we were hanging out before. Conversations boil down to, you know, joking around, gossiping, flirting, you know, so sharing information about that was going on around you.

And, you know, we look at this, especially as adults, we're like, this is terrible. How could these people spend so much time doing this completely useless task? And yet, at the same time, this is one of the most important learning skills we need out there, which is learning how to actually move around the social world.

And so the fact that we've actually taken away in sort of more structured environments and that young people are really sort of pushing to have it is really interesting in that landscape. And they are. They're learning how to, you know, make sense of hierarchies and social status. They're learning how to say information and have it misinterpreted and have to backtrack and figure out how to say it again.

And they're working all of that sort of, they're doing all that social works, which becomes really powerful. As they switch into sort of young adult spaces, and they finally have a little bit more freedom, both because they're finally of age to drive, they're in different geographic environment, whether they're in the military, off at college, or, you know, in a work landscape.

We see a sort of switch to more mobile uses, and a lot of the social media really combines with that. So the technology gets used as a way to say, hey, let's meet up. Let's gather in these places. The key thing to understand about the social network sites is that they're first and foremost about connecting with people that you already know.

And I think there's always this misunderstanding that they're about networking and meeting strangers, which was what – when I was a teenager, that's what I was doing online. But that's no longer the case for most teenagers and most young adults. They're there connecting with the people that they already know or the people they desperately wish to know – i.e., celebrities. (Laughter.)

And what's really interesting in all of this is that, you know, when adults – adults who spend all this time now for the past five years telling young people this is a dangerous, dangerous place. Don't talk to strangers. Don't talk to strangers. But now, I love that all of these organizations out there are now trying to go and reach young people through the social media.

6

You're a stranger, too, right? (Laughter.) Like you are just as scary. We've done a really good job of convincing them that all strangers are scary. So we have this sort of interesting inflection on all of the social space. So they're thinking about their different ways of becoming part of public, but it's not public to all people across all space and all time. It's public across their peer groups.

MS. WOODRUFF: I want to – and I do want to move on, but I have to ask you because it's been raised to me by a number of people. Because so much of their learning about social interaction is in front of a laptop computer rather than face-to-face, what are we learning about how they are dealing with people when they have to deal with human beings?

MS. BOYD: I mean, you know, let's be clear. Teenagers spend, you know, a huge chunk of their day sitting and staring at someone lecturing at them, right? So first off, we've got a structured environment where they're trying – they're still trying to pass notes and gossip and joke around in interstitial spaces that are in person.

Once we get out into the young adults, they're definitely interacting with people, and what you hear over and over again from teenagers is – when I ask them like why do you spend all this time online? They're like because I can't get together in person. Which would you prefer? Definitely getting together in person.

But at the same time – so they're doing all this online, but it's not because they want to be online. It's by and large, they want to be in person. They're just having to deal with social situations where that's not possible. Now, that said, in terms of what they are learning, you know, many of you have your BlackBerrys in your pocket.

I'm guessing that you've had some really interesting moments with colleagues where you've said something that didn't get interpreted the way you intended and had to deal with the ramifications of it. You had to learn – most likely at an older age – how to navigate textual conversations.

So the fact that they're engaging in this means that they're actually engaging in a whole multimodal way of interacting socially that allow them to interact socially in ways that we expect in the professional world. We don't expect a professional world that is purely face-to-face. We have to deal with the phone, we have to deal with text.

Now, they do have some variations about what they think is rude. And I actually think this is – this is a delightful generational difference. For some reason, you know, I talk to older workers in white-collar environments, and they'll talk about, IM – it's so interruptive. It's so rude to the workforce. But somehow getting a phone call isn't?

Right? It's OK to like ring up anybody? And what's amazing is you'll see a lot of teenagers who will text one another and be like can I call you? It's not saying that texting is always preferred, but it becomes an inverted social norm which is – but this is a lighter-touch way of checking in before I've actually locally interrupted you.

So I think we've also got these different expectations based on what we assume are standards, but we're seeing other ways, trying to think out the same set of logic about what is appropriate, what is a way of navigating these sort of social and professional spaces.

MS. LENHART: And just to support danah's point, we have some data that suggests when given a choice of how to communicate, teens will actually, as she said, will pick the face-to-face. That's the default, that's what they want, and they're still communicating face-to-face even outside of the school environment on a daily basis.

But because of various locational and geographic constraints, they go to the cell phone, they go to text messaging and social networks as a default as a way to expand upon that. So the numbers basically support danah's point, as well.

MS. WOODRUFF: Dylan Casey, what would you add to all this, and then bring us gently into your world, your focus at Google, on search and how that's characterizing this generation – how they use search. I want to make this transition, but I want to hang onto some of the points that we've been making, as well.

DYLAN CASEY: Yeah, sure. So in my professional life, we don't collect age-specific data about our users, but we do collect a significant amount of data around what people are doing, especially on Google products. And we anonymize it, but we look at it at the aggregate level to try to make some sort of inference in how are our products being used, how are they performing, which ones are used more often, and how are they being used. And we use them from a perspective of trying to understand what we're doing well and what we're not doing well or how we might change our strategy in terms of developing new products.

But specifically in the search realm, for the longest time, we looked at search trends as a way to make inferences about topicality or what was important or trying to determine geographically-based trends.

And recently, with this kind of proliferation of what I refer to as a colloquial term, real-time search, is where trends are telling us what people are looking for and kind of surfacing topics from a perspective or from a dynamic of, hey, I want to find out about this, or I'm interested in this, or this kind of looking-for-information dynamic. Real-time content, if you look at it at the aggregate level, also allows us to identify what are topics – what's being said on the internet right now. And so it's a slightly different dynamic.

And when we spend a lot of time thinking about how we wanted to build the product and what were the use cases and who were the users that we were trying to build for, we realized that the reason that we couldn't avoid – because we really tried to avoid this term "real-time search" because – and danah probably knows from her time at Google – speed has always been important, and real-time has this notion of right-this-second.

MS. WOODRUFF: I thought it was already real-time.

MR. CASEY: Well, yeah, I mean, all of search and the information that we can gather on the internet and then index and make available through different mechanisms, speed has always been important. But we think – and kind of our own analysis and research internally – is that real-time has come about, and it's important because often times the content that is being published via these different mechanisms, whether it's Facebook or Twitter or a whole host of different publishing platforms, is generally only useful or relevant for a small window of time. Like, if I say, oh, the traffic on I-95 is really horrible right now, like, nobody cares that I said that a week ago, but you might care if I said that five minutes ago or a second ago or an hour ago. And so we really focused on how can we make that – so we focused on the pipeline to get that content and put it in our index and then make use of it; like, make it searchable, make it relevant somehow.

And so that whole process from like thinking about it to actually product launch involves a lot of thought around how people are using technology, what kind of information and feedback do we get. And it's interesting because we're a metric-driven company. It's all about numbers.

And oftentimes, we probably don't look externally enough for feedback or input, especially at the level – we're very uncomfortable with doing anything that's based on analysis that is specific to somebody's personal information, right. Privacy is so important to us and has been from the very beginning.

And it's interesting because we have two twists on privacy. Internally, we're completely open with our information. There's no such thing as, like, secret projects. And because that's the – the corporate culture is this idea that access to all the information about what we're doing and what we're thinking in

research and thoughts and meeting notes and stuff like that is essential for us to operate in a way that our founders and executives want us to behave.

However, at the same time, we realize that we're in this position of collecting so much information about our users and internet traffic and the internet itself and understand that if we don't go to great lengths to protect that privacy, then we'll basically just implode internally.

And so we have a very interesting relationship with privacy and personal details. And so it creates a certain amount of tension internally to try to understand how do we adjust to what we're being told.

