

Forbes / Entrepreneurs / [#GettingBuzz](#)

AUG 8, 2016 @ 02:27 PM 9,130 👁

59 Percent Of You Will Share This Article Without Even Reading It



Jayson DeMers, CONTRIBUTOR

I demystify SEO and online marketing for business owners. [FULL BIO](#) ▾

Opinions expressed by Forbes Contributors are their own.



[pexels.com](#)

Congratulations on being a part of the 41 percent. We all realize, perhaps intrinsically, that the nature of modern online interactions is a bit superficial. We've all been guilty of sharing an article we haven't actually read—or at least not all the way through—but few of us have attempted to quantify or consider the ramifications of this effect.

A recent study confirmed this phenomenon isn't in our heads; in fact, [59 percent of all links shared on social networks](#) aren't actually clicked on at all, implying the majority of article shares aren't based on actual reading. People are sharing articles without ever getting past the headlines. So why is this the case—isn't the body of an article supposed to be the most important part? What does this mean for content marketers? And what does this mean for our society?

Attention Spans and Effort

First, let's examine the motivations behind this phenomenon in the first place. Sharing an article is “supposed” to take place after a user has already clicked the link, read the article, and found it to be interesting or valuable (i.e., share-worthy). But there are two dimensions of online human behavior that make this difficult. The first is a factor of attention span; attention spans are at an all-time low, and most users make snap decisions about articles based on their first impressions, which happen to be headlines.

The second is a factor of effort. It takes considerably less time and effort to share an article than it does to actually read it. It also comes with greater rewards; sharing an article is likely to earn you attention from friends and social media followers, or demonstrate that you've read the article, whereas actually reading it doesn't earn you anything extrinsic.

The Power of a Headline

In April of 2014, NPR pulled a prank on its audience. It published an article titled [Why Doesn't America Read Anymore?](#), which wasn't really an article at all. Instead, when you clicked this article, you were met with instructions to like the post only, and not comment on it. The implication was that anyone who commented on the article certainly didn't actually read it—resulting in more than one layer of irony as social users (and proven non-readers) fervently commented their outrage at the idea that people were non-readers.

IFLScience.com recently conducted a similar experiment, publishing an article titled [Marijuana Contains “Alien DNA” From Outside Of Our Solar System, NASA Confirms](#). The article, as of now, has over 141,000 shares, and it isn't about marijuana or alien DNA at all – it's an experiment to see how many shares it could attract with an outrageous headline alone. IFLScience states within the post that “We here at IFLS noticed long ago that many of our followers will happily like, share, and offer an opinion on an article – all without ever reading it.”

Subscribe Now: Forbes Entrepreneurs & Small Business Newsletters

All the trials and triumphs of building a business – delivered to your inbox.

This is a perfect demonstration of the power of a headline in the modern era. Since users aren't paying as much attention to internal content, the strength and popularity of a piece sometimes comes down to the strength of its headline. In a read article, headlines are one of the most powerful contributors to performance, and in a non-read article, it's the only contributor to performance. As a result, headlines have become almost like articles in and of themselves.

LIFESTYLE

A Glass Of Red Wine Is The Equivalent To An Hour At The Gym, Says New Study

🕒 23/07/2015 14:33 | Updated 08 January 2017

8.5k



Daisy May Sitch



Digital & Social Media Manager

Love a good glass of vino but hate hitting the gym to work it off? This news will make your day.



Research conducted by the University of Alberta in Canada has found that health benefits in resveratrol, a compound found in red wine, are similar to those we get from exercise.

Red wine over a heavy session on the cross-trainer? Now that's something we can definitely get onboard with.

According to lead researcher, Jason Dyck, [these findings](#) will particularly help those who are unable to exercise. Resveratrol was seen to improve physical

performance, heart function and muscle strength in the same way as they're improved after a gym session.

"I think resveratrol could help patient populations who want to exercise but are physically incapable," he says.

"Resveratrol could mimic exercise for them or improve the benefits of the modest amount of exercise that they can do."

