Psychology and Behavioral Sciences
2026, Vol. 15, No. 3, pp. 46–57
https://doi.org/10.11648/j.pbs.20261503.13

SciencePG
Science Publishing Group

Research Article

Presence Without Attention: A Phenomenology of Distraction

Mohamed Zeinu Hassen*

Department of Social Sciences, Addis Ababa Science and Technology University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Abstract

Contemporary discourse treats distraction almost exclusively as a deficit: a failure of attention, a moral lapse, a symptom of technological overreach. This article argues that such a framing forecloses a more interesting phenomenological question, namely what kind of presence distraction itself constitutes. Drawing on Husserl's account of intentionality, Heidegger's analysis of falling and average everydayness, and Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology of the body, I develop an account of distraction not as absence but as a distinct mode of being-present-to-the-world, what I call dispersed or ambient presence. I argue that the body sustains a field of practical involvement even when explicit attention has migrated elsewhere, and that this split between bodily presence and attentional focus is not an aberration of consciousness but one of its basic structural possibilities. The second half of the article situates this phenomenological account within the contemporary attention economy, drawing on Bernard Stiegler's theory of tertiary retention to explain why digital environments do not merely capture attention but reorganize the very structure of retention and protention that makes sustained presence possible. I conclude by considering the ethical and existential stakes of a world engineered to produce distraction as a permanent condition, and by proposing that the antidote is not simply more attention but a recovery of what I call thick presence: an integration of bodily, temporal, and intentional dimensions of experience that mere concentration cannot by itself restore.

Keywords

Phenomenology, Attention, Distraction, Presence, Husserl, Heidegger, Merleau-Ponty, Stiegler

1. Introduction: The Paradox of Distracted Presence

There is a peculiar experience familiar to nearly everyone in a media-saturated world: one is in a room, ostensibly with another person, and yet one is not there. The body sits at the table; the eyes make intermittent contact; the voice produces appropriate murmurs of agreement. And yet something essential is missing. We say, in ordinary language, that the person is "not really here," or that they are "somewhere else." This description is not merely metaphorical. It expresses a genuine phenomenological puzzle: how can someone be bodily present and yet, in some significant sense, absent? And more puzzling still: how can this absent presence coexist with a kind of continuous, low-level engagement with the immediate environment, the capacity to notice when one's name is spoken, to react to a sudden noise, to keep from spilling one's coffee?

This article takes this everyday puzzle as an entry point into a phenomenological investigation of distraction. My aim is

*Correspondence: Mohamed Zeinu Hassen (Mohammed.zeinu@aastu.edu.et)

Received: 2 July 2026; **Accepted:** 11 July 2026; **Published:** 28 July 2026

not primarily diagnostic or moral. I am not interested, at least not in the first instance, in whether distraction is bad for us, though I will turn to that question near the end. I am interested in a prior question: what is the structure of consciousness and embodiment that makes distraction possible, and what does distraction reveal about the nature of presence itself?

The dominant cultural and even philosophical treatment of distraction assumes what I will call the deficiency model. On this view, distraction is a privation: attention is the norm, the achievement, the mark of a properly functioning mind, and distraction is simply attention's failure to occur or to be sustained. Distraction, on this model, has no positive phenomenological content; it is defined purely negatively, as an absence of the thing that matters. This assumption is doing significant work, both in popular discourse about technology and attention, and in more academic treatments within philosophy of mind and cognitive science, where distraction tends to appear as a topic only insofar as it interferes with executive function, task performance, or working memory.

I want to resist the deficiency model, not because distraction is unproblematic (it plainly is not) but because treating it purely as an absence prevents us from seeing what it actually is: a mode of experience with its own structure, its own temporality, and its own relationship to the body and the world. If we want to understand why contemporary digital environments are so effective at producing and sustaining distraction, and why this matters existentially and not merely in terms of productivity, we need an account of distraction that takes it seriously as a phenomenon in its own right, rather than as a mere shadow cast by the absence of attention.

A brief methodological note is in order before proceeding. The method employed throughout is descriptive phenomenology in the classical sense: an attempt to articulate the essential structures of a type of experience through careful reflective attention to that experience, rather than through empirical measurement or third-person experimental observation. This does not mean that empirical work on attention and distraction from cognitive psychology and neuroscience is irrelevant to the present inquiry; on the contrary, a fully adequate account would need to consider how the structures identified here relate to empirical findings on divided attention, task-switching costs, and the neural correlates of mind-wandering. But the relationship between phenomenological description and empirical explanation is not one of simple reduction in either direction. Phenomenology aims to clarify the structure of experience as it is lived, a structure that empirical findings must ultimately answer to if they are to count as explanations of anything recognizably called attention or distraction, while remaining agnostic, for the purposes of the present analysis, about the underlying neural or computational mechanisms that realize these structures. My claims in what follows are therefore claims about the essential, describable structure of distracted experience, not claims about its neurological implementation, though I take it that an adequate neuroscience of attention would need to be answerable to the phenomenological distinctions drawn here, on pain of simply changing the subject.

The argument proceeds in several stages. Section 2 examines how attention has been understood in the phenomenological tradition, focusing on Husserl's account of intentionality [1] and the structure of the perceptual field, Heidegger's analysis of falling and average everydayness [2], and Merleau-Ponty's account of the body as the vehicle of being-in-the-world [3]. Each of these thinkers, I argue, contains resources for an account of distraction that goes beyond the deficiency model, even though none of them develops such an account explicitly. Section 3 draws on these resources to articulate distraction as a positive phenomenon, characterized by what I call dispersed intentionality and ambient presence. Section 4 elaborates several modes of distracted presence that this framework makes visible. Section 5 turns to the technological conditions of contemporary distraction, drawing on Bernard Stiegler's account of tertiary retention [4, 5] to explain how digital media do not simply compete for a fixed quantity of attention but actively reshape the temporal structure of consciousness itself. Section 6 considers the ethical and existential stakes of this analysis, and Section 7 concludes.