You know, like, I have a 4-year-old son who will probably never, ever understand the concept of a compact disc, right. To him, he's just looking for play buttons. Whether they're on devices or on the internet, he just wants to play music by hitting this button. And so he's being shaped by technology, and then in turn, he's shaping the way that we develop products.

For example, we recognized that a huge number of searches on Google were music-related or entertainment-related. And so we said, OK, we need to figure out how to address that. And so we developed products and now you can go to Google and you can search and just hit a play button.

And so there's an interesting dichotomy and interaction ecosystem between how young people that are new to technology and new to accessing information are affected by it, and then in turn, how their interaction with that technology affects the actual production and development of it.

MS. WOODRUFF: Danah?

MS. BOYD: Can I take up the point about privacy because it actually makes me think of something really critical. There is a large myth out there that young people don't care about privacy, and I think that that really needs to be dispelled in all of this.

Young people care deeply about privacy but how they actually think through privacy looks very different than older folks. And I think actually that's more life-stage issues than anything else. But we sort of can tease some of this out.

First off, there's also a distinction between what we talk about in industrial conversations about PII – personally identifiable information – and what I talk about jokingly as PEI – personally embarrassing information. (Laughter.) And I actually think that the latter is what young people are much more concerned about than the former. And they're really thinking through, you know, what are the social elements there.

The other thing we have to sort of take into account in all of this is what kind of environment they're living in and the kinds of ways in which they interact socially. So you and I might be having this conversation as friends in the schoolyard, talking back and forth. And you know, I tell you things; you might forget some of it. Some of it, you thought was really interesting and you decided to share with the room. And this is a perfectly reasonable way in which we have regular conversations.

Part of it is that this conversation – except for the fact that we're miked and camera-ed and all sorts of other things – would be private by default, public through effort. What happens in a social media landscape is an inversion of that. It becomes public by default, private through effort.

And so we do hear teenagers talk a lot about this and young adults talking about this – like, yeah, I write that I'm bored but, you know, who's going to really pay attention unless they want to talk back to me? So I'll write that I'm bored publicly not because I'm announcing it to all people across all space and all time but because I would love to find somebody else who is bored amongst my friend group who wants to chat with me. But if I'm going to tell Amanda something that's going to really embarrass her, I'm going to take it to a private environment, and we'll really work through that.

What this is means is with technology, there's an expectation of trust about – just like there is with this conversation. If we had a private conversation, and I told you not to tell anybody and then you spread it to the entire room, I'd be really angry with you. And it's a violation of trust. It's not the fact that she couldn't do it; it's the fact that I expect her not to.

The same thing ends up operating with technology, which is that once young people have worked out what they think as the social norms of that particular space, when the technology changes the rules, young people get upset. It's not because things weren't public, but making things more public or changing the scale of publicity really does impact them because they're trying to navigate the space accordingly.

The other sort of factor in all of this to really take into account is a calculation of what can be gained versus what can be lost. Young people by and large when we're taking generalizations are calculating all of the things they might gain from being public. Being cool amongst their friends? That's a big gain. Maybe getting the attention of a celebrity? That's a big gain. The possibility of becoming a celebrity themselves? That's a big gain. Most of you in the room, especially those with a political bent, are always thinking about everything you have to lose. And that's the calculation you make with these spaces.

What's really interesting is that this is inflected by socioeconomic positions more than anything else as we sort of see the transition. So young kids who are on the path to Harvard or Yale or want to be or their parents have wanted them to be since they were five, they're going to make these calculations about all that they could possibly lose much earlier than kids who are not really thinking about college but are thinking about what it means to sort of get attention and get a job that was about publicity.

So when we think about all of these issues around privacy, we can't just talk about personally identifiable information because you know what, they're not making calculations about governments and corporations. They're making calculations about very much intimate and direct power over them – parents, teachers, college admissions officers, potential local bosses. And we have to sort of think about it in that space in why it is they have certain reactions.

So when a technology changes the system, they get upset because of the change of norms.

MS. WOODRUFF: Okay, we've got a lot of nodding heads and anxious people. I'm going to let Tom say something and then Amanda, and I've got a question.

MR. ROSENSTIEL: Well, I think one of the things that's important, if we want to bring this back to the question of what people are going to learn about public life and what we call the news, the old media platform essentially was a form of force-feeding. The news was bundled by editors or producers at a newscast or newspaper or a radio station, and you had some limited choices if you were reading the newspaper, which sections you were going to look at and which stories you'd read. And in television, you had fewer. You had to kind of sit through the whole wheel. I could tune out, and the research shows I would completely tune out, forget that story that you just did. And I'd remember the next one because it interested me.

So what's going to happen now that we can't force-feed in the media and that the news has essentially been unbundled? I as a consumer can find the story I want. And the data suggest that that's what people are doing. They don't consume news all at once. They consume it serially through the day. And there are these spikes. When people hear something, they get interested and they go look for that story.

So what is that going to mean about how society is going to fall apart now that I can't force-feed you what I think is important to you? I think what we're seeing in the data suggests that when people decide that something is worth knowing about, they now have the power to go learn about it.

The campaign was very revealing. People of many different ages, even much younger than Millennials, became excited and became plugged in, became interested, used different channels of technology than had been used for politics before.

So in much the same way that a questioner mentioned, I want to get a – what was it – a bus stop near my community college, that is I think how we might anticipate media consumption that's going to happen in the future. When I have a problem that I want to learn about, I have the capacity to learn about it, and I have the tools – I know how to use this technology to learn about it.

So one of the key things for those of us in the information business I think is going to be how do we make stuff seem relevant? How do we make it clear that this is – this is a bus stop for you.

MS. WOODRUFF: Do we just give up though on the idea that we who know the news business, know about journalism, should decide what's important and –

MR. ROSENSTIEL: No, and these guys probably have data on this too, but the data that I've seen suggest that people are still saying, what's new? That's, I think, an almost-human instinct. And there are phrases for this in different languages. My high school newspaper that I edited was called Habari Gani, which means "what's happening" in Swahili. And that's a term that people have – in almost every culture, there's some variant of that phrase.

And the research suggests that people do go to top headlines. The research also suggests, interestingly, that simply – and this is why there's a war coming with Google – the research also shows that just going to Google and reading the headline, what the news source is – that's the New York Times or whatever – and the first sentence is for many people enough. I can get a lot of news by just grazing across. What you consider to be the appetizer, I consider to be the meal.

MS. WOODRUFF: Amanda, you wanted –

MS. LENHART: Yeah, I wanted to actually go back to the point that danah was making where she was talking about the difference between public and private, and come back and talk a little bit about some of the places of conflict between young teens or older teens and Millennials and older generations around this public versus private.

Because I think what happens – and in my own work, I get asked a lot about, like, well, don't teenagers and don't young adults know that, like, employers and college people are looking at their profiles? Why do they put all this information out there? And as danah pointed out, a lot of it has to do with this fact of not necessarily being concerned, but having in your mind a particular audience.

But I think what happens now is because everything is public by default, there's no way to do what we do in our personal and sort of physical interactions, which is code switch. The way I act to my mother is different than the way I act to Lee Rainie, my boss, and the way I act to danah boyd. And when I'm with danah in person, I can make those calculations and calibrations. But when I present myself in a digital space, I don't have that ability to make those kinds of nuanced choices. Or if I do, it's a little bit of a blunt instrument. It's like, you know, a hammer instead of a fine-grained laser tool.

And because of this, you get into situations where – I think this is an example you used at one point, danah – where there's a young man – African-American – who wanted to be admitted to an Ivy League institution, and he had gotten in, and he had great grades and he was doing really well, and then an admissions officer goes and looks at his Facebook profile, gets access to it in some manner, and sees that he's throwing gang signs and that he is associating himself with gang activity. And the officer thinks, oh my gosh, we don't want this person to come to our institution because they're going to bring this gang activity.