Discussion over the health benefits of red wine have been well documented. Studies have revealed that those who drink a glass of red wine a day are less likely to develop dementia or cancer, that it's good for your heart, anti-ageing and can [regulate blood sugar](#).

And now there's research backing that fact that it boosts heart rate? This is literally the best thing ever.

Though, let's be straight here - this is all in moderation, it only applies to red wine and the university's study was carried out on rats, not humans.

Still, if you want to up your intake of resveratrol? Try blueberries, peanut butter, red grapes and dark chocolate. Remember, a balanced diet is everything.

All about a healthy diet? Check out these 10 foods that will have your skin looking gorgeous and glowy in no time.

More: [Health & Wellbeing](#) [Wine](#)

[Suggest a correction](#)

Get up at least once every 30 minutes. Failure to do so may shorten your life, study finds



By **Melissa Healy**

SEPTEMBER 11, 2017, 4:50 PM

You can spend a lot of accumulated time on your bottom in the course of a day. Or you can sit for lengthy spells without a break.

Both, it turns out, are very bad for you.

Whether you're a heavy sitter or a binge-sitter, racking up prolonged sedentary time increases your risk of early death, according to a [study](#) published in Tuesday's edition of the *Annals of Internal Medicine*.

That conclusion held up even after researchers took account of mitigating factors, such as time spent exercising. Even for people who hit the gym after a long day in a desk chair, sitting can be deadly.

The findings led the study's authors to suggest that people who sit a lot should get up and move around every 30 minutes to counter the health risks that come with prolonged sedentary behavior.

The study team, led by [Columbia University](#) exercise researcher [Keith Diaz](#), tracked the movements of close to 8,000 Americans older than 45 by asking them to wear an accelerometer on their hip.

Over a period of 10 days, sitting or lounging behavior took up the equivalent of 12.3 hours over a 16-hour waking day — about 77%, on average.

That's a whole lot of sitting. But subjects differed in the extent to which they hunkered down for long stretches without getting up and moving around. When researchers measured the "bout length" of subjects' sitting spells, they found that 52% lasted less than a half-hour, 22% lasted between a half-hour and just under an hour, 14% lasted 60 to 89 minutes and 14% went on for more than 90 minutes.

After tracking subjects for four years, the researchers found that subjects who racked up the most time sitting were most likely to have died during the study period, and those who spent the least time sitting were least likely to have died. That was no surprise.

But when they looked at the death rates as a function of how often subjects went long hours without getting up, they saw a similar pattern: Those whose sitting bouts tended to be lengthier were more likely to have died than were those whose sitting spells tended to be shorter.

Make no mistake, the authors of the new research cautioned: “Accumulation of large volumes of sedentary time is a hazardous health behavior regardless of how it is accumulated.” But logging sedentary time in shorter bouts of sitting “is the least harmful pattern of accumulation.”

Study participants who racked up the most time in a chair tended to be older, were more likely to smoke, and were disproportionately African-American. They tended to be teetotalers, to have a higher [body-mass index](#), and were less likely to get much intentional exercise. They were also more likely to have diabetes, high blood pressure, worrisome cholesterol readings and a history of stroke, atrial fibrillation or coronary heart disease.

Such findings, of course, beg the question of which comes first — the immobility or the illness that leads to death

Get 3 months for ONLY \$1
Fall sale ends 9/22

SAVE NOW ›

imply causality,” University of Toronto cardiologist

But the findings of this prospective population-based study do fit with those of experimental studies. In trials involving humans sequestered in research labs, scientists have shown that racking up prolonged, uninterrupted bouts of sitting and lounging cause more worrisome short-term changes in metabolic and cardiovascular function than sedentary behavior that’s interrupted by periods of physical activity.

It only makes sense that those short-term changes translate over time to more profound changes in the risk for diseases linked to sedentary behavior, said [Dr. James A. Levine](#), an obesity expert at the Mayo Clinic who studies the health effects of sitting.

“If you’re sitting too much, you need to do something about it — like right now,” Levine said. “Unless you get moving now, you’re in trouble later.”