2. Presence and Attention in Classical Phenomenology

2.1. Husserl: Intentionality and the Structure of Attention

Edmund Husserl's phenomenology begins from the thesis of intentionality: consciousness is always consciousness of something [1]. Every act of perceiving, remembering, imagining, or judging is directed toward an object, and this directedness is not an incidental feature of mental life but its defining structure. What is less often appreciated is that Husserl's account of intentionality already contains a sophisticated theory of attention, one that resists any simple identification of consciousness with a narrow beam of focal awareness.

In his analyses of passive synthesis [1], Husserl distinguishes between the thematic object of an act (the thing explicitly intended, the "theme" toward which the ego is directed) and the vast field of co-given, marginally conscious content that surrounds and supports that theme. When I look at a book on my desk, the book is thematic; but I am also marginally aware of the desk, the room, the ambient light, the sounds outside the window, and my own bodily posture. This marginal awareness is not unconsciousness. It is a mode of consciousness, what Husserl calls the "background" or "horizon," and it is structurally indispensable to the very possibility of thematic awareness. There is no focal attention without a horizon from which it stands out.

This point matters enormously for a phenomenology of dis-

traction, because it shows that even in the most focused, attentive state, consciousness is never simply identical with its thematic object. Attention is always attention against a background, and the relationship between theme and horizon is dynamic: what is marginal can become thematic, and what is thematic can recede into the margin, through a process Husserl calls the modification of attention [1]. Distraction, on this account, is not the introduction of some entirely foreign element into consciousness; it is a shift in the distribution of thematic and marginal awareness, a reorganization of the same field that also makes focused attention possible.

Husserl further distinguishes between the ego's "attentional ray," which can be directed voluntarily, and the passive affective pull exerted by objects in the field of experience prior to any voluntary act [1]. Certain contents "solicit" attention (they exercise what Husserl calls an affective allure) independent of the ego's decision to attend to them. A sudden movement in peripheral vision, an unexpected sound, a felt bodily discomfort: these draw the attentional ray toward themselves. This passive dimension of attention is crucial, because it shows that the shift from focus to distraction is frequently not a failure of will but a structural feature of a consciousness that is essentially responsive to its environment. To be the kind of being who can attend at all is to be the kind of being who is also, ineliminably, distractible.

What Husserl's analysis does not fully provide, however, is an account of what happens to the object from which attention has been withdrawn. Does it simply disappear from consciousness, or does it persist in some diminished but still operative form? This question becomes central once we turn to Heidegger and Merleau-Ponty, both of whom, in different ways, insist that the objects and involvements from which explicit attention withdraws do not vanish but continue to structure our comportment.

2.2. Heidegger: Falling, Absorption, and Average Everydayness

Martin Heidegger's existential analytic of Dasein in Being and Time [2] offers resources that, read against the grain, illuminate the structure of distraction more directly than Husserl's more static analysis of intentional content. Heidegger's Dasein is not primarily a subject that represents objects to itself; it is a being whose mode of existing is characterized by absorbed, practical involvement in a world of equipment and concernful dealing. The hammer is not, in everyday use, an object of contemplative attention; it is "ready-to-hand," used without being noticed, integrated into a seamless practical activity of building or repairing. Heidegger calls this mode of engagement Zuhandenheit, readiness-to-hand, and he argues that it is more fundamental than the detached, attentive stance of theoretical observation, which he calls Vorhandenheit, presence-at-hand, and which arises only when the smooth flow of practical absorption is interrupted (when the hammer breaks, or is missing, or gets in the way) [2].

This analysis already suggests that what we ordinarily call "attention" in the focal, thematic sense is a relatively rare and derivative achievement, arising against a background of absorbed coping that constitutes the normal mode of being-in-the-world. Most of what Dasein does, most of the time, it does without attending to it in any explicit sense (walking, typing, driving a familiar route, navigating a room). This absorbed coping is not distraction in the pejorative sense; it is skillful, competent engagement. But it does share with distraction the crucial feature of not requiring, and often actively excluding, thematic attention. Heidegger's account thus already destabilizes the assumption that attention is the default or achievement-mode of consciousness, from which distraction is a mere falling away [6].

Heidegger's concept of Verfallenheit, falling, adds a further dimension. Dasein, Heidegger argues, has a structural tendency to fall into absorption in the world of the "they" (das Man), into idle talk, curiosity, and ambiguity, modes of being that involve a kind of restless, superficial engagement with things and with others, without genuine appropriation or authentic understanding [2]. Curiosity (Neugier), in particular, is characterized by Heidegger as a mode of seeing that does not linger, that seeks novelty for its own sake, that moves restlessly from one thing to the next precisely in order to avoid dwelling with any one thing. "Curiosity is concerned with a constant possibility of distraction," Heidegger writes [2], describing a mode of Dasein's being that seeks not to understand what it encounters but merely to have encountered it, and then to move on. Idle talk (Gerede), correspondingly, involves speaking and being spoken to without any grounded relation to the matter under discussion; words circulate and are passed along without the kind of primary disclosure that would constitute genuine understanding [2].