But what we're not getting is that he's doing that to be authentic in his friend group. It may not actually be that he's a member of a gang, but he's doing that to build that kind of rapport and authenticity in his network of peers, which is his audience, and the audience that he's thinking of.

So what I think is a big challenge for all of us as we go out and start interacting with Millennials, interacting with teens, is remembering that when we look at their online self presentation through a social network, on Twitter, you're not the intended audience. And that if you're just interacting with this person in another medium, the way they may be showing themselves to you would be very different. And we need to take that into account.

MS. WOODRUFF: But aren't they now able to make it private much more easily than they used to?

MS. BOYD: No, not only are they not able to, but Facebook keeps making it harder. So for those of you who didn't pay much attention, in December, Facebook changed the default privacy settings and have proudly announced that 35 percent of the population went out of their way to change the settings. That means that 65 percent made their material public. And I'm watching this data streaming in, and I'm watching all of it and it's not meant to be public.

And one of the most heartbreaking cases that I actually had to deal with in the fallout of this was a woman whose ex-husband was after her daughter. And they had moved across the country to get away from the situation. The daughter and the lawyer and the mother had sat down, in very detailed discussions, talked about how to make this – to allow her to have a life, and in having a life in high school required her to have a Facebook and really going out of their way to create a Facebook with her with all of the privacy settings set down, brought in a tech guy to help set it out.

December rolls around. She didn't know what she was doing – she clicked yes, straight through. Everything was suddenly public. And so one of the things that's really frustrating in all of this is that most people – and Amanda's data show this over and over again – is that, yes, there are people that are going out of their way to figure this out. There are definitely people who want it. But the technology is not making it easy.

And we are seeing this sort of be a constant conflict, and there's usually a public justification, especially using the rhetoric of "young people don't care about privacy." And one of the things, I think, that really also needs to be highlighted is that the young people who are least privileged in our society have a lot more to lose by a lot of what goes on in these systems, and we really have to think about what kind of structures we need to put in place to help those who are most marginalized.

MS. WOODRUFF: Aren't we asking – I mean, through all of this, underlying all this, it seems to me, one of the points is that we are asking these young people to make these decisions about public/private much younger than previous generations. They're being asked to make some pretty profound or consequential decisions at a much earlier age – am I right about that?

MS. LENHART: Absolutely. I mean, if you think in the past, we have like – think about juvenile records. Your juvenile records can be sealed – if you commit a crime or engage in some kind of activity when you're under 18, that doesn't actually – that doesn't count when you're an adult and that's partly because we've decided that young adults and people under the age of 18 at least don't have the same kind of judgment that you do when you're older.

And yet now, we expect them to have that same kind of judgment in their ability to determine what's appropriate for self-presentation, when we don't necessarily expect them to have that kind of judgment in their actions.

MS. BOYD: I would argue that actually this is changing for all people of all ages. We're seeing a lot more persistence of data today ever, and I say that even for those of us who were speaking out in public. If you're a journalist out there, you might have written a newspaper article that might have gone into microfilms in some library off there – now this is easy to pull back, of the thing you wrote 10 years ago that you know what, was kind of embarrassing.

So we're seeing a persistence that goes out. What is challenging for young people is that they're trying to find spaces where there are other young people there. One of the things I'm kind of entertained by is that

in most of my interviews lately, I've been reminded that Facebook is for old people – (laughter) – because it's now the – what's fun about hanging out with your parents if they're reminiscing about their own high school experiences? (Laughter.) That's kind of lame, and so we're seeing all of these different inflections about "public" never meant all people across all space and all time, and I think professionally and socially and personally, we're having to deal with a level of information persistence, information searchability, information replicability, information scalability, that we've never seen before.

MS. WOODRUFF: If they're not doing Facebook, what are they doing instead?

MS. LENHART: I think they're still on Facebook.

MS. BOYD: They're just not passionate about it like they were. Their parents are deeply passionate. (Laughter.)

MS. WOODRUFF: Fascinating. Dylan?

MR. CASEY: Yeah, I mean, it's true there's probably a lot of photos that I wouldn't necessarily want shared of myself that are in a box in my closet. But for kids today and for this generation, they're all online, and to both Amanda and danah's point, it's just behind the click of a button, and that's kind of scary, and there's significant ramifications from that.

And I agree that it's really important, and it's kind of the responsibility of everybody that is developing these technologies and building these products to really think hard about that. And speaking on behalf of Google, we spend a lot of time trying to do that, and we make mistakes, and when we do, we try to say, hey, we made a mistake, and we're trying to fix that right this second.

MS. BOYD: Of course, your friends are now scanning up those photos and putting them on Facebook for you –

MR. CASEY: Yes, I know.

MR. ROSENSTIEL: Judy's got them here; they'll be onscreen in a moment.

MR. CASEY: But you're absolutely right, and that is just the reality that we live in right now. We need to figure out ways to have rigorous discourse around what we're going to do about it and how we're going to handle it.

MS. WOODRUFF: With all of this, I want to try to project ahead to what this may say about this generation, as it gets older, in the workplace and so forth, so feel free to weigh in on any of that. But as I think about search again, I'm thinking about what one of the young people said in that video that we showed. I remember her very well – Columbus, Ohio; she made the comment about, we're just so used to getting answers to everything right now.

MR. CASEY: Right.

MS. WOODRUFF: We met another young woman in Birmingham, Alabama, who said, we think all the worst problems in the world, whether it's AIDS or anything else, can be solved because we know where to go to get information. We want answers; we want to get it fixed!

Do you at Google think about these kinds of things when you think that this younger generation is now – they've been weaned, they've grown up expecting answers immediately to almost everything?

MR. CASEY: Well, yeah. I hear it every single day in one manner or another that speed matters. And you know of course that's probably pretty specific to just some of our products, but I think in general, as bandwidth improves, as access to the internet improves and more people get access to the internet,

along with that the importance of how quickly they can get the content that they're looking for becomes important as well.

I think what's interesting, whether it's news or blogs or webpages, to the extent that people can either have a browsing experience where content is just being pushed to them versus when their experience is really around, OK, well, here's what I want to find out about. And there are so many different ways that you can engage with content, with those different dynamics.

Statistically, we see that there are fewer people that are going to the internet, or at least our properties, just in a browse mode. Our news homepage, for example, gets far less page views than an actual news results page, and the reason is because we serve news results pages when people are looking for specific or enter a query and we think, oh, that's a significant news query, so they get that information interstitched in there. But we see less of that kind of browse. But let me just say a point: But what's interesting is that we also recognize that there is an appetite for just say, hey, just tell me what's happening right now or tell me some information. And so the speed at which we can deliver that becomes even more important in that specific dynamic.

MS. WOODRUFF: Well, that previous point you made about, they come to the internet with an idea in mind of what they want to look for. Where do those ideas come from? Where do those –

MR. CASEY: Oh, well, yeah – I referenced music a lot because it's something that we've spent a lot of time thinking about. This notion of the top 40 – is it the top 40 because those are the 40 most listened to songs? Or are those the 40 songs that the record labels want to promote the most? There's research that suggests that people like to listen to music that they've heard before so that's why this whole feedback mechanism gets created.

But then what happens when you start to say, well, here's music based on what people are looking for, and back to your point and to your question, well, how do they know to look for it? Well, the social networks come into play, right, because it's like a friend – originally, it was, I made this mix tape for you, and this was music that somehow I had gathered up in various ways, and I've made a mix tape for you, and I'm giving it to you. Well, now, that dynamic has completely changed in the way that people are creating playlists, and that gets stored in their online social profile and they choose to share that. Well, that has a completely different way of getting disseminated.

