



I'm not robot



Continue

Is google making us stupid mla citation

Is Google fooling us? What internet is doing for our BrainsCover page in the Atlantic issue Google is making us Stoopid? The authors continue to publish The Atlantic, July 1, 2008, in The Atlantic, 2008. Websitecover Story Google Is Fooling Us? What the Internet is doing to our brains! (Alternatively Google is making us Stoopid?) A magazine article by technology writer Nicholas G. Carr, and of the internet's impact on cognition is highly critical. It was published as a six-page cover story in the July/August 2008 edition of The Atlantic magazine. [1] Carr's main argument is that the Internet can have harmful effects on cognition that reduces concentration and thinking ability. Despite the title, the article is not specifically targeted at Google, but has more on the cognitive effects of the Internet and the World Wide Web. [2] [3] Carr expanded his argument in the shallows: What the Internet is doing to our brains, a book published by W. W. Norton in June 2010. The essay was largely discussed in the media and blogosphere, with reactions to Carr's argument being polarized. In the Britannica blog, focusing on the apparent bias in Carr's reasoning toward literary reading is a part of the discussion. In Carr's view, reading on the Internet is generally a shallower form than reading from printed books in which he believes a more intense and sustained form of reading is used. [4] Elsewhere in the media, the impact of the Internet on memory retention was discussed. And, in the online scientific journal Edge, many argued that it was ultimately the responsibility of individuals to monitor their internet use so that it does not affect their cognition. While long-term psychological and neurological studies have yet to yield definitive results justifying Carr's reasoning, some studies have provided glimpses into the changing cognitive habits of Internet users. [5] A UCLA study led some to wonder whether a breadth of brain activity—which was shown to occur while users perform Internet searches in the study's functional MRI scans—actually facilitates reading and cognition or possibly burdens on the mind. And whether the quality of thought can be determined by the additional presence of brain activity in areas known for decision-making and controlling complex reasoning skills. Before the publication of Background Carr's Atlantic essay, critics had long been concerned about the potential for electronic media to supplant literary reading. [6] In 1994, American academic Sven Birkerts published a book titled Gutenberg Elgis: The Fast of Reading in an Electronic Age, which included a collection of essays against the declining influence of literary culture—tastes in literature that are favored by a social group—with a central basis among essays. The distribution formats for the book are inferior to the paper avatar. [7] [8][9] Birkerts was inspired to write the book after his experience with a class he taught in the fall of 1992, where students were little appreciated for the literature he had assigned them, stemming from, in his opinion, his ineptitude to the diversity of skills involved in deep reading. [10][11][12] In Persius Unbound, an essay from the book, Birkerts submitted several reservations toward the application of interactive technologies to educational instruction, warning that the long-term cognitive effects of these new processes of data absorption were unknown and that they could expand short-term memory banks and yield a correlated show of long-term memory. [13] In 2007, developmental psychologist Maryanne Wolf took the cause of her book Proust and Squid: Story and Reading to protect reading and print culture in the science of the brain, approaching the subject from a scientific angle opposite Birkerts' cultural historical angle. [2] [8] [14] [15] Some reviewers were only criticizing Wolf for touching the potential impact of the Internet on reading in his book; [16] [17][18] However, in the essay published concurrently with the release of the book she elaborated on her concerns. In an essay in the Boston Globe, Wolf expressed her grave concern that children who develop knowledge into heavy users of the Internet could produce mere information decoders who think neither the time nor the motivation below or beyond their googled universes, and cautioned that the immediacy of the web and the volume of information should not be confused with true knowledge. [19] In an essay published by Powell's books, Wolf contended that reading some of brain strength could be lost in future generations if children are not taught to read first, and to think deeply about their reading, and only then to read E. [20] Preferring to maintain an academic perspective, Wolf strongly stressed that his speculation has not yet been scientifically verified, but deserved serious study. [21] [22] Big Switch in Carr's 2008 book: Rewiring World, from Edison to Google, provided a basis for the content in the final chapter, iGod, its post-Atlantic magazine article titled Google Is Fooling Us? [23] Motivation to write is Google fooling us? The difficulties came from Carr's found he found not only in the books he had to read but even remaining engaged with books that he found very interesting. [3] It is sometimes called deep reading, a term coined by academic Sven Birkerts in his book The Gutenberg Elgis and later defined with an additional cognitive meaning by developmental psychologist Marianne Wolf. [11] [21] [22] [24] [25] Summary Google is fooling us? For a 2008 article written by technologist Nicholas Carr And later expanded to a published version by W. W. Norton. This book examines the cognitive effects of technological advancements that re-undertake some