What is significant here is that Heidegger describes falling not as an occasional lapse but as a structural, near-constant tendency of average everydayness. Distraction, in this Heideggerian sense, is not the exception to an attentive norm but one of the basic ways Dasein typically comports itself toward the world, alongside, and in tension with, the possibility of an authentic, resolute mode of existing in which Dasein takes hold of its own being. This suggests a picture in which distraction is not simply the absence of attention but a specific, characterizable mode of engagement: restless, oriented toward novelty, resistant to dwelling, and yet still fundamentally a way of being-in-the-world, still involving comportment, disclosure, and understanding, however superficial.

This matters for our purposes because it reframes the question we should be asking about distraction. Rather than asking why attention fails to occur, we should ask what kind of disclosure of the world curiosity and idle talk make possible, and what kind of presence they constitute. Heidegger gives us the beginning of an answer: falling discloses the world, but it discloses it as endlessly available for further curiosity, as something to be sampled rather than dwelled with. This is already a positive phenomenological characterization, not merely a

negative one.

2.3. Merleau-Ponty: The Body and the Field of Presence

If Husserl gives us the structure of the intentional field and Heidegger gives us the structure of absorbed and falling comportment, Maurice Merleau-Ponty gives us the crucial third element: an account of how the lived body sustains a field of presence that is irreducible to, and can come apart from, explicit conscious attention.

Merleau-Ponty's central contribution in the Phenomenology of Perception [3] is the concept of the body schema (schéma corporel), the pre-reflective, practical sense the body has of its own position, capacities, and possibilities for action, which operates prior to and independently of explicit representation. The body, for Merleau-Ponty, is not an object that consciousness represents to itself; it is the very medium through which the world is disclosed, "our general medium for having a world" [3]. The body "knows" where the limbs are, how to reach for a cup, how to navigate a familiar hallway in the dark, without this knowledge ever needing to become an explicit object of attention. Merleau-Ponty calls this capacity "motor intentionality," a form of directedness toward the world that operates through the body's practical grip on its situation rather than through cognitive representation [3].

This gives us exactly the resource we need to understand how bodily presence can persist even when attention has migrated elsewhere. The body's motor intentionality does not require, and is often disrupted by, explicit conscious attention. Merleau-Ponty describes cases in which the intrusion of reflective attention into an ordinarily skillful, absorbed bodily activity (for instance, thinking too hard about the placement of one's fingers while playing a musical instrument) actually degrades the performance [3]. The body's ordinary mode of operation is precisely a kind of non-attentive, practical presence, a "knowing how" that is closer to what he calls a "bodily intentionality" than to intellectual cognition.

Crucially, Merleau-Ponty's account of the body also encompasses what he calls the "intentional arc," the way the body projects around itself a whole field of possible actions and meanings (what he terms our "milieu") that remains operative even when we are not explicitly attending to any particular element within it [3]. When I sit in a room typing at a keyboard while thinking about something else entirely, my body continues to maintain what Merleau-Ponty would call a practical grip on the room: I remain oriented to the door, to the temperature, to the presence of other people, to the general shape of the space, even though none of this is thematic for me. This is precisely the phenomenon of ambient bodily presence that persists through and beneath explicit distraction.

Merleau-Ponty also gives us resources for understanding perceptual "attention" itself in a way that undercuts the sharp dichotomy between attending and not attending. For Merleau-Ponty, perception is not a passive registration of a fully determinate world followed by an active spotlighting of certain elements by attention. Rather, perceptual consciousness is itself always already a structuring, a Gestalt-forming activity in which figure and ground are constituted together [3]. Attention, on this view, does not simply illuminate a pre-given object; it participates in bringing the object to determinate perceptual presence, against a background that necessarily remains comparatively indeterminate. This means that what we call "the background," far from being unconscious or absent, is a genuine, if indeterminate, mode of perceptual presence, precisely the kind of presence that persists during distraction.

2.4. James's Fringe and the Stream of Thought

Although William James is not typically classified within the phenomenological tradition proper, his psychological analysis of consciousness in The Principles of Psychology [7] anticipates several of the structural insights later developed by Husserl and deserves brief mention here, both because of its historical proximity to phenomenology and because of the vividness with which it captures the phenomenon under discussion. James famously insists that consciousness does not come to us in discrete, well-defined units but as a continuous "stream," and that within this stream, the objects of thought are never given in isolation but always accompanied by what he calls a "fringe" or "psychic overtone," a felt sense of relations, tendencies, and contextual affiliations that surrounds every focal object of thought without itself becoming focal [7]. James's account of the fringe is strikingly close to Husserl's account of the horizon [1], developed independently and by a very different method, and its convergence with the phenomenological tradition lends further support to the idea that the co-presence of focal and marginal content is not a parochial thesis of one school of thought but a structural feature of consciousness recognized across quite different approaches to its description.

James also gives us an early and precise formulation of attention's selective character: our experience, he suggests, just is whatever we agree to attend to, and this act of agreement is inseparable from an active, sometimes effortful, turning of consciousness toward one among the many objects simultaneously present in the fringe of experience [7]. What James adds to the picture developed above is an emphasis on the effortful, voluntary dimension of sustained attention, what he calls "voluntary attention," which he distinguishes from the more passive, "reflex" or involuntary attention that responds automatically to sudden or intense stimuli. This distinction maps closely onto Husserl's later distinction between the voluntarily directed attentional ray and the passive affective solicitation of salient objects [1], and it suggests that the capacity for sustained, thematic presence to a single object or situation (precisely what I am calling thick presence) has always required a certain effort of will directed against the ordinary, fringe-sat-

urated flow of the stream of thought. Distraction, from a Jamesian perspective, is not an aberrant intrusion into an otherwise placid stream of undivided attention; it is closer to the default condition of the stream itself, from which sustained voluntary attention must be continually, effortfully secured.

