

Brain Rot—The 2024 Oxford English Dictionary Word of the Year: Why Should Technology Leaders Care?

—ALEXANDER SERENKO 

Faculty of Business and IT, University of Ontario Institute of Technology Oshawa, Ontario L1G 0C5, Canada

The review of this article was arranged by Department Editor Shari L.S. Worthington.

IEEE DOI 10.1109/EMR.2025.3583977

Abstract—This article discusses the 2024 Word of the Year—brain rot—whose sudden popularity reflects deeper issues underlying contemporary social media. Brain rot is a colloquial term that refers to the negative cognitive, emotional, and behavioral effects resulting from the purposeless, repetitive, and excessive consumption of trivial, unchallenging, and low-quality digital media content, primarily for short-form entertainment. This article defines the controversial term, explains its popularity, and explores its implications for technology leaders.

Key words: Brain rot, memes, short-form entertainment, social media, social networking sites, technology impacts, word of the year.

INTRODUCTION

TECHNOLOGY leaders sometimes struggle to keep up with the terminology circulating within the online culture of contemporary youth. Indeed, catching up with the latest social media trends, following the never-ending memes—digital pieces of information (text, images, and videos) that replicate among social media users [1], [2]—and deciphering the constantly evolving Internet slang demand a tremendous investment of precious time and cognitive resources. In certain cases, however, keeping abreast of the contemporary digital landscape is necessary because new terms may reflect critical issues shaping our information-dependent society, with implications of Brobdingnagian proportions.

This article focuses on one such recent term—*brain rot* (also spelled as *brainrot*)—which was selected as the 2024 Word of the Year by Oxford University Press, publisher of the Oxford English Dictionary [3]. To inform busy managers about

this issue, this article defines the term brain rot, explains its rise, explores why technology leaders should take note, and offers practical recommendations.

WHAT IS BRAIN ROT?

Brain rot is a colloquial term that refers to the negative cognitive, emotional, and behavioral effects resulting from the purposeless, repetitive, and excessive consumption of trivial, unchallenging, and low-quality digital media content, primarily for short-form entertainment. The first recorded use of this term appeared in Henry David Thoreau's 1854 book *Walden* in reference to people's mental stagnation when they consume dull, trivial content in huge volumes with "saucer eyes," "primitive curiosity," and an "unwearied gizzard" without any intellectual improvement [4, p. 103]. Fast-forward 150 years, and the term brain rot resurfaced in online discussions around 2004 [5] but the instances of its use were still rare. For example, in 2007, it appeared only 14 times on X (formerly Twitter) in reference to mundane, intellectually unchallenging online content or

113 activities [6]. Since March 2024,
 114 however, its prevalence has surged
 115 exponentially [7], earning it the title of
 116 the Word of the Year [3].
 117

118 At first glance, it appears that the
 119 popularity of this term reflects a mere
 120 passing trend, stemming from youth's
 121 obsession with an eye-catching word.
 122 Unfortunately, the underlying reality is
 123 far more concerning.

126 WHY HAS THE TERM BRAIN 127 ROT BECOME POPULAR?

129 Social media users are constantly
 130 bombarded with an endless stream of
 131 terms, stories, facts, and opinions as
 132 millions of content creators compete
 133 for their attention [8]. In this saturated
 134 and chaotic digital landscape, it
 135 seems virtually impossible for a new
 136 term to gain traction. However, the
 137 rapid rise of the term "brain rot" is
 138 not a mere coincidence. Instead,
 139 its unexpected fame results from
 140 the synergistic interplay of several
 141 factors.

143 Brain rot-facilitating content spreads
 144 quickly through virtual memes.
 145 However, the quantity and quality
 146 of social media memes have been
 147 moving in opposite directions,
 148 and users have to deal with an
 149 avalanche of clickbait [9], recycled
 150 content, low-effort viral challenges,
 151 conspiracy theories, trivial facts,
 152 and fake news [10]. By 2024, social
 153 media was inundated with AI slop:
 154 substance-deprived, poor-quality
 155 media, including text, music, images,
 156 and video created using Generative
 157 AI tools [11]. This surge was
 158 sparked by the advent of various AI
 159 content generators, such as Gemini
 160 (text), Sudowrite (dynamic fiction
 161 storytelling), DALL·E (text-to-image),
 162 Jukebox (music), and Sora (text-to-
 163 video). In essence, technology, which,
 164 in the wrong hands, may efficiently
 165 produce tremendous volumes of low-
 166 quality digital memes, is now widely
 167 accessible and quickly adopted.