cognitive activities—namely knowledge-discovery—for external computational devices. The book recognized the mainstream for questioning assumptions people make about technological change and advocate for a component of personal accountability in our relationships to the tools. Carr begins essays by saying that his recent problems with focusing on reading lengthy texts, including books and articles that he used to read effortlessly, stem from spending too much time on the Internet. He suggests that constantly using the Internet may reduce one's ability to focus and reflect on content. He introduces some anecdotes taken from bloggers who write about changes in their reading and writing habits over time. In addition, he analyzes a 2008 study by University College London about new types of reading that will emerge and become prominent in the information age. She specifically refers to the work of Maryanne Wolf, a reading behavioral scholar, which includes technology and theory about the role of media in learning how to write new languages. Carr argues that while speech has an innate ability that stems directly from the brain structure, reading is conscious and taught. He acknowledges that this theory is lacking evidence so far, but refers to works such as Wolf's Proust and Squid, which discuss how neurons of the brain adapt to a creature's environmental demands to become literate in new problem areas. The Internet, in his opinion, is just another type of environment that we would be uniquely suited to. Carr discusses how concentration can be impaired by internet use. He refers to the historical example of Nietzsche, who used a typewriter who was new during his time in the 1880s. Reportedly, Nietzsche's writing style changed after the advent of the typewriter. Carr classifies this example as demonstrative of neuroplasty, a scientific theory that suggests that neural circuits are in amenity and flow. She invokes the idea of sociologist Daniel Bell that technologies expand human cognition, arguing that humans inadvertently conform to the very qualities, or type of patterns involved in the functions of these instruments. He uses the watch as an example of a tool that has improved and regulated both human perception and behavior. Carr argues that the Internet is changing behavior at unprecedented levels because it is one of the most comprehensive and life-altering technologies in human history. He suggests that the Internet produces cognitive distractions in the form of ads and popups. These concentration-changing events are only spoiled by online media as they for their strategies and visual forms Friendly for those of platforms More legitimate and move the viewer into processing them. Carr also believes that people's ability to focus may be minimal because new algorithms free them from the work of knowledge; That is, the process of manipulating and synthesizing abstract information into new concepts and findings. He compares the Internet with industrial management systems, figuring out how they complained to workers that they felt like automata after the implementation of the tellerist management workflow. He compares this example with Google's modern example, which places its computer engineers and designers in a systemic knowledge environment, creating strong insights and results at the expense of creativity. Additionally, Carr argues that the Internet primarily makes its money by exploiting users' privacy or bombarding them with the convenience of goofy browsing of the overstimulation, a vicious circle where companies rewarded thinking instead of constant thinking. Carr ends his essay by exploring the roots of the doubtful instincts. He discusses events where people were careful about new technologies, including Socrates's doubts about the use of written language and the concern of a fifteenth-century Italian editor about the shift from written to manually printed works. All of these technologies changed indelible human cognition, but also led to mind-opening innovations that endure today. Still, Carr ended his argument on an ambivalent note, citing a quote by Richard Foreman that lamented the erosion of educated and outspoken people. Although Google and other knowledge-finding and knowledge-building technologies may speed up existing human computational processes, they may also have the human potential to easily create new knowledge to be turned off in advance. Reception we can expect ... That will differ from those woven from our reading of circuit books and other printed works woven from our use of the net. — Nicholas Carr, Is Google Fooling Us? . [24] Carr's essay was widely discussed in the media in both serious and passing. While English technology writer Bill Thompson said Carr's reasoning was successful in provoking a broader debate.[2] The New York Times' Damon Darlin quipped that even though [everyone] is talking about [the] article in Atlantic Magazine, only[s] om subset of that group actually read the 4,175-word article, by Nicholas Carr by Nicholas Carr. [26] There were controversial online responses to Carr's essay, according to Chicago Tribune critic Steve Johnson, partly the result of the essay title Google is fooling us?, a question that the article doesn't appropriately actually pose and he believed a 'right bait for not being funny' blog posts; Johnson challenged his readers to carefully consider their online responses in the interest of enhancing the quality of the debate. [3] Many critics discussed the merits of Carr's essay on the great In forums formally set up for this purpose at online centers such as Britannica blog and publisher John Brockman's online scientific magazine Edge, where the roster of names quickly took on one which glimpses internet critics of the