Taken together, these thinkers give us the beginnings of an account in which presence is not a unitary phenomenon that is either fully "on" (attention) or fully "off" (distraction), but a layered, differentiated field with multiple simultaneous registers: thematic focus, marginal co-consciousness, absorbed practical coping, restless curiosity, and bodily motor intentionality. Distraction, I want to argue, is best understood not as the collapse of this field but as a particular redistribution within it, one in which thematic focus migrates away from the immediate practical or social situation while bodily and marginal presence remain operative. It is to this positive characterization that I now turn.

3. Distraction as a Phenomenon, Not a Deficiency

3.1. Redefining Distraction: Beyond the Failure Model

I want to propose the following working definition. Distraction is a mode of consciousness in which thematic, attentional directedness is oriented away from the situation in which the body is practically and perceptually embedded, while a marginal, ambient form of bodily and perceptual presence continues to operate within that situation. This definition has several important features that distinguish it from the deficiency model.

First, it treats distraction as involving two objects or situations rather than one. There is the situation from which attention has withdrawn (call this the host situation, the conversation, the room, the task at hand) and there is the situation, thought, memory, or anticipation toward which attention has migrated (call this the guest content). The deficiency model tends to focus exclusively on the host situation and describes distraction purely as a failure to attend to it. But this misses half the phenomenon: distraction is not merely a subtraction from the host situation, but an addition of thematic focus to the guest content. The distracted mind is not empty; it is full, but full of something other than what the practical situation calls for.

Second, the definition insists that the host situation is not phenomenologically abandoned but is maintained in a modified, marginal form. This is crucial, and it is precisely what the resources from Husserl, Heidegger, and Merleau-Ponty allow us to articulate [1, 2, 3]. The person who is bodily present at a dinner table while their attention is thematically absorbed in a text message they just received has not vanished from the dinner table. Their body continues to orient toward the other people at the table; they continue to register (marginally) the rhythm of the conversation; they remain capable of noticing when they are addressed directly, at which point what Husserl calls the affective pull of a salient stimulus can draw the attentional ray back to the host situation [1]. This capacity to be "recalled" to the host situation by a sufficiently salient event is itself evidence that the host situation was never simply absent from consciousness; it was present in a different mode.

Third, this definition allows us to see that the deficiency model's implicit standard of success (full, thematic, uninterrupted attention to the host situation) is not actually the norm of ordinary human experience even in the best of circumstances. As the discussion of Heidegger's Zuhandenheit [2] and Merleau-Ponty's motor intentionality [3] suggested, a great deal of ordinary competent engagement with the world takes place without full thematic attention, and indeed depends on the absence of such attention for its smooth functioning. The skilled driver who arrives home with no explicit memory of the drive has not failed to be present to the road; she has been present to it in the mode of absorbed coping, precisely the mode that Heidegger identifies as more fundamental than deliberate, attentive presence-at-hand [2]. It would be a mistake to describe this as "distraction" in the pejorative sense, and this points to an important distinction we must now draw between different modes of non-thematic presence.

3.2. The Dispersed Cogito

I want to introduce the notion of the dispersed cogito to capture what is distinctive about distraction as opposed to absorbed coping, on the one hand, and full thematic attention, on the other. Absorbed coping, as in Heidegger's account of using a hammer [2], involves a unified intentional arc: the skilled body and the practical task are integrated into a single, coherent field of activity, even though this activity does not require explicit thematic attention. There is no guest content competing with the host situation; there is simply a mode of engagement with the host situation that does not require thematisation.

Distraction, by contrast, involves what I am calling dispersal: the thematic ray of attention is captured by content that is discontinuous with, and often has no practical relation to, the host situation. The person scrolling through a social media feed while ostensibly listening to a lecture is not smoothly coping with the lecture in the way the skilled hammerer copes with the hammer; the lecture has become mere background noise, while a genuinely separate thematic content (photographs, messages, headlines) has captured the attentional ray. This is why distraction so often carries a phenomenological quality of fragmentation or splitting that absorbed coping does not: the subject experiences, however dimly, a felt tension between two competing calls on its attention, whereas the skilled coper experiences no such tension because there is only a single unified activity.

This notion of dispersal allows us to preserve what is right in the ordinary, pejorative sense of distraction (it does involve

something like a fracturing of unified presence) without collapsing back into the deficiency model, because the dispersed cogito is not merely a diminished or failed cogito. It is a specific structure: a doubling of intentional orientation, in which one strand remains tethered, however marginally, to the bodily and practical situation, while another strand is thematically absorbed elsewhere. The dispersed cogito is still, in an important sense, a unified subject (it is one and the same "I" who is marginally aware of the dinner table and thematically absorbed in the text message) but it is a subject whose unity is stretched across two registers of presence rather than concentrated in one.

This dispersal has its own characteristic temporal structure, which I will explore further in Section 5 by way of Stiegler [4, 5], but it is worth noting here that dispersal is not static. The relative salience of host situation and guest content fluctuates continuously; the attentional ray moves back and forth, sometimes smoothly, sometimes with a jarring, effortful quality, as when one has to consciously "pull oneself back" to the conversation one has ostensibly been part of the whole time. This oscillation is itself a distinctive phenomenological texture of distracted experience, one that differs qualitatively both from sustained thematic attention (which has a settled, continuous quality) and from absorbed coping (which has a seamless, unnoticed quality). Distracted presence has a flickering quality, a felt effort of partial returns and departures, and this flickering is, I want to suggest, one of the most characteristic marks of contemporary experience in media-saturated environments.

