

From: Ike Groff <[REDACTED]>
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: Fwd: NYTimes on the decline in empathy: Stop Googling. Let's Talk.
Date: Mon, 28 Sep 2015 20:29:09 +0000

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

From: Will Ford <[REDACTED]>
Date: September 28, 2015 at 7:57:25 AM EDT
To: Ike Groff <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Re: NYTimes on the decline in empathy: Stop Googling. Let's Talk.

Stop Googling. Let's Talk.

By SHERRY TURKLE SEPT. 26, 2015

[Continue reading the main story](#)
Share This Page

Email

Share

Tweet


Save

More

[Continue reading the main story](#)

COLLEGE Photo

students tell me they know how to look someone in the eye and type on their phones at the same time, their split attention undetected. They say it's a skill they mastered in middle school when they wanted to



text in class

without

getting

CreditYann Kebbi

caught. Now they use it when they want to be both with their friends and, as some put it, “elsewhere.”

STORIES
FROM
OUR
ADVERTISERS

[Continue reading the main story](#)

These days, we feel less of a need to hide the fact that we are dividing our attention. In a 2015 [study](#) by the Pew Research Center, 89 percent of cellphone owners said they had used their phones during the last social gathering they attended. But they weren’t happy about it; 82 percent of adults felt that the way they used their phones in social settings hurt the conversation.

I’ve been studying the psychology of online connectivity for more than 30 years. For the past five, I’ve had a special focus: What has happened to face-to-face conversation in a world where so many people say they would rather text than talk? I’ve looked at families, friendships and romance. I’ve studied schools, universities and workplaces. When college students explain to me how dividing their attention plays out in the dining hall, some refer to a “rule of three.” In a conversation among five or six people at dinner, you have to check that three people are paying attention — heads up — before you give yourself permission to look down at your phone. So conversation proceeds, but with different people having their heads up at different times. The effect is what you would expect: Conversation is kept relatively light, on topics where people feel they can drop in and out.

[Continue reading the main story](#)

[SHARE YOUR STORY](#)

Stop Googling. Let’s Talk.

How do you keep face-to-face conversation alive in your family and among your friends? Describe any rituals, traditions, commitments, rules and so on. Leave a comment below or on the [Times Facebook page](#). We may use your anecdote in a follow-up piece.

[GO TO FACEBOOK](#)

Young people spoke to me enthusiastically about the good things that flow from a life lived by the rule of three, which you can follow not only during meals but all the time. First of all, there is the magic of the always available elsewhere. You can put your attention wherever you want it to be. You can always be heard. You never have to be bored. When you sense that a lull in the conversation is coming, you can shift your attention from the people in the room to the world you can find on your phone. But the students also described a sense of loss.

One 15-year-old I interviewed at a summer camp talked about her reaction when she went out to dinner with her father and he took out his phone to add “facts” to their conversation. “Daddy,” she said, “stop Googling. I want to talk to you.” A 15-year-old boy told me that someday he wanted to raise a family, not the way his parents are raising him (with phones out during meals and in the park and during his school sports events) but the way his parents think they are raising him — with no phones at meals and plentiful family conversation. One college junior tried to capture what is wrong about life in his generation. “Our texts are fine,” he said. “It’s what texting does to our conversations when we are together that’s the problem.”

Photo



CreditYann Kebbi

It’s a powerful insight. Studies of conversation both in the laboratory and in natural settings show that when two people are talking, the mere

presence of a phone on a table between them or in the periphery of their vision changes both what they talk about and the degree of connection they feel. People keep the conversation on topics where they won't mind being interrupted. They don't feel as invested in each other. Even a silent phone disconnects us.

In 2010, a team at the University of Michigan led by the psychologist Sara Konrath put together the findings of 72 studies that were conducted over a 30-year period. They [found](#) a 40 percent decline in empathy among college students, with most of the decline taking place after 2000.

Advertisement
[Continue reading the main story](#)

Across generations, technology is implicated in this assault on empathy. We've gotten used to being connected all the time, but we have found ways around conversation — at least from conversation that is open-ended and spontaneous, in which we play with ideas and allow ourselves to be fully present and vulnerable. But it is in this type of conversation — where we learn to make eye contact, to become aware of another person's posture and tone, to comfort one another and respectfully challenge one another — that empathy and intimacy flourish. In these conversations, we learn who we are.

Of course, we can find empathic conversations today, but the trend line is clear. It's not only that we turn away from talking face to face to chat online. It's that we don't allow these conversations to happen in the first place because we keep our phones in the landscape.

In our hearts, we know this, and now research is catching up with our intuitions. We face a significant choice. It is not about giving up our phones but about using them with greater intention. Conversation is there for us to reclaim. For the failing connections of our digital world, it is the talking cure.

The trouble with talk begins young. A few years ago, a private middle school asked me to consult with its faculty: Students were not developing friendships the way they used to. At a retreat, the dean described how a seventh grader had tried to exclude a classmate from a school social event. It's an age-old problem, except that this time when the student was asked about her behavior, the dean reported that the girl didn't have much to say: "She was almost robotic in her response. She said, 'I don't have feelings about this.' She couldn't read the signals that the other student was hurt."