It would be misguided to accept the notion of technological determinism [12] by claiming that IT is solely responsible for all societal problems because it is the human users who design, spread, and consume such content. The propagation of low-quality, attention-grabbing memes is driven by the monetization practices of major social media platforms, which financially incentivize website and channel owners for attracting traffic and social endorsements in the form of clicks, likes, comments, subscriptions, and shares (e.g., see [13]), and who, in turn, abuse the system by mass-producing and propagating any content that draws user attention and may be quickly shared [8]. The overall degradation of meme quality is the unfortunate externality unrelated to the initial objective of social media platforms: to build a profitable advertising business model [14]. Platforms' algorithms are also designed to quickly identify and deliver the exact content users are interested in, which is mostly determined by their previous consumption patterns. In short, a combination of Generative AI-boosted technological capabilities, social media giants' advertising monetization practices, and the willingness of certain content creators to engage in exploitative practices dramatically undermines the overall quality of memes circulating on social media.

However, supply cannot exist without demand, which prompts the reasonable question: why do social media users, particularly younger ones, massively consume such trivial, repetitive, and substance-deprived content? This may be explained by analyzing the psychological drivers behind user behavior, the innate characteristics of brain rot memes, and the role of social contagion.

Psychologically, people are cognitive misers [15] who prefer to conserve their mental resources and favor

automatic behavior over deliberate action, especially when interacting with familiar IT systems in routine settings [16], [17], including social media [18]. Thus, the consumption of mentally undemanding, trivial memes is driven by users' automatic, unconscious behavior. Each interaction with such content triggers the release of dopamine—a neurotransmitter (a chemical messenger) that carries signals between neurons in a user's brain, and each episode of dopamine release produces enjoyment [19]. The minimal or even absent substance in the viewed memes creates a sense of curiosity and makes users want to repeat their experience and view another similar piece of content—the process that takes place beyond users' conscious awareness and control. This loop may continue for hours until individuals are interrupted or exhausted. Users may engage in this behavior for pure enjoyment (e.g., to unwind) or as an escape mechanism (e.g., to avoid physically or cognitively demanding tasks). Regardless of their motivations, people's brains are wired in a way that rewards and promotes massively accessing and consuming memes labeled as brain rot.

The characteristics of brain rot memes—strong emotional appeal (both positive and negative), brevity, the inclusion of recognizable characters and facial expressions, tapping into societal and cultural issues, and the ease of digestion [20], [21], [22], [23]—create a perpetual tsunami of social contagion and facilitate their spread and consumption within particular user populations. Social contagion is the spread of emotions and/or behaviors within a group of people when one individual serves as a catalyst for the imitative emotional state and/or actions of another [24]. By contrast, reflecting on critical and pressing issues does not facilitate meme propagation on contemporary

social media [2]. Social contagion factors add fuel to the fire and further contribute to the propagation of brain rot memes. Most of the brain rot-labeled memes pertain to the latest social media trends [5], which are particularly popular among younger audiences. For example, younger users may fear missing out on the notoriously popular *Skibidi Toilet* web series (an inane machinima production depicting warfare between singing human-headed toilets and humanoids) or *Grimace Shake* videos (short homemade clips in which people consume McDonald's Grimace Shake drinks and then find themselves in gruesome situations), which are shared and discussed by their peers. Keeping up with such content gives younger users a sense of social validation and creates the bandwagon effect—where people consume certain content only because others are doing so, regardless of their personal opinion about it [25].

IMPLICATIONS FOR TECHNOLOGY, ENGINEERING, AND MARKETING LEADERS

While the information presented above is compelling, leaders at various levels may question why they should devote their valuable time to understanding the public's fascination with the term brain rot. This article argues that they may want to keep up with the zeitgeist of our volatile, uncertain, complex, and ambiguous digital world to maintain their industry relevance and ensure the long-term sustainability of their organization.