3.3. Distraction and Temporal Self-Constitution

The dispersed cogito, as characterized above, is not only a matter of divided intentional content; it also involves a distinctive modification of the temporal structure of experience. Husserl's analysis of internal time-consciousness [8] holds that every lived present is constituted through a threefold structure of primal impression (the strictly momentary now-phase), retention (the immediate, non-representational trailing-off of what has just occurred, which allows a melody to be heard as a melody rather than a sequence of disconnected tones), and protention (the corresponding anticipatory opening onto what is about to occur) [8]. This threefold structure is not a contingent feature of certain experiences but a condition for the possibility of any temporally extended experience whatsoever: without retention and protention, consciousness would be a mere succession of disconnected, punctate impressions rather than a continuous stream.

Distraction, understood through this Husserlian lens, involves a specific disruption of the coherence between the retentional-protentional structure appropriate to the host situation and the retentional-protentional structure appropriate to the guest content. When thematic attention migrates to the guest content, the subject begins to live within a new temporal horizon (anticipating the next line of the text message thread, retaining the previous exchange) while the temporal horizon proper to the host situation (the unfolding sentence of the conversation partner, the developing argument of the lecture) continues, but is no longer the horizon within which the subject's own protentions are primarily organized. This is why returning one's attention to the host situation after a period of distraction so often involves a palpable, if minor, experience of temporal disorientation: one must reconstruct, often through inference rather than direct retention, what has occurred in the interval, precisely because one's own retentional chain was, for that interval, organized around a different temporal object.

This point matters because it shows that distraction is not simply a spatial or topical phenomenon (a matter of which object one's attention is aimed at) but a temporal one, involving a genuine, if partial and reversible, migration of the subject's own stream of retention and protention away from the temporal unfolding of the host situation. It is this temporal dimension of distraction, more than its topical dimension, that Stiegler's analysis of tertiary retention allows us to illuminate most precisely [4], since what technical devices of attention capture principally exploit is not simply our interest in particular topics but the very rhythm of retention and protention through which the stream of consciousness organizes itself moment to moment. A notification does not merely present an interesting new topic; it interrupts an ongoing protentional arc and substitutes a new, typically shorter and more immediately resolving one, and it is this restructuring of temporal rhythm, repeated many times over the course of a day, that most decisively distinguishes contemporary technologically-mediated distraction from the more occasional, self-limiting forms of mind-wandering that have presumably always been part of human experience.

4. Modes of Distracted Presence

Building on the framework developed above, I want to distinguish several modes of distracted presence that are frequently conflated under the single heading of "distraction" but that in fact have distinct phenomenological structures.

4.1. Ambient Presence

The first mode is what I will call ambient presence: the persistence of a diffuse, non-thematic awareness of one's surroundings even while thematic attention is fully absorbed elsewhere. This is the mode most directly illuminated by Husserl's account of the horizon [1] and Merleau-Ponty's account of the body's practical grip on its milieu [3]. Ambient presence explains why a person deeply absorbed in a book on a train nonetheless has some registration of the train's movements, the announcements of stops, the presence of other passengers, registration sufficient to prompt appropriate action (standing up at the right stop) without ever requiring explicit, thematic attention to these things.

Ambient presence is not merely subliminal perception in the sense studied by cognitive psychology (that is, perception

below a threshold of conscious registration); it is, in the phenomenological sense, genuinely conscious, but conscious in a marginal rather than thematic mode. The phenomenological evidence for this is that ambient content can, under the right conditions, become thematic with remarkable speed and continuity (one does not need to "reconstruct" awareness of the train from scratch when the announcement calls for attention; one simply notices what one was already, marginally, aware of). This continuity between marginal and thematic awareness is precisely what distinguishes phenomenologically conscious ambient presence from genuinely unconscious processing.

4.2. Split Intentionality

The second mode is what I have already introduced as the dispersed cogito, and which I will now more precisely term split intentionality: the simultaneous thematic orientation toward two distinct contents, one of which typically corresponds to the guest content (the smartphone, the daydream, the intrusive worry) and one of which corresponds, in an attenuated but not merely marginal way, to the host situation. Split intentionality differs from mere ambient presence in that the host situation has not receded fully into the margin; it retains some degree of thematic salience, which is precisely what produces the felt tension, the sense of being "pulled in two directions," that is characteristic of much ordinary distraction. The parent who is texting while pretending to watch a child at the playground is not simply marginally aware of the child in the way one is marginally aware of ambient noise; there remains an anxious, semi-thematic monitoring that periodically demands fuller attention, producing the characteristic back-and-forth oscillation described above.

4.3. The Half-Turned Body

The third mode, which I will call the half-turned body, draws attention to a specifically embodied and often social dimension of distraction that is easy to overlook if one focuses only on the structure of intentional content. Bodies orient themselves toward what they are engaged with, and this orientation is itself expressive and perceptible to others, independent of what is occurring "internally." The half-turned body is the body whose orientation itself has become divided: shoulders angled partly toward a companion and partly toward a screen, eyes flicking between a conversation partner's face and a device, the whole postural configuration expressing, to any observer, a divided allegiance.

This mode matters because it shows that distraction is not merely a private, internal phenomenon but has an intersubjective, expressive dimension that is itself part of its phenomenological structure. The felt experience of being on the receiving end of someone's half-turned body (of sensing, correctly, that one has only partial bodily address) is a distinctive and increasingly common feature of contemporary social experience, and it cannot be fully captured by an account that treats distraction solely in terms of the distracted subject's own intentional structure. Following Merleau-Ponty's account of intercorporeality [3], the mutual, pre-reflective attunement of bodies to one another in shared situations, we can say that the half-turned body constitutes a specific breakdown or attenuation of intercorporeal attunement: the bodies remain co-present in space, but the reciprocal bodily address that normally characterizes face-to-face encounter is only partially sustained.