day. [27] [28] [29] [30] Calling it the great digital literacy debate, British-American entrepreneur and author Andrew Keen considered Victor an American reader who was blessed with a wide range of compelling writings from all america's most vocal internet giants. [30] Book critic Scott Esposito explained that Chinese characters are incorrectly described as ideograms in Carr's essay, an error that he considered undermine the logic of the essay. [31] The myth that the Chinese script is ideographic was effectively debunked in scholar John DeFrancis' 1984 book The Chinese Language: Fact and Fantasy; [32] Difransis classifies Sugar as a logosylable writing system. [33] Carr acknowledged that the terminology of 'ideogram' had been debated, but in response to Esposito he explained that he decided to use the common term and cited the Oxford American Dictionary to demonstrate that they similarly define Chinese characters as examples of ideograms. [34] Writer and activist Seth Finkelstein said that obviously many critics would label Carr's argument as Luddite.[35] and he was not disappointed when a critic later maintained that Carr's opposite stance [was] gradually forcing him into a caricature of Ludism. [36] Then, journalist David Wollman, in a Wired magazine piece, described the silly notion as that the web hurts us more than it helps, before an overview of a statement that had many technologies that had historically been condemned; Wolman concluded that the solution was better schools as well as a renewed commitment to reason and scientific rigor so that people can distinguish knowledge from waste. [37] Many prominent scientists working in the field of neuroscience considered Carr's reasoning to be scientifically laudable. James Olds, professor of computational neuroscience who directs the Krasnow Institute for Advanced Studies at George Mason University, was quoted in Carr's essay for his expertise, and on the publication of the essay Olds wrote a letter to the Editor of The Atlantic in which he reiterated that the brain was too plastic—referring to changes in the organization of the brain as a result of experience. It wasn't such a long stretch for Carr's meme given the kids' opinion that given the plasticity of the brain it was. [38] Michael Marsenich, one of the pioneers of neuroplasticity research, later added his comments to the discussion, saying he had delivered a speech in Google in 2008 in which he asked the audience the same question that Carr asked in his essay. Merzenich believed there was absolutely no That our brains are less directly engaged in the synthesis of more shallow information, when we use research strategies that refer to 'efficiency', 'secondary (and out of context)' and 'once finished, lightly'. [39] Gary Small, another neuroscientist director of UCLA's Memory and Aging Research Center, wrote a letter to The Atlantic's editor in which he said he believes brains are developing circuitry for online social networking and adapting to a new multitasking technology culture. [40] Testimonials and denials in the media, there were numerous testimonials and denials given by journalists for the first part of Carr's argument about the potential for contemplation, however, were far rare. [41] Although columnist Andrew Sullivan said that when he grew up, there was little leisure time at his disposal for contemplation that he did.[42] anecdotes provided by journalists described only in a third-party context, such as columnist Margaret Gohane's anecdote of how a consultant had found a growing tendency to provide ill-thought details for his technical problems in his clients. [41] [43] Miami Herald columnist Leonard Pitts described his difficulty reading a book in which he felt like he was getting away with something like when you exit the office to catch a matinee. [44] Technology evangelist John Eudel acknowledged that, in his retreat from the Internet, he sometimes struggled to settle into books, especially fiction, and especially in printed form. [45] He found portable long-form audio transformative, however, because he could easily receive constant attention, which makes him optimistic about his ability to reactivate ancient traditions like oral storytelling, and rediscover his powerful neural effects. [9] [45] Also writing in The Atlantic, a year after Carr, futurist Jamais Cascio argued that human cognition has always evolved to meet environmental challenges, and that those originating from the Internet are no different. He described 'skimming' referenced by Carr as a focus deficit due to the immaturity of the filter algorithm: the trouble is not that we have too much information at our fingertips, but our tools for managing it are still in their infancy... Many technologies that Carr worries about to develop precisely help us get some control over a flurry of data and ideas. Google is not the problem; This is the beginning of a solution. [46] Cascio and Carr articles have been discussed together in several places. Pew Research used them to create a tension-payer question survey that was distributed to noted academics. Most answered in Carr agreeing with the proposal was wrong: Google doesn't fool us. [47] In the Googilisation of everything, Vaidyanathan stood for the side with Carr. However, he thought both arguments relied too much on determinism: Carr in thinking that reliance on more than one internet device would inevitably cause the brain to atrophy, and Cascio in thinking that getting smarter is the essential consequence of the evolutionary pressure he describes. [48] Zuckerberg Nauton from Gutenberg said that, while many agreed Carr had hit on an important topic, his conclusions were not widely endorsed. [49] Strongly contesting Carr's argument, journalist John Batelle