MS. WOODRUFF: Tom, bring this back to news and information and where it comes from and where these ideas get planted in their head. Is it because – one of my favorite quotes from a woman, a consultant we interviewed a few years ago for this project, she said, young people, she said they may not go to news as much as older generations. She said her most memorable comment from, I think, a young teen was, I don't have to go looking for the news – when something is important, I'll hear about it . My friends will text me, or it'll show up on Facebook.

MR. ROSENSTIEL: Right. You know, if you look at what was the most important finding in media research in the 20th century, it was that media doesn't tell people what to think, it tells them what to think about. And now that that force-feeding is changing, they are getting their cues about what to think about from many more places. The authorities that people have may be a friend who says, who they think is cool and has knowledge of things that they are interested in and says, oh, I like this college or I think Barack Obama's neat or I'm interested in this. And that suddenly becomes an agenda-setting influence.

So I think that part of it has to do with what's important – what are my problems? What are my needs right now? If you go and you study pedagogy and you go into a room and say, when's the last time you learned something new, people will tell you about a situation that they were in where they actually had a need to learn this stuff. Now, it may be an artificial need – maybe a test tomorrow – or it could be that you're suddenly on a sailing ship, you've never been sailing before, and you're going to have to learn to tie these knots because – or you're on vacation, and suddenly the Mayans are interesting because you're there, and the ruins are in front of you.

So I think the issue's going to be where are the cues coming from? Where are the agenda-setting, influencing things coming from? There are no longer controlled by the media, but the curiosity can be satisfied by the media.

MS. BOYD: Over the holidays, I was in a movie theater and I was delighted to watch two parents clearly arguing about who was in a movie of the past, and the kid just kept going, you're wrong, you're wrong – here's the right answer. (Laughter.) And this idea that this wasn't about memory, which was the game of keeping information of the past, but in some ways, there were certain things that were facts, and IMDB had them, and parents didn't. (Laughter.) And of course the parents kept getting more and more frustrated, being like, but I remember it right! You're wrong. (Laughter.)

And so one of the things I think is really interesting is the degree to which young people assume certain things can be acquired and obtained through the digital media, and they don't expect that they have to memorize or remember certain things because it's there somewhere. And this presents us a whole set of new and interesting challenges.

First off, anything that Google pumps up at the top is right, regardless of how it was produced or all of the implications of that, and this creates some interesting elements of it, especially as it relates to education, which is that over and over again, I spent time in schools where teachers are like, anything in The New York Times is right; anything in Wikipedia is wrong. And I use The New York Times for a reason, right? We've had ongoing, fraught questions about how news is produced and how we have to think about the truthiness, shall we say – (laughter), of said news.

And I think it's really interesting that what we also see is that at some level, young people, especially younger adults who've gone through college, get that there's something mostly right about Wikipedia, even when things are sort of wrong. And here's what I think is actually critical about Wikipedia, which becomes essential for thinking about these kinds of things, which is that every single edit on Wikipedia is publicly documented, which means that you can actually see the history and the biases of all of these people and all of the changes as this article got battled out to make.

You don't get to see what happens in the editing room of a newspaper or how that news story got spun to have a specific kind of headline that of course gives a totally different slant to it. And what's really interesting is to think about crowdsourcing as a meaningful means of information aggregation and access.

MS. WOODRUFF: I don't know what that means.

MS. BOYD: Taking all sorts of people in to sort of produce it at once, rather than having an expert. And so it sets the news point. What we see in terms of status updates being a source of news is the idea that crowdsourcing: My friends will collectively tell me what is relevant so that things will bubble up as it relates to me. Information around there will bubble up, and it will slowly get worked out and negotiated as more data comes in. And I think we have to think about that changing landscape.

MS. LENHART: And I think the part that I think about when talking about news, when talking about music, when talking about crowdsourcing, is this idea of digital curation, that in our lives today – you know, in the past it was the news media that curated things for us, that showed us what to look at and where to go; books and book publishers did the same thing – and now we have a whole bunch of different kinds of curators. We can get our curation from a blog, from that guy whose voice we really like or from the people that we follow on Twitter or from the people in our Facebook network, as well as from the mainstream and traditional media.

And so I think what's really happening, whether it's crowdsourcing, whether it's Google, whether it's news, is that we're opening and broadening the opportunities for different curators to sort of show their slice of the universe, and you can now pick and choose what you want to hear and who you want to get your information from and get it from a variety of curated sources.

So we still want, I think, our material and our media to be curated. There's too much – the fire hose: Google offers up so much informational others offer up so much information. We can't possibly absorb it all. But having different curators, I think, allows us to get different windows and yet still get the kind of customized information we're looking for.

MS. WOODRUFF: Tom, and then we're going to take questions from all of you so start thinking about what you want to say or pose to our panel.

MR. ROSENSTIEL: I think the point that Amanda and danah make points to another point about how the news business needs to change, which is that the news used to be basically shoveling information at people. Information is now a commodity in such wide supply that it has limited value, and you can't really charge for it, at least at the moment.

But information that does more than simply provide facts to people, that may be unique, that can't be found anywhere else, that authenticates, that accomplishes something more than simply telling you what movie was he in or who was that guy – that's where news organizations that aspire to survive are going to have to go.

They are going to have to produce things that – I worked at the L.A. Times for a long, long time and we had in the left-hand column on the front page, we had something that was called a "non-dupe," and a lot of your prestige came from how many "non-dupes" you did. I've been there about a year when I said, "Why is this thing called a 'non-dupe' anyway?" And they said, because it's considered a non-duplicated story: something that can be found nowhere else. And essentially, I think, that's where the news business aspires to go because you can't make a living providing information that people can find everywhere.

MS. WOODRUFF: All right. Questions from the audience? And I'm going to look broadly – there's a young woman right here. You're first – you want to give us your name and if you represent an organization?

Q: ELIZA KRIGMAN, NATIONAL JOURNAL: Eliza Krigman, National Journal. I'm particularly interested in differences within the Millennial generation, and my hunch is that technology has created more fissures within this generation than any other, so I'm wondering if the whole panel could speak to that. And I'd also be interested in hearing danah boyd elaborate on the privacy myth and any data that backs that up.

MS. WOODRUFF: Let's start on the fissures. What do you mean by "fissures"? Fissures of?

MS. KRIGMAN: Fissures, like because blogging was so 2007, that within the Millennials there's actually more generational differences. For instance, I'm 27. I may not relate to how an 18-year-old uses their social networking because it changes so rapidly. And I'm wondering if any of the data in the study particularly would address that.

MS. WOODRUFF: All right. I'm going to ask Amanda that, and then I'm going to come back to you for your question for danah.

MS. LENHART: So in looking at the data, there's actually quite a bit – and so I spend a lot of time looking across teens and Millennials where we could make that – make those comparisons, as well as looking at Millennials themselves. And what we actually see with a lot of technologies, particularly social and interactive technologies, that there's kind of this hump that crosses over teens and Millennials, and that it's basically like 15 to 24, there's kind of an intensity of use which on either side drops off, partly for financial and parental reasons on the young side, and I think for life-stage, family – you know, older Millennials are more likely to be married, more likely to be child-bearing and more likely to be in a different life phase. And so that's where we see those kinds of – the most intensity of use is concentrated there.

In terms of fissures and differences, there weren't a lot between older and younger. There are some that are highlighted in the report for teens and Millennials, the differences – so again, for taking the whole

cohort, the differences that I – I would really characterize Millennial use of technology as just a little bit more adult, and by that I mean a little bit more free.