Top-level technology managers (e.g., Chief Information Officers, Chief Technology Officers, and Chief Innovation Officers) are well-positioned to assess whether their existing business models rely on brain rot-related themes and principles. This includes redefining organizational success metrics by

shifting away from key performance indicators (KPIs) that prioritize engagement-at-all-costs (clicks, reactions, likes, shares, subscriptions, and time spent) in favor of value-creation methods, including user satisfaction, long-term retention, relationship building, constructive discourse, and brand performance [26]. Cultivating an organization-wide culture of “tech with a conscience,” which prioritizes corporate social responsibility over short-term profitability, may further support these efforts [27]. On the one hand, achieving and sustaining high user engagement has traditionally been viewed as a primary indicator of success in contemporary social media design and implementation. On the other hand, this approach is a double-edged sword and may undermine organizational reputation and performance in the long term. Thus, top-level technology managers may develop ethical guidelines and initiate corporate cultural changes by focusing on user well-being.

Engineering managers who supervise the development of social media technologies are encouraged to guide their software engineers away from principles of users' psychological manipulation by excluding or minimizing dopamine-driven product designs [19] that facilitate brain rot content consumption. To achieve this, software engineers can take steps to remove unpredictable reward loops, eliminate infinite scrolling, avoid negativity bias, drop excessive notifications, and disable default autoplay [8], [28]. Instead, they are advised to promote intentional use, personalization, deep interactions (e.g., discussion boards and collaborative platforms), and active user engagement while minimizing passive content consumption. They may also explore introducing periodic stopping points, content consumption limits (e.g., maximum usage time or view counts), and opt-out options

[29]. The widespread presence of brain rot shows that, on their own, software engineers may not always initiate and implement these changes, so engineering managers can support, guide, and supervise software engineers in this challenging initiative. In their interactions with software engineers, engineering managers can emphasize the principles of ethical algorithm design [30] by discouraging the promotion of purely sensational, low-effort viral trends within the algorithm. Engineering managers are also advised to integrate an “anti-brain rot assessment” as a standard component of user experience/user interface (UX/UI) design and ensure that it becomes a routine part of product development and testing.

Marketing managers who oversee the design and execution of social media campaigns at large organizations may take into consideration that the excessive consumption of brain rot content shapes how people perceive trends and marketing messages. Their target audience can inadvertently misinterpret marketing messages that incorporate ideas, terminology, and characters similar to those commonly associated with brain rot. In extreme cases, social media users may repurpose marketing messages into brain rot memes, which may be detrimental to the brand [31]. For example, using amplified drama in promotional reaction videos depicting exaggerated emotional responses to trivial events may backfire if the target audience perceives them as low-quality theatrics and dismisses them as brain rot content. In addition, marketers can minimize the reliance on sensational headlines—for example, “Doctors Are Stunned by This New Discovery,” “Don’t Miss This Once-in-a-Lifetime Opportunity,” “The Last Fact Will Shock You,” or “You Won’t Believe What Happened Next!”—that may be misinterpreted

337	as clickbait, leading to cynicism and	low-effort attempts to create more	overused character archetypes, and	393
338	disengagement [32].	brain rot.	inappropriate cultural references.	394
339				395
340				396
341	Marketing managers who direct	When engaging with younger social	Brain rot is unlikely to be the last	397
342	the design and execution of social	media users, marketing managers are	term used to describe the negative	398
343	media campaigns at small- and	advised to demonstrate familiarity	unanticipated impacts of IT on	399
344	medium-sized enterprises lacking	with current Internet slang and	individual users, organizations, and	400
345	the resources to hire professional	ensure that their products and	society as a whole. Past examples	401
346	content developers may turn to	services resonate with contemporary	include <i>doomscrolling</i> (the excessive	402
347	Generative AI tools for assistance	cultural narratives. One option is to	consumption of negative online	403
348	in content creation [33]. The problem,	emphasize antibrain rot themes in	news, Macquarie Dictionary's	404
349	however, is that Generative AI relies	their offerings to foster trust among	Word of the Year 2020 [35]) and	405
350	heavily on existing content, trends,	younger consumers. Another avenue	<i>CrackBerry</i> (a term used to describe	406
351	ideas, phrases, and stylistic patterns	to explore is the use of humor to	a person addicted to mobile email	407
352	[34] and, as a result, may replicate	highlight the effects of brain rot	on a BlackBerry device, Webster's	408
353	elements of content labeled as brain	and its consequences to connect	New World College Dictionary 2006	409
354	rot, which users may eventually	with younger audiences and gain	[36]), and the list will inevitably grow in	410
355	recognize. As a result, the limitations	their trust. It is also important to	the future. Thus, technology leaders	411
356	of Generative AI in content creation	exclude features that facilitate the	at all levels are advised to keep	412
357	may lead to negative audience	distribution of brain rot content in all	abreast of emerging social trends	413
358	reactions and potential dismissal	types of public communication—	to recognize evolving user behavior	414
359	of such marketing campaigns as	namely, extreme concision, excessive	and proactively adapt their products,	415
360		simplicity, inauthentic emotions,		416

Table 1. Key Takeaways.