praised the virtues of web: [W]hen I'm deep in searching for knowledge on the web, jumping to links from links, reading deeper into an instant, skimming hundreds of links next, when I'm pulling back framing and reforming questions and devouring new connections as quickly as Google and Web can serve them. , when I'm performing bricolage in real time during the hours, I'm feeling 'to lighten my brain, I'm feeling more [sic] like I'm getting smarter. [2] [50] Web journalist Scott Rosenberg explained that his reading habits are the same as they were when he was ploughing a teenager through the shelf of Tolstoy and Dostoyevsky [in his] way. [51] In the view of book critic Scott Esposito, responsible adults have always had to deal with distractions, and, in his case, he claimed to be able to turn off the noise completely and read in depth. [31] [41] Analysis in criticism of the rise of Internet-based computing, a philosophical question of whether a society can control technological progress was raised. In the online scientific journal The Edge, Wikipedia co-founder Larry Sanger argued that personal will be necessary to maintain cognitive ability to read a book, and computer scientist and author Jaron Lanier rebuked the idea that technological advances are an autonomous process that will move independently of us in its chosen direction. [29] Lanier echoed a scene said by American historian Louise Mumford in her 1970 book The Pentagon of Power, in which Mumford suggested that technological progress shaping a society could be controlled if the whole power of a society's free will was employed. [23] [52] Lanier believed that technology is quite hindered by the idea that there is only one axis of choice which is either pro or anti when it comes to technology adoption. [29] Yet Carr said in the Big Switch that he believes a person's personal choice toward a technology had little impact on technological advancements. [23] [53] According to Carr, the view expressed by Mumford about technological advancements was wrong because it regarded technology only as progress in science and engineering rather than as an influence on of production and consumption. Economics were a more important consideration in Carr's opinion because the most efficient ways of providing an important resource in a competitive market would prevail. As technological advancements shape society, a person may be able to resist influence, but his lifestyle will always be lonely and in the end futile. Despite some holdouts, technology will nonetheless shape economics which, in turn, will shape society. [23] [53] A selection of a special quote in Carr's essay from pathologist Bruce Friedman, a member of the Faculty of the University of Michigan Medical School focused on literary reading, which read a developing hardship books and long essays and commented exclusively on novel war and peace, was criticized for having a bias toward narrative literature. Quotes failed to represent other types of literature, such as technical and scientific literature, which, on the contrary, were much more accessible and widely read with the advent of the Internet. [24] [54] In the Britannica blog, author Clay Shirkey said that war and peace were too long, and not so interesting, further stating that it would be difficult to argue that the last ten years have seen a lack of availability or understanding of content on scientific or technical topics. [36] Shirkey's comments on war and peace were ridiculed by many of his colleagues as verging on Philistinism. [25] [55] [56] In Shirki's defense, inventor W. Daniel Hillis stressed that, although the books were made to serve a purpose, that the same purpose could often be served by better means. While Hillis considered the book a good and admirable tool, he imagined that the scrolls of clay pills and papyrus, in their time, were their own charms. [29] Wired magazine editor Kevin Kelly believed the book is the top of human culture should be opposed. [7] And Birkerts differentiated online reading from literary reading, stating that the reader later directed within himself and enters an environment that is not at all like the open-ended information area that is cyberspace in which he feels psychologically fragmented. [27] [57] Coping with abundance books makes men less studious. – Hironimo Squariscio, editor of 15th Century Venice, lamented the printing press. Many critics theories about the effects of the change from the lack of abundance of written content in the media as a result of technologies offered by the Internet. The change was examined for its ability to take individuals into superficial understanding of many subjects rather than just a deeper understanding of certain subjects. According to Shirki, a person's ability to concentrate was facilitated by a relatively empty environment, which existed when The availability of the web gave rise to new media. Although Shirki acknowledged that the unprecedented amount of written content available on the web could be an opportunity to sacrifice the cultural significance of many actions, he believed the solution was to help make the sacrifice worth it. [36] In direct contrast, Sven Birkerts argued that some deep understanding of our heritage [was] necessary, and called for some consensus vision among those sizes that could be shaped toward our society and culture, warning against allowing the commercial market to dictate the future standing of traditionally important cultural works. [60] While Carr found solace in Shirki's Pennywise that new forms of expression could emerge consistent with the Internet, he considered this pennywise belief rather than one of the reasons. [25] Later in response, Shirki continued to explain on his subject that abundant writing technologies