The dean went on: “Twelve-year-olds play on the playground like 8-year-olds. The way they exclude one another is the way 8-year-olds would play. They don’t seem able to put themselves in the place of other children.”

One teacher observed that the students “sit in the dining hall and look at their phones. When they share things together, what they are sharing is what is on their phones.” Is this the new conversation? If so, it is not doing the work of the old conversation. The old conversation taught empathy. These students seem to understand each other less.

But we are resilient. The psychologist Yalda T. Uhls was the lead author on a 2014 [study](#) of children at a device-free outdoor camp. After five days without phones or tablets, these campers were able to read facial emotions and correctly identify the emotions of actors in videotaped scenes significantly better than a control group. What fostered these new empathic responses? They talked to one another. In conversation, things go best if you pay close attention and learn how to put yourself in someone else’s shoes. This is easier to do without your phone in hand. Conversation is the most human and humanizing thing that we do.

I have seen this resilience during my own [Continue reading the main story](#) research at a device-free summer camp. At a nightly cabin chat, a group of 14-year-old boys spoke about a recent three-day wilderness hike. Not that many years ago, the most exciting aspect of that hike might have been the idea of roughing it or the beauty of unspoiled nature. These days, what made the biggest impression was being phoneless. One boy called it “time where you have nothing to do but think quietly and talk to your friends.” The campers also spoke about their new taste for life away from the online feed. Their embrace of the virtue of disconnection suggests a crucial connection: The capacity for empathic conversation goes hand in hand with the capacity for solitude.

In solitude we find ourselves; we prepare ourselves to come to conversation with something to say that is authentic, ours. If we can’t gather ourselves, we can’t recognize other people for who they are. If we are not content to be alone, we turn others into the people we need them to be. If we don’t know how to be alone, we’ll only know how to be lonely.

A VIRTUOUS circle links conversation to the capacity for self-reflection. When we are secure in ourselves, we are able to really hear what other people have to say. At the same time, conversation with other people, both in intimate settings and in larger social groups, leads us to become better at inner dialogue.

[Continue reading the main story](#)

Sign Up for the Opinion Today Newsletter

Every weekday, get thought-provoking commentary from Op-Ed columnists, The Times editorial board and contributing writers from around the world.

But we have put this virtuous circle in peril. We turn time alone into a problem that needs to be solved with technology. Timothy D. Wilson, a psychologist at the University of Virginia, led a team that [explored](#) our capacity for solitude. People were asked to sit in a chair and think, without a device or a book. They were told that they would have from six to 15 minutes alone and that the only rules were that they had to stay seated and not fall asleep. In one experiment, many student subjects opted to give themselves mild electric shocks rather than sit alone with their thoughts.

People sometimes say to me that they can see how one might be disturbed when people turn to their phones when they are together. But surely there is no harm when people turn to their phones when they are by themselves? If anything, it's our new form of being together.

[Continue reading the main story](#)

RECENT COMMENTS

Jbergeski 16 hours ago

As I read this article, I thought of my favorite painting at the Detroit Institute of Arts, "The Nut Gatherers" by William-Adolphe Bouguereau...

Abby 16 hours ago

My parents recently celebrated their 50th wedding anniversary, for which my brother and I had a party at a local, beautiful, low-key...

anne 16 hours ago

■ in my 50s and I've been irritated for years by friends who spend our rare times together staring at their phones and texting during our...

[SEE ALL COMMENTS](#)

But this way of dividing things up misses the essential connection between solitude and conversation. In solitude we learn to concentrate and imagine, to listen to ourselves. We need these skills to be fully present in conversation.

Every technology asks us to confront human values. This is a good thing, because it causes us to reaffirm what they are. If we are now ready to make face-to-face conversation a priority, it is easier to see what the next steps should be. We are not looking for simple solutions. We are looking for beginnings. Some of them may seem familiar by now, but they are no less challenging for that. Each addresses only a small piece of what silences us. Taken together, they can make a difference.

One start toward reclaiming conversation is to reclaim solitude. Some of the most crucial conversations you will ever have will be with yourself.

Slow down sufficiently to make this possible. And make a practice of doing one thing at a time. Think of unitasking as the next big thing. In every domain of life, it will increase performance and decrease stress.

But doing one thing at a time is hard, because it [Continue reading the main story](#) means asserting ourselves over what technology makes easy and what feels productive in the short term. Multitasking comes with its own high, but when we chase after this feeling, we pursue an illusion. Conversation is a human way to practice unitasking.