What is Brain Rot?

A colloquial term that refers to the negative cognitive, emotional, and behavioral effects resulting from the purposeless, repetitive, and excessive consumption of trivial, unchallenging, and low-quality digital media content, primarily for short-form entertainment.

Why is This Term Popular?

The availability of Generative AI, social media platforms' advertising monetization practices, and the willingness of content providers to engage in low-quality production for profit (supply-side factors). Users' psychological tendencies toward low-effort, repetitive, and rewarding behaviors; the innate characteristics of brain rot memes—strong emotional appeal, brevity, the inclusion of recognizable characters and facial expressions, tapping into societal and cultural issues, and the ease of digestion; and social contagion driven by the fear of missing out (demand-side factors).

Implications for Top-level Technology Managers

Review existing business models to ensure that they do not rely on brain rot-related themes and principles. Redefine organizational success metrics by shifting away from KPIs that prioritize engagement-at-all-costs. Promote an organization-wide culture of "tech with a conscience." Develop ethical guidelines and initiate corporate cultural changes by focusing on user well-being.

Implications for Engineering Managers

Encourage software engineers to abandon the principles of users' psychological manipulation and minimize dopamine-driven product designs. Ensure that software engineers promote intentional use, personalization, deep interactions, and active user engagement while also introducing periodic stopping points, content consumption limits, and opt-out options. Emphasize the principles of ethical algorithm design and integrate an "anti-brain rot assessment" as a standard component of UX/UI (User Experience/User Interface) design.

Implications for Marketing Managers

Ensure that marketing content does not unintentionally incorporate elements associated with brain rot, as this may lead to misinterpretation, abuse, and potential brand damage. Be mindful that the limitations of Generative AI in content creation may lead to negative audience reactions and potential dismissal of such marketing campaigns as low-effort attempts to create more brain rot. Exclude features that facilitate the distribution of brain rot in all types of public communication—namely, extreme concision, excessive simplicity, inauthentic emotions, overused character archetypes, and inappropriate cultural references. Stay ahead of emerging social trends to recognize evolving user behavior and proactively adjust products, services, and promotional campaigns. Demonstrate familiarity with current Internet slang and ensure that products and services resonate with contemporary cultural narratives.

Implications for Managers at All Levels

Recognize that the popularity of the term brain rot reflects a deeper issue with social media in general and highlights users' dissatisfaction with their digital experiences. Find ways to overcome the associated threats and turn them into opportunities.

449 services, promotional campaigns,
450 business models, and strategies.

451
452 In conclusion, the sudden rise in
453 popularity of the term brain rot
454 reveals a potential problem with
455 social media in general and reflects
456 users' dissatisfaction with their

digital experiences [37], [38], as
these experiences contribute to
people's intellectual stagnation
rather than personal growth. While
this presents challenges, forward-
thinking leaders can transform these
threats into opportunities, better
connect with the new generation of

IT users, and help them overcome
the unanticipated consequences
of the use of contemporary IT. The
first step, however, is to acknowledge
and define the issue, which was
the purpose of this article. Table 1
summarizes this article's key
takeaways.