They're a little less constrained by things like income, since more of them have jobs and money coming in than teenagers do. There's less parental oversight or supervision, so that means you have things with Millennials like that they're much more likely to text while driving. They're more likely to have a cell phone, but they're actually less likely to send text messages on a daily basis than teens are. So again, there are some slight differences in there, but again, it's a lot, I think, about income and freedom that really marks the differences between the two groups.

MS. BOYD: I also think –

MS. WOODRUFF: She had a question for danah – oh, go ahead.

MS. BOYD: I also think it's absolutely critical that we highlight that there are huge variations across socioeconomic and racial lines in all of this, and I think that often when we talk about a generation, we obscure the fact that this is really, really significant, and it's often in unexpected ways.

And so for example, I spent a lot of time tracking urban teenagers, low income urban teenagers, for a while, and I was fascinated how they had what we adults would call smartphones long before their suburban, wealthier counterparts. Why? Because they had picked up the Sidekick, and the Sidekick was a really interesting device that with T-Mobile allowed you to go, and you didn't have to have a phone plan, and you could have a $30-a-month plan and that would cover all data except for calling. And so that meant that you saw this entire group of low-income, primarily black and Latino kids in urban environments, going to T-Mobile every week, paying their $30 and having a really high-end internet access device long before we saw the iPhone come out. And so the inflections are not always that low-income usage is worse or limited compared to wealthier, more privileged youth, but that we have some of these inflections that we need to account for.

MS. LENHART: And one of the most fascinating pieces in this report, and which actually another report that we're going to be releasing in a few weeks about cell phone use that focuses exclusively on teens, but in this Millennials report as well, we see that actually, African American and Latino young adults, as well as low-income young adults, are much more likely to go online wirelessly. And in that, if you actually drill down, it's actually on a cell phone or handheld – it's on an iPhone, it's on a Sidekick, it's on a BlackBerry.

And we actually saw that through my colleague, former colleague John Horrigan's work about a year ago with the broad population of adults, and that African Americans, Latinos are more likely to use cell phones to go online. And so certainly it doesn't necessarily mean the differences and – low-income doesn't necessarily mean behind.

MS. WOODRUFF: Did you still have a second question?

MS. KRIGMAN: Yes, I was interested to hear if there's any data to back up the privacy point you were making about young people, or what you could elaborate there.

MS. BOYD: So I mean, first of all, for those who aren't aware, I'm an ethnographer: I do a lot of qualitative work. Amanda and I spend a lot of time going back and forth on qualitative-quantitative. Yes, I have a lot of data on it. Yes, it is very overdue in writing it up, and I'm really apologetic – (laughter) – for everyone on that one. Please give me some time. I am desperately working on it; my editor wants me to be not here and working on it more, so I'm working on it.

MS. LENHART: But we do – there is actually data in the report that suggests that Millennials – and actually in earlier reports that we've done – that suggests that young adults are – and teens, in particular – are more likely to protect their privacy by either having their profiles completely locked down or having their profiles visible only to adults. And this isn't in respect to social networks only, but in general, from

focus group work that we've also done, at least with adolescents, there is an actual – like a lot of mind-share paid towards privacy.

MS. WOODRUFF: Question over here?

Q: SCOTT SWAIL, EDUCATIONAL POLICY INSTITUTE: Hi, my name's Scott Swail, with the Educational Policy Institute. A few bullet points: I think this is tremendously interesting, and I don't know who said it, whether it was this panel or before, but the Millennials will do something technologically and then the rest of us, our age group, pick it up. I think that's somewhat true, but I look through some of the responses, and I didn't see – always see – a big difference between what the Millennials are doing and what we're doing.

Now, I'm 47 – I know I look much younger than that but just go with it, OK? But we're all on – like, in this room, I'd be interested to know who is not on Facebook or something we used to call MySpace or texts? If you're not doing any of those, put up your hand for a moment. There's a few of you – there's a few Luddites out here. But the point is that most people are doing this.

I'd like to see the results of this study analyzed with business-type people in their 30s and 40s, as opposed to just on the average, because I bet the Millennials probably skew a lot closer to people in the business world than people who perhaps aren't in whiter-collar jobs. I'd just like to get your perspective.

MS. WOODRUFF: Why do you think that?

MR. SWAIL: Because I think anyone in business has to be connected somehow. Who doesn't check, who isn't checking their iPhone during this meeting or checking their BlackBerry Storm II or whatever it is? I just think you're all connected now.

MS. LENHART: I think your point is well-taken, that in this room, I think we know we are more connected; we're more likely to be connected, and I think the point of these reports is to actually step back and say, let's actually step away from just the people that we know, who we always interact with, and make sure that we're actually looking beyond the Beltway, we're looking beyond business and we're actually seeing what the bulk of people are doing so that we can understand our own use in the context of that and realize that actually, we're kind of outliers in some respect.

MS. BOYD: But I also actually don't know that I agree with your hypothesis. I think that this room is going to be over-represented on things like LinkedIn; you're going to have a higher percentage of BlackBerrys out there than we're talking non-white-collar workforce. But one of the things is, I tracked MySpace from its beginning to its rise and watched all of that play out, and what was astonishing to me was in watching MySpace hit, it hit first and foremost in the adult population. I mean, it hit first and foremost with the low-income and families of color and not white-collar at all. In fact, I think that's one of the reasons that we've narrated it as the dangerous, scary, horrible place, is because it primarily was reflective of more blue-collar lifestyles and practices.

I watched a lot of adults that were using these sites engage with their extended families, their cousins, their aunts or uncles, all of that play out, and I think that in some ways, in some spaces, white-collar folks are not actually at the beginning and the forefront of this. In fact, I think it's really interesting to see when they're not. And I worry that we look to them because I think the media in particular continues to validate white-collar technology practices and sort of disrespects any technology that comes out of low-income or of communities of color.

And with that in mind, I think we have to just think about the life-stage and the expectations. I think one of the things that we tend to see white-collar folks using it for business. Duh – that's what they're using it for. Blue-collar folks aren't using it for business, but they're doing a lot of family upkeep, and I think that when we look at the social media for that in mind, I think that's really critical.

MS. WOODRUFF: Fascinating. Question way back over here. Yes, sir?

Q: CHUCK RAASCH, GANNETT: It's Chuck Raasch from Gannett. This is a reference to Mr. Casey's comment about "speed matters," and I'd like to go back to the earlier panel's point about this generation's confidence in government. And I'm wondering, given those two trends together, their expectations on information and what comes from it and maybe what change can come from it, as this generation grows older, is it heading for a constitutional and expectations train wreck here, in the pace of change that can come of this? It's one thing to get information, it's the other thing to deal with a government that was set up constitutionally to be deliberative. And I'm wondering if you've considered this and then I'd like to ask the entire panel just one other –

MS. WOODRUFF: Well, let me get that question on the table. I can only handle one question at a time, sorry. (Laughter.) You want to take a stab at that, Tom?

MR. ROSENSTIEL: You know, first of all it's a big country, and I think there are levels of engagement that people have. In one of the books that I wrote, I talked about something that I called the "interlocking public," which is that we're smarter as a group when you've got people who are marginally engaged, people who are somewhat engaged and people who are highly engaged because if you only have the highly engaged involved, you get a limited set of interests, and we forget the way that things affect a broader group of people, that we're actually – that there is some sort of wisdom in pluralism.

I think if the people who are focused on speed get too far ahead of the people who are not as engaged, and the people who are not as engaged will rise up and say, whoa! What are you doing? I don't understand this – let's not do it. That happens here in Washington from time to time.

MS. WOODRUFF: Dylan, do you have thoughts on this since you're responsible –

MR. CASEY: For the comment?

MS. WOODRUFF: – speed? Yeah.