Our phones are not accessories, but psychologically potent devices that change not just what we do but who we are. A second path toward conversation involves recognizing the degree to which we are vulnerable to all that connection offers. We have to commit ourselves to designing our products and our lives to take that vulnerability into account. We can choose not to carry our phones all the time. We can park our phones in a room and go to them every hour or two while we work on other things or talk to other people. We can carve out spaces at home or work that are device-free, sacred spaces for the paired virtues of conversation and solitude. Families can find these spaces in the day to day — no devices at dinner, in the kitchen and in the car. Introduce this idea to children when they are young so it doesn't spring up as punitive but as a baseline of family culture. In the workplace, too, the notion of sacred spaces makes sense: Conversation among employees increases productivity.

We can also redesign technology to leave more room for talking to each other. The “do not disturb” feature on the iPhone offers one model. You are not interrupted by vibrations, lights or rings, but you can set the phone to receive calls from designated people or to signal when someone calls you repeatedly. Engineers are ready with more ideas: What if our phones were not designed to keep us attached, but to do a task and then [release us](#)? What if the communications industry began to measure the success of devices not by how much time consumers spend on them but by whether it is [time well spent](#)?

It is always wise to approach our relationship with technology in the context that goes beyond it. We live, for example, in a political culture where conversations are blocked by our vulnerability to partisanship as well as by our new distractions. We thought that online posting would make us bolder than we are in person, but a 2014 Pew [study](#) demonstrated that people are less likely to post opinions on social media when they fear their followers will disagree with them. Designing for our vulnerabilities

means finding ways to talk to people, online and off, whose opinions differ from our own.

Sometimes it simply means hearing people out. A college junior told me that she shied away from conversation because it demanded that one live by the rigors of what she calls the “seven minute rule.” It takes at least seven minutes to see how a conversation is going to unfold. You can’t go to your phone before those seven minutes are up. If the conversation goes quiet, you have to let it be. For conversation, like life, has silences — what some young people I interviewed called “the boring bits.” It is often in the moments when we stumble, hesitate and fall silent that we most reveal ourselves to one another.

The
youn
g
wom
an
who
is so
clear
about
the
seven
minu
tes

[Continue reading the main story](#)

that it takes to see where a conversation is going
admits that she often doesn’t have the patience
to wait for anything near that kind of time before

[Continue reading the main story](#)

going to her phone. In this she is characteristic of what the psychologists Howard Gardner and Katie Davis called the “app generation,” which grew up with phones in hand and apps at the ready. It tends toward impatience, expecting the world to respond like an app, quickly and efficiently. The app way of thinking starts with the idea that actions in the world will work like algorithms: Certain actions will lead to predictable results.

This attitude can show up in friendship as a lack of empathy. Friendships become things to manage; you have a lot of them, and you come to them with tools. So here is a first step: To reclaim conversation for yourself, your friendships and society, push back against viewing the world as one giant app. It works the other way, too: Conversation is the antidote to the algorithmic way of looking at life because it teaches you about fluidity, contingency and personality.

This is our moment to acknowledge the unintended consequences of the technologies to which we are vulnerable, but also to respect the resilience that has always been ours. We have time to make corrections and remember who we are — creatures of history, of deep psychology, of complex relationships, of conversations, artless, risky and face to face.

Sherry Turkle is a professor in the program in Science, Technology and Society at [REDACTED] and the author, most recently, of "Reclaiming Conversation: The Power of Talk in a Digital Age," from which this essay is adapted.

Follow The New York Times Opinion section on [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#), and sign up for the [Opinion Today newsletter](#).

On Mon, Sep 28, 2015 at 7:52 AM, Ike Groff <[REDACTED]> wrote:

Can you cut and paste the story to me I have met my 10 free stories for the month

From: Will Ford [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2015 6:31 AM
Subject: NYTimes on the decline in empathy: Stop Googling. Let's Talk.

Stop Googling. Let's Talk. <http://nyti.ms/1VhHsVN>

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail and any attachment(s) is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please immediately notify the sender at [REDACTED] or by replying to this e-mail and delete the e-mail and any attachment(s) from your system. Nothing herein shall be construed as a financial promotion to any person or persons, or a solicitation or recommendation to buy or sell any security or other investment or to engage in any trading strategy. Information presented is from sources believed to be reliable, but is not guaranteed to be accurate or complete. This information should not be taken as an offer nor as a solicitation of an offer to buy or sell securities or other financial instruments. Email transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure, timely or error free. Tourmaline Partners, LLC may review and store both incoming and outgoing messages. Use by other than the intended recipients is prohibited.

This e-mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and intended only for the person or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this e-mail and any attachment(s) is strictly prohibited. If you have received this e-mail in error please immediately notify the sender at 203-302-7300 or by replying to this e-mail and delete the e-mail and any attachment(s) from your system. Nothing herein shall be construed as a financial promotion to any person or persons, or a solicitation or recommendation to buy or sell any security or other investment or to engage in any trading strategy. Information presented is from sources believed to be reliable, but is not guaranteed to be accurate or complete. This information should not be taken as an offer nor as a solicitation of an offer to buy or sell securities or other financial instruments. Email transmission cannot be guaranteed to be secure, timely or error free. Tourmaline Partners, LLC may review and store both incoming and outgoing messages. Use by other than the intended recipients is prohibited.