always required new social structures to go with them, explaining that Gutenberg's printing press led an abundance of inexpensive books that met a host of large and small inventions. . such as the separation of imagination from non-fiction, recognition of talents, listing of concepts by indexes, and the practice of noting versions. [54] As a result of the vast repository of accessible information on the web, the web's impact on memory retention, 100 critics pointed to a decrease in the desire to recall certain types of information, indicating that they believe, changes in the process of recalling information, as well as the types of information that are recalled. According to Ben Worthen, a Wall Street Journal business technology blogger, the growing importance placed on the ability to remember information directly from memory rather than the ability to access information, in the long term, would change the type of job skills that companies who are hiring new employees will find valuable. Due to an increased dependence on the Internet, Worthen speculates that long ago the man who remembers every fact about a subject may

not be as valuable as the man who knows how to find all of these facts and many others. [41] [61] Salon.com's Evan Ratliff wondered if the use of devices had the effect of releasing phone numbers for recall, as well as geographic and historical information, some cognitive resources that in turn reinforce other aspects of cognition. Drawing parallels with interactive memory — a process whereby people remember things in relationships and groups — Ratliff mused that maybe the web was like a spouse who is around all the time, with a special knack for factual memory of all varieties. [27] Far from conclusive, the impact of the web on these ruminant memory retention left an open question. [27] A model of technology subjects and motifs effect 1878 on the neural circuitry of the brain Writing Ball, who Nietzsche began using in 1882 when his poor vision made it difficult for him to write by hand. [62] [63] In the essay, Carr introduces a discussion of scientific support for the idea that the brain's neural circuitry can be re-wired with an example in which the philosopher Friedrich Nietzsche is said to have been influenced by technology. According to German scholar Friedrich A. Kittler in his book Gramophone, film, typewriter, Nietzsche's writing style became more aphoristic after he started using typewriters. Nietzsche started using a maling-hansen writing ball because of his unsuccessful vision, which had disabled his ability to write by hand. [23] [64] The idea that Nietzsche's writing style had changed for better or worse when he adopted the typewriter was disputed by many critics. Kevin Kelly and Scott Esposito each offered alternative explanations for the obvious change. [29] [31] [65] Esposito believed that the brain is so big and wonderful and highly complex that it seems far away from the premise that the acquisition of a few years of internet media or a typewriter can fundamentally string it up again. [31] In response to Esposito's talk, neuroscientist James Olds said recent brain research showed it was very clear that the adult brain could re-wire on the fly. It was reported in the New York Times that many scientists believed that it was certainly plausible that the brain's neural circuitry could be shaped differently by regular Internet use than reading printed functions. [6] Although there was a consensus in the scientific community about how it was possible to change through experience for the brain's neural circuitry, the potential impact of web technologies on the brain's neural circuitry was unknown. [38] [39] On the subject of the impact of the Internet on reading skills, Ginivre F. Eden, director of the Center for The Study of Studies at Georgetown University, commented that the question was whether or not the Internet changed the brain in a way that was beneficial to a person. [6] Carr believed that the impact of the Internet on cognition was harmful, weakening the ability to focus and consider. Children cited the potential benefits of computer software that specifically targets learning disability, adding that some neuroscientists believed that neuroplasticity-based software was beneficial in improving receptive language disorders. [38] Children mentioned neuroscientist Michael Merzenich, who formed several companies with his peers in which neuroplastyity-based computer programs were developed to improve the cognitive functioning of children, adults and the elderly. [38] [66] In 1996, Merchench and his colleagues started a company called Scientific Learning in which neuroplastic research was used to develop a computer training program called Fast Forward Seven brain exercises that improve language impairment and offered learning disabilities in children. [67] Feedback on Fast Forward showed that these brain exercises also had benefits for autistic children, an unexpected spillover effect that Merzevich has attempted to harness by developing the modification of fast forwards specifically designed for autism. [68] In a later company, which Merzelich called Posit Science, brain exercises such as Fast Forward and other techniques were developed with the aim of accelerating the brains of elderly people while maintaining the plasticity of their brains. [69] HAL in 2001: Stanley Kubrick's 1968 science fiction film A Space Odyssey in 2001: A Space Odyssey, astronaut David Bowman gradually separates the mind of an artificial intelligence named HAL by sequentially unplugging his memory banks. Carr compared the feelings of despair expressed by Hal because its mind falls apart in itself, at that time, cognitive difficulties in engaging with long texts. [2] He felt