MR. CASEY: Yeah, I mean, I think speed matters for different things in different contexts, right, like at a competitive level, if you go to one search engine, and it takes a long time to get the answer, you're going to go to the one that gives you the answer the quickest. But there's other scenarios in which if the speed is creating this kind of culture of, we have to get it done right this second or we have to respond and act and iterate and interact with this feedback mechanism that is so fast, I think that has a separate set of implications that we're all dealing with, regardless of our generation. I'm sure that many of you in the room have to deal with the barrage of e-mails and phone calls and stuff like that.

To danah's point that – I think actually what's interesting is to look at the way younger generations are – I'm going to send you a text message before I call you because this is a social protocol within this one specific group or age group, and I think that's the important thing to think about in regards to speed.

MS. WOODRUFF: Is there anybody else in the – we've got some really smart people too in the audience. Anybody in the audience have any particular thought on this question of whether we're headed – what are we headed for with this generation, you know, expecting answers right away in dealing with the government that doesn't work that way? I don't want to put anybody on the spot.

Q: RICHARD YANIKOSKI, ASSOCIATION OF CATHOLIC COLLEGES AND UNIVERISITIES: This is not a profound insight, so it's going to be very brief. Dick Yanikoski from Association of Catholic Colleges and Universities. Impatience is the prerogative of the young. I think it's always been the prerogative of the young. Their own lifecycle is fairly short at that point. Change seems very rapid when you go from 15 to 16 it's a big event. When you go from 65 to 66, it's not as big an event at least in social terms.

So it seems to me that a part of it is just maturation, that whether they use different technologies or the same technologies or technologies not yet developed, the deliberative sense will come with the responsibility of adulthood. And as the earlier panel mentioned, as maturity sets in, you begin to have a

family, you begin to have children, you begin to have voting responsibilities, leadership roles at work or in your community. Deliberation is a natural part of that. So I expect that's where the answer will come from – not from changes in technology per se.

MS. WOODRUFF: That's a relief. Now, I promised you you're – (laughter) – it's good to know – I promised you a second question. Do you still want it? You're OK. All right. All right, who – lots of, lots of hands here. Right here. Yes. Is that Linda Wertheimer? I can't see with the light behind you. Linda Wertheimer, NPR.

Q: LINDA WERTHEIMER, NPR: Linda Wertheimer, NPR. (Laughter.) What about gender and technology? How do the two genders use it?

MS. BOYD: That's a great question. Amanda?

MS. LENHART: It's a great question. And really, the way we see it, it sort of break down – and I'm thinking mostly in, sort of, content-creation terms – is that young women are – and I will say, I should say that we are actually seeing some of these boundaries kind of erase over time.

But young women are the most intense users of technologies that connect you to others and that are expressive. And the one exception to that is video, where young men are much more likely to engage with, post or watch videos online. I don't know why that is and if others have thoughts on that, I would love to hear them. And –

MS. WOODRUFF: Are you saying young women are more likely to do social networking – Facebook or –

MS. LENHART: To do social networking, Facebook, to post on a blog, to –

MS. WOODRUFF: By how much greater?

MS. LENHART: It's not that much greater. It is statistically significant, but we're talking five or seven percentage points. Again, it is something. It is a distance that is closing, and in some cases has narrowed to a non-statistically significant point in the past couple of years.

MR. ROSENSTIEL: What about gaming?

MS. LENHART: Gaming is the other point where young men are much more likely to both own the hardware to game and then to play games and to do so for longer.

MS. BOYD: And I should say qualitatively one of the things that we see is that even in these spaces where they may all be using it – such as social network sites – we see differences in the actual details of the practices. Sometimes we see it quantitatively; we definitely see it qualitatively.

Even when I saw – I was looking at creation – profile creation – I was delighted to find that a lot of the guys that I would meet had their profile first created by a girlfriend. So who had basically dragged them in kicking and screaming. They may have been sort of engaged with it and then still enjoyed it, but it was different.

Qualitatively, when I start to – when I start to actually track what's going on in terms of their status updates and the content that they're producing, there are differences. There are differences that, you know, it's much more, sort of, social, personal upkeep coming out of the girls. It's much more, here's what I'm doing, coming out of the boys. And so some of it is just playing out with what you see as – for all intents and purposes – traditional gender reproduction.

MR. ROSENSTIEL: I have one piece of qualitative research and that is that everyone in my house can use the clicker now and make every device operate, and that's a sea change. (Laughter.)

MS. WOODRUFF: All right – is that a gender statement? (Laughter.)

MR. ROSENSTIEL: For many years, I think the fact that you needed seven clickers to make the television work, there was a gender difference. And now the technology is more coherent. And everybody can run everything.

MS. WOODRUFF: Well, we have a gender-blind disability in our household.

MS. BOYD: I should also – one other thing to note is that again when we think about what we value, we tend to also value a lot more boys' work in this space than we do a lot of the girls' work in this space. And I'm seeing – one of the places I'm really seeing this –

MS. WOODRUFF: In which space? You mean –

MS. BOYD: In a lot of the online and social media and activities that are going on. And one of the places we actually are seeing this sort of actively play out is around remix culture versus fan fiction. So these are two sort of elite practices where remix culture is primarily coming from the boys; fan fiction is primarily coming from the girls.

And the latter is sort of pooh-poohed as, sort of, not that relevant, not that interesting. It doesn't get the same valorization that we have even to the remix culture. So I think that even if we look at some of these different dynamics, we have differences, but we also have what is validated culturally and what is not.

MS. WOODRUFF: Can you give us a one-sentence definition of what each one of those is?

MS. BOYD: Remix – so say that you took – you saw Monty Python and you saw Star Wars and you decided you're going to make a remix video of the two talking to one another. All right? Classic sort of video reproduction remix culture.

Fan fiction – a classic example would be that you're in love with Harry Potter as a character sketch and you decide that you're really upset that two of the characters should have been together that weren't together. So you write – you rewrite what should have been using the already existing fan culture.

Both are hardcore content production using already existing cultural artifacts, but one is valued much more than the other. And you see that both in how the media is covering it, how scholars are covering it –

MS. LENHART: And one is textual and one is visual.

MS. BOYD: Also very true.

MS. WOODRUFF: And I'd like to know how the fan fiction would translate to Congress if somebody could think of – (laughter). Their favorite member of Congress –

MS. BOYD: Actually, I will say that there are some great games actually about re-narrating how certain Congress critters would possibly interact if left alone in other places. It can get really entertaining. (Laughter.)

MS. WOODRUFF: Oh. OK. Let's see at this table, that gentleman in the blue shirt. And then we'll go back there and come back. Yeah.

Q: SHRIRAM HARID, HUFFINGTON POST: Thank you. I have a question for danah in particular and the rest of the panel about crowdsourcing. And I wonder – I'm a reporter for the Huffington Post – I wonder how healthy of a development that is from a journalistic perspective. Specifically my concern is that stories that are very newsworthy like, say, civil strife in the Congo get crowded out by stories that are popular. And my concern – I think, I mean, aggregators like the Huffington Post are guilty of that as well obviously.

But I wonder if crowdsourcing breeds a certain complacency in terms of scouting out news. And what that means not only for journalists but for consumers of news. And I think it might be incumbent on people like – I mean, Nicholas Kristof, for example, does a tremendous job publicizing stories that are very important, but I think this development could very well imperil that kind of journalism.

MS. BOYD: There's a couple of – oh, go for it.

MS. WOODRUFF: A good question. And I want Tom Rosenstiel to weigh in on that too, but you start out.

MS. BOYD: I said, there's a couple of different things I want to tease out there. There's a difference between reporting and investigative journalism. Right? And what ends up getting surfaced up much more is reporting. Right? Reporting on a situation – meaning, I was here, I saw the Hudson, you know – the plane go into the Hudson. Here's my picture. Here's my details and my data. And sort of feeding that into the mill.