4.4. The Deferred Return

A fourth mode deserves separate treatment because it concerns not the synchronic structure of distracted experience but its characteristic temporal shape. I will call this mode the deferred return: the phenomenon whereby a subject registers, often quite explicitly, that their attention has wandered from a host situation, forms an intention to return to it, and yet postpones that return, sometimes repeatedly, while remaining aware throughout that the return is owed. This is a strikingly common feature of distraction in digital environments: one notices that one meant to be reading a document, or listening to a colleague, or writing a paragraph, and one forms the thought "in a moment" or "just one more," while continuing to attend to the guest content. What is distinctive about the deferred return is that it involves an explicit, thematic awareness of the very structure of split intentionality described in Section 4.2 (the subject is not merely dispersed but aware of being dispersed) and yet this awareness does not by itself occasion the return.

This mode is significant because it resists any purely voluntarist explanation of distraction's persistence. If distraction were simply a matter of insufficient awareness of one's own divided state, then the deferred return would be self-correcting: noticing the deferral would suffice to end it. But the phenomenology of the deferred return suggests otherwise. The intention to return coexists with a continued, if uneasy, absorption in the guest content, in a manner that recalls Jean-Paul Sartre's analysis of bad faith [9], in which a subject holds two attitudes toward the same situation without either fully collapsing into the other. The deferred return is, in this sense, not merely a cognitive lapse but a lived, temporally extended structure with its own characteristic phenomenology of mild, recurring self-reproach, one that is arguably a distinctive existential signature of habitual engagement with environments engineered for continuous partial engagement, a point to which the discussion of Stiegler in Section 5 will give further precision [5].

5. Technology and the Architecture of Attention

5.1. Stiegler and Tertiary Retention

The phenomenological analysis developed so far describes

a structure that is, in principle, available to any embodied, temporal consciousness, independent of any particular technological environment. But it is obvious that contemporary digital technologies have transformed both the frequency and the character of distracted experience in ways that call for further analysis. Here the work of Bernard Stiegler [4, 5, 10], who develops and radicalizes Husserl's analysis of time-consciousness in dialogue with the anthropology of technics, is especially illuminating.

Husserl's analysis of internal time-consciousness [8] distinguishes between primary retention (the immediate, non-representational holding-onto of what has just occurred, which is constitutive of the experience of a temporally extended present, as when we hear a melody as a melody rather than as a series of disconnected tones) and secondary retention, or recollection (the representational recall of a past experience as past) [8]. Stiegler adds a third category: tertiary retention, the technical exteriorization of memory in artifacts (writing, photography, film, and now digital recording and algorithmic curation) that did not themselves live through the originary experience but that nonetheless condition how we retain and access the past [4].

Stiegler's crucial claim is that tertiary retention is not a neutral supplement to a prior, technologically unconditioned consciousness; rather, the availability of technical memory devices actively shapes primary and secondary retention themselves, because it shapes what is deemed worth attending to, worth remembering, and worth anticipating in the first place [4]. This is Stiegler's radicalization of Husserl: consciousness, for Stiegler, is always already technically conditioned; there is no pure, pre-technical time-consciousness to which we might return [4].

Applied to the phenomenology of distraction, Stiegler's analysis suggests that contemporary digital environments do not simply compete for a pre-existing, fixed quantity of attention, as the popular metaphor of the "attention economy" implies. Rather, they actively reorganize the structures of retention and protention (Husserl's term for the anticipatory horizon of the present, our expectation of what is about to occur) that make sustained thematic presence possible in the first place [8]. The notification, the infinite scroll, the autoplay function: these are not simply objects competing with other objects for a spotlight of attention that could, in principle, remain fixed elsewhere. They are engineered specifically to exploit and reshape the passive affective solicitation that Husserl identified as one root of attentional capture [1], and to habituate consciousness to a protentional structure of constant, low-level anticipation of the next stimulus.

Stiegler's concept of "grammatization" (the process by which flows of consciousness and behavior are progressively discretized, formalized, and made technically reproducible) is directly relevant here [5]. Just as writing grammatized speech and industrial technics grammatized the gestures of manual labor, contemporary digital platforms grammatize attention itself: they break the flow of experience into discrete, quantifiable, capturable units (the "like," the notification, the completed video view) that can be optimized for and extracted as economic value. The result, Stiegler argues, is a kind of systemic short-circuiting of what he calls l'esprit, a term encompassing both mind and spirit, in which the long circuits of attention formation that depend on patience, apprenticeship, and what he calls "long-duration" retention (the kind cultivated by sustained reading, extended conversation, or artistic practice) are increasingly displaced by short circuits optimized for immediate, quantifiable engagement [5, 10].

5.2. The Attention Economy as Phenomenological Environment

It follows from this analysis that we should be cautious about a purely individualist or voluntarist framing of distraction, according to which distraction is simply a matter of an individual's insufficiently disciplined will. The phenomenological structures described in Sections 3 and 4 (ambient presence, split intentionality, the half-turned body) are not themselves pathological; they are structural possibilities of embodied, temporal consciousness. What has changed in the contemporary environment is the systematic, engineered exploitation of these structural possibilities by technologies explicitly designed, tested, and optimized (often through direct application of behavioral psychology, including variable-ratio reinforcement schedules borrowed from the design of gambling technology) to maximize the frequency and duration of split intentionality and to weaken the phenomenological "pull" of the host situation relative to the guest content [11].