The finding that a workout will not undo the harms caused by prolonged sitting is unsurprising, Levine added.

“Even if you’re a gymgoer and think you’re safe on account of your excellent effort, you are not,” Levine said. “No one gets away from this stuff. ... Excess sitting, this study seems to suggest, is a death sentence.”

In his editorial, Alter worried that people intent on reversing patterns of sedentary behavior will have a lot on their plates.

To live longer, healthier lives “may require us to count the total number of hours we are sedentary per day, the total number of minutes we sit at a time, the total number of standing breaks we take per hour, the total number of steps we take per day, and the total metabolic equivalent of task-minute volume of exercise we achieve per week,” he wrote.

“Yikes! That sure is a lot of counting over the course of a lifetime — all to reverse the evolutionary patterns of a society gone lazy,” Alter added. “Might it not just be easier to return to our origins as hunters and gatherers?”

The New York Times | <https://nyti.ms/2h7f6m0>

WELL | LIVE

Gut Bacteria May Play a Role in Weight Loss

By NICHOLAS BAKALAR SEPT. 15, 2017

Whether a diet works might depend on which bacteria are in your gut.

Using feces samples, Danish researchers analyzed the ratio of two gut bacteria, *Prevotella* and *Bacteroides*, in 62 overweight people. For 26 weeks, they randomly assigned them to a low-fat diet high in fiber, fruits, vegetables and whole grains or a diet comparable to that of the average Dane.

Those on the high-fiber diet with a high *Prevotella* to *Bacteroides* ratio lost an average of 10.9 pounds of body fat, three and a half pounds more than those on the diet with a low ratio. Those on the regular diet with a high *Prevotella* ratio lost four pounds, compared with five and a half pounds for those with a low *Prevotella* ratio, a statistically insignificant difference.

The study is in *The International Journal of Obesity*.

The lead author, Mads F. Hjorth, an assistant professor at the University of Copenhagen, said that losing fat, and not muscle mass, is what is most meaningful to improved health.

Dr. Hjorth said that there has been a lot of promise in studying the microbiome, but little in the way of practical results.

“This finding is something that could really be used,” he said. Microbiome testing is not routinely available now, “but within a reasonable amount of time it might be a possibility.”

Correction: September 18, 2017

An earlier version of this article misstated the average amount of weight some study participants lost. It was 10.9 pounds, not 10 pounds.

A version of this article appears in print on September 19, 2017, on Page D4 of the New York edition with the headline: Dieting: Gut Bacteria and Weight Loss.

© 2017 The New York Times Company

New Scientist Live Limited VIP tickets remaining – Book now

DAILY NEWS 7 September 2017

Bats crash into windows because of a glitch with their 'sonar'



The greater mouse-eared bat has a habit of bumping into windows

Imagebroker/Rex/Shutterstock

By **Michael Le Page**

Windows are traps for fast-flying bats. As bats fly towards a building at an angle making echolocating clicks, the lack of echoes that come back from smooth vertical surfaces makes them appear as gaps.

“They think it’s an opening,” says Stefan Greif of the Max Planck Institute for Ornithology in Seewiesen, Germany.

There are many anecdotal reports of bats being found dead or injured near buildings with large windows, Greif says. But no one knows how many bats are killed this way, or if it is one of the reasons why many bat populations are declining.

However, bats’ inability to perceive smooth surfaces might partly explain why large numbers are being killed by the blades of wind turbines.

“I have always thought that bats have a hard time detecting these smooth blades,” says Greif. But the sheer speed at which the blades move is probably the main killer.

Bat-hit plates

Greif made the discovery by accident. In a 2010 study, he showed that bats perceive any smooth horizontal surface as water. This perception appears to be hardwired rather than learned – even juvenile bats that have never encountered water will repeatedly try to drink from a smooth metal plate.

Greif left some of the plates standing upright during these experiments, and noticed that bats tended to collide with them. Now he, Sándor Zsebők and their colleagues have done further experiments.