Which is very different than going out and really investigatively understanding a specific situation where you don't have local reporting in different ways – although actually it's interesting to see Global Voices take on a different role in all this.

The other component of this, which you're highlighting is, do people pay attention to things that aren't sort of high-quality news? Yeah. I mean, if you spend too much on Twitter, you will watch Justin Bieber trend every two to three days. For those who don't have to deal with teen starlets, you're much happier people. But this is sort of a – this is like the New Kids of the, on the Bock next generation, right? Like that's sort of of these sort of classic starlets that come back.

There's no doubt that when given a crowdsourcing decision-making, people will tend to consume things that are much more gossip-driven, things that are much more celebrity-driven, things that are much less, sort of, hard news. And I watch a lot of teens and adults do exactly that. But then on the other hand I'm not convinced that they were always watching hard news when they were watching news historically.

I mean, I spend – I always watch the local news whenever I am in a new city. And it's amazing if you actually look at – it's like, OK, there's another fire, there's another cat caught in a tree, there's another – I mean, it's not always sort of hard news either. So I'm not – I'm not convinced that this is entirely new. But there's little doubt that the drive is to sort of soft news.

MR. ROSENSTIEL: Yeah, I'll try and keep this answer short. It's a complicated – this is a very complicated issue. But we have precedents – it's not entirely new. And local television news got very focused on minute-by-minute ratings in the 1990s. And you can misinterpret this data. Or you can do – you can focus on things that will generate an audience very quickly and in the long run actually drive down your audience, drive away your audience because you only focus on stories that generate a lot of attention and drive out the stories that a lot of different people are interested in.

It's what I call, "the fallacy of 30 percent." If you do only stories like O.J. and these Michael Jackson kinds of stories, you eventually drive out the people who wanted to get information about this subject, this subject, this subject and this subject. Imagine a front page where if you had a diversity of stories, you could attract 100 percent of your audience to at least one of those stories. If you only focus on stories that are blockbusters, you may – which attract 30 percent of – you know, a lot of people are interested in them. You drive people away because they don't find the things they're interested in in there.

The other element of this is the transaction that funded journalism was, I would take money from real estate ads and car ads and I'd use it to cover the city council because I thought that was interesting. If the revenue becomes very attached to the specific content, it's not clear how we're going to subsidize the coverage of civic news that may not have a broad interest. At the moment, frankly, this is not a huge

issue because there isn't much revenue online for any content. But eventually this could become a very significant issue.

MS. WOODRUFF: Right here. And then we'll go back over there.

Q: SPEAKER UNKNOWN: (Inaudible, off mike) – and this is actually kind of a follow up. One of the findings in general that I thought was kind of interesting was about the way that this generation is more sympathetic to institutions. And I was curious how that plays with the research I think you all have done about people's trust in the media in general decreasing. And you know, what do we know about how people attach credibility to pieces of news, especially among Millennials. Is there much of a different between having The New York Times brand on there and having a blog post? How does that differ from other generations?

MS. WOODRUFF: Amanda, Tom, whoever – I don't know.

MS. LENHART: We don't have a lot of data about teens' assessment of credibility. I do know that teens certainly value transparency. And I think what danah was talking about, about Wikipedia being something that – where you can see literally how the decisions get made, I think raises certain questions in the minds of teens and young adults about how news is created. And so I think that that may make them more skeptical. But I don't actually know how that plays out in practice. And I don't know if Tom's shop has done work on that.

MR. ROSENSTIEL: I mean, you know, what we see is – and the behavior isn't drastically different by generation I think, but that people are not focused on specific brands. Two-thirds of the traffic to The New York Times comes through links rather than people going to the homepage. I mean, it's what Dylan was saying too. I think that my own sense is that these are very discriminating consumers. Right? They're very proactive. They take command. They understand when there are problems on Facebook. They get irritated. They're very adept.

And I think that as they become news consumers, they will begin to become very discriminating about whether that information has value to them. But that's a long-term process because these are people who at this point are not heavy news consumers. I mean, as they become older Millennials, yes. But news consumption has generally – you know, grows as you age. On the internet, somewhat else, but that function is still there.

MS. WOODRUFF: To the extent we're told they respect their parents and they look up to their parents and the older generation, do they respect their parents' news sources?

MR. ROSENSTIEL: I think they respect Google's judgment about what's a news source. (Laughter.) You better get it right.

MR. CASEY: I know. Well, I was just going to say, it's not an easy – it's not an easy thing to get right. It's not as simple as saying, OK, well, we should promote this news story because it has the most number of clicks. It's not a simple, like, one-plus-one math problem. It's a very complicated algorithm.

And the reason that it's complicated is because we recognize that it's a really big task to ask computers to try to determine what's important and what's not. And we spend a lot of time and energy and intellectual power on trying to differentiate the significance and importance between popularity and social importance – or what you might think as importance.

And there're different ways to try to accomplish that from the user's perspective – whether you rely on your social networks to determine what stories are important or what content is important or what is the right search result or what is the right news story or whether you rely on your parents.

Or we see that 30 percent of almost all micro-blog-type updates, whether it's from Facebook or Twitter or MySpace or various other platforms, that contain links to news articles. And basically what's happening

is, this person – somebody is saying, hey, go read this article, or to some extent, there's some intent back there. And a lot of these platforms are built in such a way that you're kind of broadcasting to the public, and you're also broadcasting to friends or people that have selected to follow you in some cases.

So I think it's a very complicated problem. We're not even close to being able to having it solved yet. And I think it's a really interesting to have a discussion around how use of the technology influences the way that the technology is developed to then in turn influence the use. And whether or not something is popular or important, I mean, that's a discussion that we will continue to have forever.

MR. ROSENSTIEL: I would just add this, that in our study of new media and blogs and social media that the vast majority of links that people are referencing are not only legacy media but these high-prestige legacy media.

MS. WOODRUFF: Like –

MR. ROSENSTIEL: Like the BBC is enormously significant. And The New York Times and particular authors – particular writers have real prestige too. It's not just the institution.

MS. WOODRUFF: I see. OK. We can all –

MS. BOYD: And one little thing is that for those of who are sort of – especially those inside the Beltway – one of the things we desperately need in this space is we need to talk about media literacy. And we need to talk about media literacy that is both old media and new media and the combination of which I feel like we – if anything we segment them out into digital media and old-school news media. We need to be having a really coherent conversation about media literacy more generally that I fear is not typically happening, especially in the education spaces.

MS. WOODRUFF: Maybe that's something that Pew can tackle.

MS. LENHART: And there's also, I think, issues too around – I think the Kaiser Family Foundation recently did a report that talked about – that looked at media use among 8- to 18-year-olds. And they talked a lot in their report about sort of the shifting of location of consumption of media, you know, from paper to online, from TV to DVR to the Web.

And so I think we all need to be careful in our work as we move forward measuring where people are consuming things, making sure that we're casting the broadest net possible. And making sure that when we look at TV consumption by young adults that we're also remembering that, oh, maybe they're actually watching that and watching news, even online.

MS. WOODRUFF: Online. All right. We can smell lunch. Everybody – I can hear stomachs – (laughter) – I can hear stomachs growling, so I'm only going to take about maybe two more questions. Way back there, the young woman with her hand up. And then we'll take one more after that.

Q: LINDA BRAUN, YOUNG ADULT LIBRARY SERVICES ASSOCIATION: If you only knew my age. (Laughter.) Linda Braun, the Young Adult Library Services Association. And tying in directly with what you were just saying, my brain is sort of going through a disconnect from the first panel to this one and parents. And that looking up to parents and grandparents and also that idea of looking for regulation – I'm not sure that's the right word at this point –

But you know, in working with libraries and teachers and parents, there's this – the younger generation is using technology in a different way than others. And also not necessarily looking to them for the kinds of support and help about privacy and safe use that I think you're talking about with media literacy. And I feel like there's a disconnect there and what do we do about that disconnect. I don't know if you can answer that question.