This reframing has significant implications. If distraction were simply a failure of individual attention, the appropriate response would be individual: greater willpower, better habits, digital "detox." These responses are not without value, but the phenomenological and technical analysis developed here suggests that they address only the individual pole of what is, in fact, a co-constituted phenomenon involving both the structural possibilities of consciousness and an environment specifically engineered to actualize certain of those possibilities in a directed, monetized way [5]. An adequate response to contemporary distraction, on this view, needs to address the technical and institutional conditions of tertiary retention (the design of platforms, the business models that reward the capture of attention, the absence of institutional supports for what Stiegler calls long-circuit attention formation) and not only the individual comportment of the distracted subject [10].

5.3. Convergence with Empirical Findings on Mind-Wandering

It is worth noting, briefly, that the phenomenological structure articulated in this article finds a measure of independent corroboration in empirical psychology, even though the two approaches proceed by very different methods and answer to

different standards of evidence. Empirical research on mind-wandering, notably the work associated with the "default mode network" in cognitive neuroscience, has established that task-unrelated thought is not a rare or pathological aberration but occupies a very substantial proportion of waking mental life, occurring, by some estimates, during close to half of an ordinary day's waking hours across a range of tasks [12, 13]. This convergent empirical finding (that the mind spontaneously and frequently generates task-unrelated thought even during effortful tasks) lends indirect support to the Jamesian and Heideggerian claim that something like restless, fringe-generated or curiosity-driven movement of thought is a default tendency of consciousness rather than an occasional lapse from an attentive norm.

Equally suggestive is empirical work distinguishing "task-unrelated thought with awareness" from task-unrelated thought that occurs without the subject's noticing that their mind has wandered at all [13], a distinction that maps with some precision onto the difference drawn in Section 4 between split intentionality, in which the host situation retains some thematic salience and the subject is aware of the pull toward the guest content, and a deeper form of dispersal in which the host situation recedes so far into the margin that the subject has, for a period, no awareness at all of having left it, only later "catching" themselves, as one catches oneself at the bottom of a page whose content one cannot report. This is not offered as a claim that phenomenology and cognitive science are describing identical objects by different means, since the methods, aims, and standards of evidence of the two approaches remain distinct; rather, it is offered as evidence that the phenomenological distinctions drawn here are not artifacts of a particular philosophical vocabulary but pick out structural features of distracted experience that are independently traceable by other methods of investigation.

6. Toward a Phenomenology of Distraction

6.1. Distraction as a Mode of Being-With

One further dimension deserves emphasis before we turn to the ethical stakes of this analysis: distraction's relation to what Heidegger calls Mitsein, being-with-others [2], and what Merleau-Ponty analyzes as intercorporeality [3]. Much everyday distraction occurs in social contexts, and its phenomenological texture is inseparable from its intersubjective dimension. The half-turned body described in Section 4.3 is a specifically social phenomenon: its distinctive felt quality, for both the distracted person and their companion, depends on the fact that human beings are, prior to any explicit judgment, attuned to one another's bodily orientation as an expression of care, interest, and address [3].

This suggests that an adequate phenomenology of distraction cannot remain at the level of an isolated subject's intentional structure; it must attend to the ways in which distraction disrupts, modifies, or partially sustains intersubjective attunement. When two people share a meal while each is split between the other and a device, what results is not simply two instances of individually dispersed cogito occurring in parallel, but a modified form of shared situation, one in which the mutual solicitation that would ordinarily draw each toward fuller engagement with the other is itself weakened by the competing solicitation of each person's respective device. There is a mutual withdrawal here that is qualitatively different from either person's distraction considered in isolation, and this suggests that contemporary technologically-mediated distraction has a genuinely social phenomenology, not merely an aggregation of individual phenomenologies.

This social dimension also helps explain why the experience of being on the receiving end of another's distraction so often carries a distinctive affective charge (a mild but unmistakable sting of diminishment) that would be difficult to account for on a purely individualist model of attention as an internal cognitive resource. If attention were simply a private allocation of cognitive bandwidth, there would be no obvious reason why its withdrawal by another should feel like anything at all, still less like a small wound. But if, as the account of intercorporeality suggests, our very sense of being addressed and regarded by another is constituted intersubjectively, in and through the reciprocal attunement of embodied subjects [3], then the withdrawal of another's thematic regard is not merely the absence of a cognitive process occurring elsewhere in their head; it is a modification of a shared, jointly constituted situation, one whose diminishment we are positioned, by our own intercorporeal sensitivity, to register directly and often painfully.

6.2. Ethical and Existential Implications

What, finally, are we to make of all this? I have resisted, throughout, treating distraction simply as a moral or practical failing, insisting instead on taking seriously its positive phenomenological structure. But this should not be mistaken for a claim that distraction is existentially or ethically neutral. The analysis developed here in fact gives us more precise resources for understanding what is at stake in contemporary distraction than the deficiency model does, precisely because it identifies what is lost not merely in quantitative terms (less attention paid) but in qualitative, structural terms.

What chronic, technologically engineered split intentionality threatens is not attention per se but what I want to call thick presence: a mode of engagement with a situation, a task, or another person in which bodily orientation, marginal awareness, and thematic focus are integrated into a single, coherent intentional arc, of the kind Heidegger describes in absorbed coping [2] and Merleau-Ponty describes in skilled bodily engagement [3]. Thick presence is not the same as intense, ef-

fortful concentration; indeed, as we have seen, the most skillful and integrated forms of engagement often involve a kind of easy, non-effortful absorption rather than strained attention. What thick presence requires is precisely the absence of a competing, discontinuous guest content pulling the thematic ray away from the host situation, not the total suppression of ambient or marginal awareness, which, as Husserl shows [1], is a structural condition of any experience whatsoever.