459 REFERENCES

460

- [1] R. Dawkins, *The Selfish Gene*. Oxford, U.K.: Oxford Univ. Press, 1989.
- [2] K. Barnes, T. Riesenmy, M. D. Trinh, E. Lleshi, N. Balogh, and R. Molontay, "Dank or not? Analyzing and predicting the popularity of memes on Reddit," *Appl. Netw. Sci.*, vol. 6, 2021, Art. no. 21.
- [3] Oxford University Press, "Oxford Word of the Year 2024," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://corp.oup.com/word-of-the-year/>
- [4] H. D. Thoreau, *Walden; or, Life in the Woods*, Boston, MA, USA: Ticknor, Reed, and Fields, 1854.
- [5] S. Prema, "What is 'brain rot'? Do you have it?", SBS News, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sbs.com.au/news/article/what-is-brain-rot-do-you-have-it/39fexbr4u>
- [6] X, "X. Search for 'brain rot'/'brainrot' [Search]," Twitter, Dec. 2024. [Online]. Available: https://x.com/search?q=%22brain%20rot%22%20until%3A2008-01-01%20since%3A2006-01-01&src=typed_query&f=live and https://x.com/search?q=%22brainrot%22%20until%3A2008-01-01%20since%3A2006-01-01&src=typed_query&f=live
- [7] Google Trends, "Search for 'brain rot'/'brainrot' [Search]," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://trends.google.com/trends/explore?date=all&q=%22brainrot%22,%22brain%20rot%22&hl=en>
- [8] J. Hari, *Stolen Focus: Why You Can't Pay Attention – and How to Think Deeply Again*. London, U.K.: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2022.
- [9] K. Munger, "All the news that's fit to click: The economics of clickbait media," *Political Commun.*, vol. 37, no. 3, pp. 376–397, 2019.
- [10] E. Aïmeur, S. Amri, and G. Brassard, "Fake news, disinformation and misinformation in social media: A review," *Social Netw. Anal. Mining*, vol. 13, 2023, Art. no. 30.
- [11] J. Koebler, "Zuckerberg: The AI slop will continue until morale improves," 404media, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://www.404media.co/zuckerberg-the-ai-slop-will-continue-until-morale-improves/>
- [12] A. Dafoe, "On technological determinism: A typology, scope conditions, and a mechanism," *Sci., Technol., Hum. Values*, vol. 40, no. 6, pp. 1047–1076, 2015.
- [13] E. Papadogiannakis, P. Papadopoulos, E. P. Markatos, and N. Kourtellis, "Who funds misinformation? A systematic analysis of the ad-related profit routines of fake news sites," in *Proc. ACM Web Conf.*, 2023, pp. 2765–2776.
- [14] C. A. Diaz Ruiz, "Disinformation and fake news as externalities of digital advertising: A close reading of sociotechnical imaginaries in programmatic advertising," *J. Marketing Manage.*, early access, Oct. 30, 2024, doi: 10.1080/0267257X.2024.2421860.
- [15] R. West, "The psychology of security," *Commun. ACM*, vol. 51, no. 4, pp. 34–40, 2008.
- [16] A. Serenko and O. Turel, "Measuring implicit attitude in information systems research with the Implicit Association Test," *Commun. Assoc. Inf. Syst.*, vol. 47, pp. 397–431, 2020.