How does sound affect us? Find out at New Scientist Live in London

They got greater mouse-eared bats (*Myotis myotis*) to fly back and forth through a narrow tunnel. When a smooth metal plate was put on one side of the tunnel, 19 of the 21 bats collided with the plate at least once, although none were injured. But when the plate was flat on the floor of the tunnel, none hit it.

When Greif put similar plastic plates near three wild bat colonies, the bats also tended to collide with them.

A mirror for sound

To understand why bats have this problem, Greif says, think of the beam of sound emitted by bats as the equivalent of the beam of light from a torch. If you shine a torch at a mirror in the dark, you won't see any reflection unless you are directly in front of the mirror or very close to it.

Smooth surfaces are the acoustic equivalent of mirrors. And while bats instinctively know that a lack of echoes from below might be a still pond or lake, they appear to assume that vertical gaps are gaps.

“Over their evolutionary history, they did not meet any smooth vertical surfaces,” says Gareth Jones of the University of Bristol, UK. He says further studies should be done to find out how serious an issue this is. “It deserves closer attention.”

If buildings near important bat colonies are found to be death traps, Greif says, the number of bats being killed could be reduced by, say, installing acoustic bat deterrents. There are practical reasons for saving bats as well as ethical ones: bats are estimated to save farmers billions each year by consuming insect pests.

Journal reference: *Science*, DOI: 10.1126/science.aam7817

A shorter version of this article was published in *New Scientist* magazine on 16 September 2017

New Scientist Live Limited VIP tickets remaining – Book now

NEWS & TECHNOLOGY 19 September 2017

Lightning storms triggered by exhaust from cargo ships



Storms ahead

Matt Mawson/Getty

By **Lakshmi Supriya**

SHIPS spewing soot into the pristine ocean air are causing extra lightning strikes along busy maritime routes. It is a bizarre example of how human activities can change the weather.

When Joel Thornton at the University of Washington in Seattle and his colleagues looked at records of lightning strikes between 2005 and 2016 from the World Wide Lightning Location Network, they noticed there were significantly more strikes in certain regions of the east Indian Ocean and the South China Sea, compared with the surrounding areas. Unusually, they occurred along two straight lines in the open ocean, which coincided with two of the busiest shipping lanes in the world. Along these paths there were twice as many lightning strikes as in nearby areas.

“We were quite sure the ships had to be involved,” says Thornton. But they still had to eliminate

Try New Scientist today for less than \$2 a week | Available for a limited time only

×

Once these had been ruled out, the team concluded that aerosols from the ships' engine exhausts were the culprit. Aerosol particles act as seeds, around which water vapour condenses into cloud droplets. In clean air there aren't many seeds, so the cloud drops quickly grow and fall as rain.

But when there are a lot of seeds, like over busy shipping routes, a greater number of small cloud drops form. Since these are light, they rise up high into the atmosphere and freeze, creating clouds rich in ice.

It is this that leads to more intense thunderstorms: lightning only occurs if clouds are electrically charged, and this only happens if there are lots of ice crystals.

A key giveaway that aerosols were behind the effect was that the lightning was most pronounced at times of the year when powerful atmospheric convection currents form that can carry the aerosol particles high into the sky (*Geophysical Research Letters*, doi.org/cc7b).

Although lightning activity is higher over the shipping lanes, the amount of rainfall is no different to nearby regions.

While the study provides clear evidence that aerosol particles affect the development and intensity of storms, Thornton says it cannot be directly generalised to the air above land because there are other factors that need to be taken into account.

"Understanding this anthropogenic effect can help us predict future climate," says Orit Altaratz Stollar of the Weizmann Institute of Science in Israel.

The study shows how the changes we make to the atmosphere affect clouds and even the development of stormy weather. Thornton also suggests that the pollution we have released over the last few hundred years may have affected storms and lightning in many places, creating lightning where there was none.

This article appeared in print under the headline "Cargo ships trigger lightning storms"

Magazine issue 3144, due to be published 23 September 2017