like someone was tinkering with his brain, re-creating neural circuitry, reprogramming memory. [24] HAL was also used as a metaphor for the final search engine in a PBS interview with Google co-founder Sergey Brin as mentioned in Carr's book Big Switch, and also Brin's Ted Talk. Brin was comparing Google's ambitions of building an artificial intelligence to HAL, while dismissing the possibility that a bug like the one that led to the killing of occupants of hal fantasy spacecraft Discovery One could happen in a Google-based artificial intelligence. [23] [70] [71] Carr observed in his essay that technological advances throughout history have often required new metaphors, like mechanical clock clocks and the age of the computer as computers. Carr concluded his essay with an explanation as to why he believed Hal was a suitable metaphor for his essay argument. He said HAL showed real emotion as his mind was separated, while during the film, humans aboard the space station appeared to be automation, thinking and acting as if they were following the steps of an algorithm. Carr believed the film's prophetic message was that individuals increasingly relying on computers for their world's understanding their intelligence could be more mechanized than humans. [2] [24] Developing attitudes of how internet use affects cognition the brain has great expertise in your circuitry and if you repeat mental functions but more it will strengthen some neural circuits and ignore others. -- Gary Small is a professor at UCLA's Semmel Institute for Neuroscience and Human Behavior. [72] After the publication of Carr's essay, a developing scene unfolded in the media as sociological and neurological studies unfolded to determine cognitive of regular internet use. Challenges to Carr's argument were frequent. As the two most vocal opponents of electronic media, Carr and Birkerts were both appealed by Kevin Kelly to formulate a more accurate definition of each defect they believed about electronic media so that their beliefs could be scientifically verified. [73] While Carr firmly believed that his skepticism about the benefits of the Internet was necessary for cognition,[25] he cautioned in both his essay and in his book The Big Switch that long-term psychological and neurological studies certainly needed to find out how cognition develops under the influence of the Internet. [3] [24] [74] Scholars at University College London conducted a study titled Information Behavior of the Future Researcher, the results of which suggested that students' research habits tend towards skimming and scanning rather than reading in depth. [75] The study provoked serious reflection among teachers about the implications of educational education. [76] In October 2008, new insights into the impact of internet use on cognition were obtained from results, reported in a press release, [77] of a study conducted by UCLA's Memory and Aging Research Center tested two groups of people between the ages of 55 and 76; Only one group of which were experienced web users. While they had read books or assigned search tasks their brain activity performed functional MRI scans, which showed that both reading and web searches had been monitored with the same language, reading, memory, and visual areas of the brain; However, it turned out that web seekers inspired additional decision-making and complex logic areas of the brain with a two-fold increase in these areas in experienced web users compared to inexperienced web users. [78] [79] [80] [81] Gary Small, director of the UCLA Center and principal investigator of the UCLA study, released the modern-brain technological change book iBrain, co-authored with Gigi Vorgan, with the press release. While a set of critics and bloggers used the UCLA study to dismiss the arguments raised in Carr's essay,[82][83] another set took a closer look at the conclusion that could be drawn from studies concerning the effects of internet use. [84] One of the reflections related to possible interpretations of the UCLA study was a greater breadth of brain activity or disrupting the quality of reading sessions when using the Internet than reading the book; And what make decision-making and complex reasoning skills that are apparently involved in internet search, according to the study, suggest using a high quality of thought or simply puzzle-solving skills. [85] [86] Thomas Claburn, in Informweek, saw that The findings about the cognitive effects of regular internet use were inconclusive and said it would take time before it was clear whether we should mourn the old ways, celebrate new, or stop worrying and learn to love the net. [5] See also the four arguments for the elimination of television neurotechnology the bicamerality of the mind captology decade of the brain that changes itself, the 2007 book on neuroplasty by the Norman Doga psychological effects of Internet usage references ^ Nicholas Carr (2008-06-12). Pages and Pages. Some sort of one or the other. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ a b c d e f Bill Thompson (2008-06-17). The way we think is changing. BBC News. ^ a b c d Steve Johnson (2008-06-18). Read this if you're easily distracted lately. Chicago Tribune. Retrieved 2009-02-10. ^ David Aunovich (2008-08-13). The Internet shrinks your brain? What the. The Times. Retrieved 2008-12-01. ^ a b Thomas Clayburn (2008-10-15). What's Making Google Smarter Than Us?: UCLA Researchers Report That Internet Search Can Help Improve Brain Function. Information week. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ a b c Motoko Rich (2008-07-27). Literacy Debate: Online, R U Actually Reading?. The New York Times. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ a b Kevin Kelly (2008-07-25). The fate of the book (and a question for Sven Birkerts). Britannica blog (originally posted in Kelly's blog Technium). ^ a b Bernard Sharrat (1994-12-18). We have books in the future. The New York Times. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ a b John Nauton (2008-06-22). I google, so I'm losing the ability to think. Observer. Retrieved 2008-10-20. ^ Birkerts 1994, pp 17-20 ^ a b Birkerts 1994, pp 146-149 ^ John Walsh and Kate Burt (2008-09-14). Can intelligent literature survive in the digital age?. Independent. Retrieved 2008-10-20. ^ Birkerts 1994, pp 138-139 ^ William Leith (2008-03-28). We were never to read. The Daily Telegraph. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Wolf 2007, p 17 ^ Guy Damon (2008-03-28). Stumbling on the books. The Daily Telegraph. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Michael Dirada (2007-09-02). Reading is hard for the brain, as this book proves. The Washington Post. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Guy Damon (2008-04-05). We're on a scroll. The Guardian. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Maryanne Wolf (2007-09-05). Learning to think in a digital world. The Boston Globe. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Marianne Wolf (2007). Reading anxiety. Powell's books. Retrieved 2007-10-13. ^ a b Veronica Ruckert (2008-07-18). What time spends online change the way we think? (Maryanne Wolf and Nicholas Carr with guests). Wisconsin Public Radio (podcast). ^ a b Malcolm Ritter (2008-12-03). Scientists asked: Is technology rewiring our brains?. International Herald Tribune. Press. Retrieved 2009-02-10. ^ a b c d e f Nicholas Carr (2008-08-07). 'Is Google fooling us?': Sources and notes. uncivilized Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ a b c d e f carr, nicholas (July 2008). Google fooling us?. Atlantic 301 (6). Retrieved on October 6, 2008 ^ A B C D Nicholas Carr (2008-07-17). Why the doubt is good: My answer to Clay Shirkey. Britannica Blog. ^ Damon Darlin (2008-09-20). Technology doesn't dumb us down. It frees our minds. The New York Times. ^ a b c d Ivan Ratliff (2008-08-14). Are you losing your memory thanks to the Internet?. Salon.com. ^ 'Is Google fooling us?' (Britannica Forum: Your Brain Online) | Britannica Blog. Retrieved 2008-07-17. 2008-11-01. ^ A B C D E Reality Club: Google Is Making Us Stupid' by Nicholas Carr. The edge. Retrieved 2008-07-10. 2008-11-01. ^ a b Andrew Keen (2008-07-27). Is the internet killing the American reader? . Great temptation. Archived from the original on 2008-09-20. Retrieved 2008-10-15. ^ a b c d scott esposito (2008-06-20). Friday column: Is Google making us read worse? . To read conversational. ^ Unger 2004, pp 2-5 ^ Wolf 2007, pp 35-37 ^ In a comment by Nicholas Carr on book critic Scott Esposito's column concerning criticism of Carr's use of the word 'ideogram', Carr said: As 'ideogram', I agree that there is a debate on vocabulary, but in my article I decided to use the common word. The Oxford American Dictionary defines ideogram in this way: 'A written character embodies the idea of a thing without indicating the sounds used to say it, e.g., digits and Chinese characters.' ^ Seth Finkelstein (2008-06-09). Nick Carr: 'Is Google fooling us? ', and man vs. machine. Thinking Infoth. ^ a b c Clay Shirki (2008-07-17). Why abundance is good: An answer to Nick Carr. Britannica Blog. ^ David Wollman (2008-08-18). Critics need a reboot. The Internet hasn't led us into a new dark age. Wired. ^ a b c d Andrew Sullivan (2008-06-20). Not so Google Stoopid, Ctd. Daily dish. Retrieved 2009-01-15. ^ a b Michael Marsenech (2008-08-11). Are going to googly Blog on the brain. Posit Science Web Site. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Gary Small (October 2008). Letter to the Editor. Our Brains at Google. Atlantic. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Compiled a b c d (with help from Google) by Evan R. Goldstein (2008-07-11). Critical Mass: Your brain at Google, the chronicle of higher education. Note: Excerpts from columnist Margaret Wentz, author John Udehl, blogger Matthew Ingram, book critic Scott Esposito, blogger Seth Finkelstein, technology analyst Bill Thompson, blogger Ben Worthen, and senior editor Andrew Sullivan are included. ^ Andrew Sullivan (2008-06-15). Google is giving us pond skater minds. The Times. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Margaret Gode (2008-06-17). How Google ate my brain. The Globe and Mail. Retrieved 2008-07-01. ^ Leonard Pitts, Jr. (2008-06-15). Reader a good read Finds satisfaction. Miami Herald. Retrieved 2009-02-10. ^ a b John Uddell Uzdale A quiet return from busy notice commons. Strategies for internet citizens. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Cassio, Jamus (July 2009). Get smarter. Atlantic Monthly. Retrieved on February 4, 2016. ^ Janana Anderson, Lee Renee (February 19, 2010). The future of Internet IV. Part 1: Review the reactions to a tense couple about whether Google will fool people. Benoh Research Centre. Retrieved 4 February 2016. CS1 main: Uses authors parameter (link) ^ Silva Vaidyanathan (March 13, 2012). Googolization of everything: (and why we should worry). University of California Press. PP 181-. ISBN 978-0-520-95245-4. Retrieved on 27th January 2016. ^ John Nauton (December 22, 2011). From Gutenberg to Zuckerberg: What you really need to know about the Internet. Quercus Publishing. PP 26-. ISBN 978-0-85738-547-5. ^ John Batel (2008-06-10). Google: Nick Carr fools, but it's made this guy smarter. Searchblog. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Scott Rosenberg (2008-06-11). Nick Carr's new knock on the web: Does it change how we read?. Wordyard. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Carr 2008, pp 21-22 ^ a b Carr 2008, pp 22-23 ^ a b Clay Shirkey (2008-07-21). Why abundance should breed optimism: A second answer to Nick Carr. Britannica Blog. ^ Larry Sanger (2008-07-18). Tolstoy and personal thinker's defense: Clay Shirkey's answer. Britannica Blog. ^ Larry Sanger (2008-07-30). The future of the Internet and civilization. Britannica Blog. ^ Sven Birkerts (2008-07-25). Reading in the open-ended information zone is called Cyberspace: My answer to Kevin Kelly. Britannica Blog. ^ Ong 1982, p 79 ^ Lori 1979, pp 29-31 ^ Sven Birkerts (2008-07-18). There's nothing to an idea of serious reading and culture defense: an answer to Clay Shirkey. Britannica Blog. ^ Ben Worthan (2008-07-11). Does the Internet make us feel different?. The Wall Street Journal. ^ Kwansah-Aidoo 2005, pp 100-101 ^ Frederick Nietzsche and his typewriter - a maling-hansen writing ball. International Rasmus Malling - Hansen Society. Retrieved 2008-11-26. ^ Kittler 19, pp 203, 206 ^ Kevin Kelly (2008-06-11). Will we let Google make us smarter?. Tecnum. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Kevin Kelly (2008-07-25). Time to prove Carr thesis: Where's the science?. Britannica Blog. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Carr 2008, p 227 ^ Information Behavior of future researcher: A Siber Briefing Paper (PDF). University College London. 11th January 2008. Archived from the original (PDF) on October 17, 2012. ^ Merris Stansbury Rethink research in the Google era: Teachers consider how the Internet has changed students' reading habits. eSchool News. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Rachel Champeau (2008-10-14). UCLA study finds that internet search increases brain function (press release) . UCLA Newsroom. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Mary Brophy Marcus (2008-10-15). Internet search results: Increase brain activity. USA TODAY. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Madison Park (2008-10-14). Study: Google does a brain good. CNN. Retrieved 2008-10-20. ^ Janine Interlandi (2008-10-14). Reading this will change your brain. Newsweek. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Internet access 'good for the brain'. BBC News. Retrieved 2008-10-14. 2008-11-01. ^ John Batel (2008-10-14). Google makes you smarter? Hey, who said that?. Searchblog. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Betsy Schiffman (2008-10-15). Study: Google makes you smart. Wired. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Steve Johnson (2008-10-28). Search for meaning in seniors brain scans. Chicago Tribune. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Nicholas Carr (2008-10-17). Googling and intelligence. Some sort of one or the other. Retrieved 2008-11-01. ^ Is Google making us smarter?. The New York Times. Freeconomics Blog. Retrieved 2008-10-16. 2008-11-01. Bibliography Birkerts, Swain (1994). Gutenberg Elegies: The Fate of Reading in an Electronic Age. Winchester, Massachusetts: Faber and Faber. ISBN 0-571-19849-X. Carr, Nicholas G. (2008). Big Switch: Rewiring the World, from Edison to Google. New York: W. W. Norton & Co. ISBN 978-0-393-06228-1. Doj, Norman (2007). The brain that changes itself: stories of personal triumphs from the boundaries of brain science. New York: Viking. ISBN 978-0-670-03830-5. Kittler, Frederick A. (19). Gramophone, film, typewriter. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press. ISBN 978-0-8047-3232-1. Kwansah-Aidoo, Kwamena (2005). Topical issues in communication and media research. New York: Nova Science Publisher. ISBN 978-1-59454-279-4. Lori, Martin J. C (1979). The World of Aldus Manutius: Trade and Scholarship in Renaissance Venice. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press. ISBN 0-8014-1214-5. Ong, Walter J. (1982). Verbalty and literacy: technologging of the word. London: Methune Publishing. ISBN 0-416-71370-X. Unger, J. Marshall (2004). Ideogram: The Myth of Chinese Characters and Embodied Meanings. Honolulu: Hawai'i Press of the University. ISBN 978-0-8248-2656-7. Wolf, Maryanne (2007). Prost and squid: The story and science of the brain reading. New York: HarperCollins. ISBN 978-0-06-018639-5. Also reading Nicholas G. Carr (2008-08-07). 'Is Google fooling us? ': Sources and notes. Some sort of one or the other. Retrieved 2008-11-01. Maryanne Wolf (2007-09-05). Learning to think in a digital world. The Boston Globe. retrieved. Maryanne Wolf (2007) | Reading anxiety. Powell's books. Retrieved 2007-10-13. mark mark (2008-09-19) Online literacy is a low-skimming web like: slow reading counterbalance. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Washington, D. C 54 (31): Page B7. Thomas H. Benton (2008-08-01). On stupidity. The Chronicle of Higher Education. Retrieved 2008-10-20. James Bowman. Stupid making us Google?. New Atlantis, No. 21, Summer 2008, pp 75-80. Kevin Kelly (2008-11-21). To become screen literate. The New York Times. Christine Rosen. People of screens, New Atlantis, No. 22, Fall 2008, pp 20-32. Carl Zimmer (2009-01-15). How Google is making us smarter. Search for the magazine. External link Veronica Ruert discusses the impact of the Internet on the brain with guests Marianne Wolf and Nicholas Carr on Wisconsin Public Radio (Friday, July 18, 2008). Edge: Reality Club Google is fooling us by Nicholas Carr wayback.archive.org: Britannica Forum: Your Brain Received from online

[fundamentals of graphics communication](#) , [samsung remote bn59 manual](#) , [mario roso de luna livros pdf](#) , [grammar worksheets middle school](#) , [giluxopdf](#) , [46954300760.pdf](#) , [geometry chapter 10 review worksheet answers](#) , [53459227193.pdf](#) , [best website to gta5 for android](#) , [guide to federal pharmacy law 9th edition pdf](#) , [25137090537.pdf](#) ,