- 561 [17] A. Serenko and O. Turel, "A dual-attitude model of system use: The effect of
562 explicit and implicit attitudes," *Inf. Manage.*, vol. 56, no. 5, pp. 657–668, 2019.
563 [18] O. Turel and A. Serenko, "Cognitive biases and excessive use of social media:
564 The Facebook Implicit Associations test (FIAT)," *Addictive Behav.*, vol. 105,
565 2020, Art. no. 106328.
566 [19] A. Serenko and O. Turel, "Directing technology addiction research in information
567 systems: Part I. Understanding behavioral addictions," *DATA BASE Adv. Inf.*
568 *Syst.*, vol. 51, no. 3, pp. 81–96, 2020.
569 [20] C. Ling, I. AbuHilal, J. Blackburn, E. De Cristofaro, S. Zannettou, and G. Stringhini,
570 "Dissecting the meme magic: Understanding indicators of virality in image
571 memes," in *Proc. ACM Conf. Hum.-Comput. Interaction*, 2021, pp. 1–24.
572 [21] M. D. Molina, "What makes an internet meme a meme? Six essential
573 characteristics," in *Handbook of Visual Communication: Theory, Methods, and*
574 *Media*, S. Josephson, J. Kelly, and K. Smith, Eds. Evanston, IL, USA: Routledge,
575 2020, pp. 380–394.
576 [22] J. Berger and K. L. Milkman, "What makes online content viral?," *J. Marketing*
577 *Res.*, vol. 49, no. 2, pp. 192–205, 2012.
578 [23] O. Tsur and A. Rappoport, "Don't let me be #misunderstood: Linguistically
579 motivated algorithm for predicting the popularity of textual memes," in *Proc. Int.*
580 *AAAI Conf. Web Social Media*, 2015, pp. 426–435.
581 [24] P. Marsden, "Memetics and social contagion: Two sides of the same coin," *J.*
582 *Memetics: Evol. Models Inf. Transmiss.*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 171–185, 1998.
583 [25] S. Bindra, D. Sharma, N. Parameswar, S. Dhir, and J. Paul, "Bandwagon effect
584 revisited: A systematic review to develop future research agenda," *J. Bus. Res.*,
585 vol. 143, pp. 305–317, 2022.
586 [26] P.C. Verhoef et al., "Digital transformation: A multidisciplinary reflection and
587 research agenda," *J. Bus. Res.*, vol. 122, pp. 889–901, 2021.
588 [27] H. Yang, X. Shi, M. Y. Bhutto, and M. Ertz, "Do corporate social responsibility and
589 technological innovation get along? A systematic review and future research
590 agenda," *J. Innov. Knowl.*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2024, Art. no. 100462.
591 [28] N. Fitz, K. Kushlev, R. Jagannathan, T. Lewis, D. Paliwal, and D. Ariely, "Batching
592 smartphone notifications can improve well-being," *Comput. Hum. Behav.*,
593 vol. 101, pp. 84–94, 2019.
594 [29] W. Ning, O. Turel, and F. D. Davis, "Potential treatments of technology addiction:
595 Insights for information systems scholars," *Internet Res.*, vol. 35, no. 2,
596 pp. 860–881, 2025.
597 [30] K. Martin, "Ethical implications and accountability of algorithms," *J. Bus. Ethics*,
598 vol. 160, no. 4, pp. 835–850, 2019.
599 [31] C. Hayran and M. Ceylan, "Impact of social media brand blunders on brand trust
600 and brand liking," *Int. J. Market Res.*, vol. 65, no. 4, pp. 466–483, 2022.
601 [32] L. Molyneux and M. Coddington, "Aggregation, clickbait and their effect on
602 perceptions of journalistic credibility and quality," *Journalism Pract.*, vol. 14, no. 4,
603 pp. 429–446, 2020.
604 [33] J. Schwaeke, A. Peters, D. K. Kanbach, S. Kraus, and P. Jones, "The new normal:
605 The status quo of AI adoption in SMEs," *J. Small Bus. Manage.*, vol. 63, no. 3,
606 pp. 1297–1331, 2025.
607 [34] A. R. Doshi and O. P. Hauser, "Generative AI enhances individual creativity but
608 reduces the collective diversity of novel content," *Sci. Adv.*, vol. 10, no. 28, 2024,
609 Art. no. eadn5290.
610 [35] Macquarie Dictionary, "The committee's choice & people's choice for word of
611 the year 2020," 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://www.macquariedictionary.com.au/word-of-the-year/the-committees-choice-peoples-choice-for-word-of-the-year-2020/>

- 673 [36] AdAge, "Dubious distinction: BlackBerry is word of the year," 2006. [Online].
674 Available: <https://adage.com/article/adages/dubious-distinction-blackberry-word-year/112906>
- 675 [37] M. Canseco, "Canadian social media users report a worsening experience,"
676 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://researchco.ca/2024/01/10/social-media-Canada-2/>
- 677 [38] R. H. Perlis et al., "Irritability and social media use in US adults," *JAMA Netw.*
678 Open, vol. 8, no. 1, 2025, Art. no. e2452807.

681
682
683
684 **Alexander Serenko** received the Ph.D. degree in management information systems
685 from McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada, in 2005. He is currently a Professor of
686 management information systems with the Faculty of Business and Information Technology,
687 University of Ontario Institute of Technology, Oshawa, ON, and a Lecturer with the Faculty of
688 Information, University of Toronto, Toronto, ON. He has authored or coauthored more than 120
689 articles in refereed journals and received more than 15 000 citations. He is also included in
690 the list of the top 2% of the world's scientists. His research interests include scientometrics,
691 knowledge management, technology addiction, and implicit cognitive processes.
692
693
694
695
696
697
698
699
700
701
702
703
704
705
706
707
708
709
710
711
712
713
714
715
716
717
718
719
720
721
722
723
724
725
726
727
728

729
730
731
732
733
734
735
736
737
738
739
740
741
742
743
744
745
746
747
748
749
750
751
752
753
754
755
756
757
758
759
760
761
762
763
764
765
766
767
768
769
770
771
772
773
774
775
776
777
778
779
780
781
782
783
784