MS. BOYD: No – I think there is a huge disconnect. And I think that there's certain things that people – I mean, basically parents have become friends in certain socioeconomic groups, which is a very different sort of thing than necessarily becoming authorities. Unfortunately, when it comes to topics like safety and privacy, they try to operate as authorities and fail miserably. And one of the main reasons that they fail is that they go back to back-in-my-day rhetoric, which never ever, ever, ever works – especially in topics that involve new media.

MS. LENHART: Yeah, but it's never worked.

MS. BOYD: That's also probably true. (Laughter.) So the one thing that – you know, when I actually talk to parents about how they should engage with youth in social media, I think the key is to actually get out of the fact that we're talking about technology and think about what is it that you're actually trying to help them navigate through.

So when it comes to privacy, don't tell teenagers or young adults: Don't do this; you'll lose your job. Go and start questions, say, why did you make this decision? And the moment you get into these conversations that start with questions, you get to see the logic that they went through, it's like, OK, so I understand you're trying to be cute to that really hot boy, but, like, when I see it, I think this. And you start to have this back-and-forth.

And the same is true with safety. And Sahara Byrne has been coming out with some really great analysis about how we have this really interesting conflict about how educators – or sort of parents are actually approaching their kids around safety issues and creating a huge disconnect in it. And so, you know, you actually have to open up the space to have these conversations. And it really is about communication and conversation.

So, and also I will say that unfortunately while there is definitely some really great data on relationships between parents and kids improving in certain ways, it's not always a rosy picture. And I think one of the most dangerous things that we can do, especially in conversations about safety, is to assume that parents are present and assume that they can actually do the work that needs to be done as a society.

And you know, we are lucky enough to have Michele Ybarra in the room who's been doing some fantastic work on documenting this material. And one of the things we know straight up is that the kids who end up engaging in some of the most risky behaviors online and put themselves in situations that – reaching trouble – have other psychosocial problems – have problems at home, have drug and alcohol uses, et cetera. So it's not – parents aren't the magical fix in that space either.

MS. WOODRUFF: Bottom line is, parents need to be doing what?

MS. BOYD: Parents need to be having conversations and communication with their kids from early ages. It's not about – there's no magic fix. There is no magic fix. And there is no general rule of what you can do to be the perfect parent. It's all about conversations.

MS. LENHART: And that we as a society need to step in and be there when parents can't be.

MS. WOODRUFF: All right, one last question. Yes. Yes, you. (Laughter.)

Q: MELISSA CIDADE, GEORGETOWN UNIVERISTY: Hi. Melissa Cidade from the Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate at Georgetown University. So I've been thinking about –

MS. WOODRUFF: Applied – again? What? Center for –

MS. CIDADE: You didn't get that? (Laughter.) The Center for Applied Research in the Apostolate. We collect data mostly about Catholics and the Catholic Church, et cetera. Though my question is maybe not related. I've been thinking about privacy and especially this discussion you've been having on privacy and Dick Yanikoski's comment about we will grow out of this stage.

As an older Millennial – and I hate that term, by the way – don't you dare call me an older Millennial – (laughter) – when I went to apply for a job, I was sitting down at an interview, and the interviewer had a picture of me and my husband and our newborn daughter. And it dawned on me that I'm Googleable. And I don't suppose I had ever considered that.

And I started thinking, oh, I better go through and I better pull stuff down. And then I thought, would it be radical for me to ask, maybe we need to renegotiate that social contract. Maybe it's OK to be Googleable. Maybe it's okay for the workplace to have a fuller picture of me as a person rather than just as a worker.

And I think that's in keeping with some of the data that we've seen about Millennials in the workplace, which is that they want better work-life balance, they want more satisfaction, they want to be seen as a person and not just a worker. So it's maybe it's more of that reflective technology going on. Thoughts?

MS. LENHART: Yeah. I mean, I would say that what your example highlights is that you actually provided information to your interviewer that they couldn't legally ask you – (laughter) – which is about your marital status and about your parenthood status. And that's, I think, really that's a big issue with young adults and with teens, and what does it mean in the future? Are we going – when are we going to have the Facebook president? And I think we are.

And at some point it will be interesting to see whether or not our values as a society begin to change and incorporate and that – ultimately that will become a mark of authenticity. Like, what do you mean you don't have a Facebook profile? What were you doing? Where were you? Were you an adolescent ever? And so I think – I think there may be that shift.

I mean, we've seen it in terms of drug use in the presidency – for example, in terms of, you know, many, many years ago you wouldn't have been able to become a presidential candidate or a viable president if you had admitted to drug use. And then we had Bill Clinton who didn't inhale and then onward and onward with George Bush and Barack Obama. And so we've shifted in our values and attitudes toward that and toward what makes you an authentic young person. And so I think we may have to do that with social media as well.

MS. BOYD: I also think there's a lot – again, this goes back to what people have to gain from publicness. I'm definitely of the sort of first generation of folks who grew up – like, I've been blogging since – for 13 years at this point – right? – which is ridiculous.

MR.   : (Off mike.)

MS. BOYD: You can find all – huh?

MR.   : (Off mike.)

MS. BOYD: They weren't quite blogs at that point. (Laughter.) You can find all sorts of really weird stuff about me. And part of it is living down that past and proceeding with the future and creating a presence that is ongoing. What I have gained personally from being public has been tremendous.

But let us note that this is also a point of absolute privilege. I have the privilege to be extremely public and to actually gain from that. And most likely, you do as well. In ways that we also have to account for those who are more marginalized by these systems and are coming from systems or going into professions where they are likely to deal with the marginalization.

And so one of the questions which I think is to Amanda's points is what are we allowed to take into account in our hiring decisions? And I think that we need to have that conversation. When somebody walks into the room, we most likely can read their gender and their race, but we are not allowed to take these into account in a hiring decision. You're not allowed to ask about marital status; you're not allowed

to ask about parenthood status. Even if you can get access to this, should you be allowed to actually take that into account?

It's not that you can radically erase race from you brain and suddenly not actually think about what somebody's racial identity is, even though you can't ask about it formally. And so we have to actually think about what we're doing with what it means to get access to information and when and where you can use it and in what contexts we think that this is just absolutely inappropriate.

MR. CASEY: Yeah and to echo, I think, I mean, we can't leave it all up to either the owners of the technology companies or to various regulation. You know, everybody has to take some sort of responsibility for content that they publish and make publicly available. And I think that's just the space that we're in right now.

Especially when camera phones came about. Right? There was this whole flurry of images that were showing up on the internet that, like, maybe people thought, oh, that wasn't so good. (Laughter.) Right? And so there's going to be like a learning effect from the way that we and all generations use media.

MS. BOYD: But let's also remember that this is not just what you individually choose to put up there; it's what your kids have chosen to put up there about you. It's what your, you know, it's what your parents are putting up about their kids. It's all directions. So we can't always talk about personal responsibility either because we have to deal with people within a broader social situation. And we have to find a way to navigate and give people respect even when they may have made wise decisions, but the people around them didn't.

MS. WOODRUFF: Okay, I've now written down about four topics for future Pew conferences. (Laughter.) And this is one of them. I'm looking at Don Kimelman.

All right. We're going to take another speed break. This one is to get lunch and bring it back here. We're going to resume at 1 p.m. with our next panel on politics. Let's thank this extraordinary panel. You've been great. Thank you. (Applause.)

(END)