The existential stakes of the loss of thick presence become clearer if we recall Heidegger's analysis of falling as a flight from a more authentic, resolute relation to one's own being [2]. Heidegger is careful to insist that falling is not simply a moral failing to be overcome once and for all, but a structural, persistent tendency of Dasein that authentic existence must continually wrest itself from. Applied to contemporary technological distraction, this suggests that the proliferation of engineered split intentionality does not introduce an entirely new existential possibility so much as it systematically reinforces and amplifies a tendency (curiosity, idle talk, the restless movement from one stimulus to the next) that was already structurally available to Dasein [2], but that now finds itself supported by an entire technical and economic infrastructure explicitly optimized to sustain it [5]. What was, for Heidegger, a possibility to be resisted through individual resoluteness now confronts individuals as a systematically engineered environmental default, which raises the stakes of resistance considerably.

This also suggests why purely individual responses to distraction (willpower, mindfulness practices, digital detoxes) while not without value, are unlikely to be sufficient on their own. If the phenomenological structures being exploited (passive affective solicitation, the ease of split intentionality, the restless movement of curiosity) are basic structural possibilities of consciousness rather than individual failings, and if the technical environment is specifically engineered to actualize these possibilities at scale, then an adequate response requires attention to the design and political economy of the technologies themselves, and not merely to the character or discipline of the individuals who use them [5]. Stiegler's own later work moves increasingly in this direction, calling for what he terms a politics of technics, oriented toward the cultivation of what he calls "long circuits" of attention and desire through education, institutional design, and the deliberate cultivation of practices (reading, apprenticeship, sustained collective deliberation) that resist grammatization into short, exploitable units [10].

None of this is to say that distraction should or could be eliminated entirely, nor would that be desirable even if possible; as we have seen, marginal and ambient awareness, and even a degree of restless curiosity, are not merely tolerable features of consciousness but constitutive ones. The aim is not a utopia of perpetual thematic focus (itself an incoherent goal given the structure of the intentional field) but a recovery of the conditions under which thick presence remains genuinely available as a possibility, rather than being structurally and systematically undermined by an environment optimized against it.

6.3. Attention as an Ethical Capacity

The stakes of this discussion become sharper still if we consider a tradition that treats attention not merely as a cognitive resource but as a moral and even spiritual capacity. Simone Weil's remark that attention, taken to its highest and rarest degree, is the same thing as prayer, and that it constitutes a form of generosity toward the person or thing attended to [14], is often quoted but rarely examined for its phenomenological content. What Weil is pointing to, I want to suggest, is precisely what this article has called thick presence: a mode of engagement in which the object of attention (and paradigmatically, for Weil, another suffering person) is allowed to appear in its own terms, undistorted by the anticipations, projects, and self-concerned preoccupations of the one attending [14]. Weil describes this as a kind of active waiting, a suspension of the ordinary, acquisitive movement of the mind toward its habitual objects, in order to make room for something genuinely other to appear.

This ethical framing adds an important dimension to the analysis developed here. If split intentionality and the half-turned body are, as I have argued, modes in which the host situation (which is very often another person) is granted only a diminished, marginal form of presence, then chronic technologically-amplified distraction is not merely an epistemic or practical shortcoming but an ethical attenuation: a systematic reduction in our capacity to grant to others the kind of undivided regard that Weil identifies with the highest form of attention [14]. This does not mean that every instance of split intentionality is a moral failing (much ordinary social life proceeds perfectly well with only partial, ambient mutual awareness, and it would be both impossible and undesirable to demand undivided thematic attention in every encounter). But it does suggest that an environment which systematically narrows the occasions on which thick presence to another person remains available, by continuously offering a more immediately gratifying guest content, poses a genuine ethical cost, one best understood not in terms of rule violation but in terms of a diminished capacity for a specific and valuable form of regard for others.

6.4. Limitations and Directions for Further Inquiry

Several limitations of the present analysis should be acknowledged, both to circumscribe its claims appropriately and to indicate directions for further work. First, the analysis has proceeded largely through the description of paradigm cases (the dinner table, the lecture hall, the train carriage) that are drawn from a broadly contemporary, technologically saturated, and culturally specific range of experience. A fuller phenomenology of distraction would need to consider whether

the structures identified here (ambient presence, split intentionality, the half-turned body, the deferred return) are genuinely invariant structures of consciousness as such, or whether they are themselves partly shaped by the historical and cultural conditions from which the present analysis draws its examples. Heidegger's own methodological caution [2], that the analytic of Dasein must guard against covertly universalizing what is in fact a historically specific mode of being, applies with equal force here.

Second, the relationship between the phenomenological analysis offered here and the empirical literature on attention, while gestured toward in Section 5.3, deserves much fuller treatment than can be provided within the scope of this article. In particular, the relationship between what phenomenology describes as marginal or fringe consciousness and what cognitive science describes in terms of pre-attentive processing, implicit memory, or unconscious perception, remains a live and contested question, one on which phenomenologists and cognitive scientists have not achieved anything like consensus [12, 13]. The present article has proceeded on the assumption that phenomenological description picks out genuine structures of experience that are not simply reducible to, but also not wholly independent of, the processes studied by cognitive science; a fuller treatment would need to defend this assumption in more detail than space here permits.

Third, the ethical analysis offered in Section 6.3, drawing on Weil [14], gestures toward a normative conclusion (that chronic technologically-amplified distraction constitutes a genuine ethical cost) without fully developing the normative framework within which such a claim would need to be assessed. Whether this cost is best understood in the vocabulary of virtue ethics, as a diminished capacity for a specific excellence of character; in the vocabulary of a phenomenologically inflected care ethics, as an attenuation of our responsiveness to the claims others make upon us; or in some other normative register entirely, is a question this article has deliberately left open, in the interest of establishing the underlying phenomenological structure before attempting to adjudicate between competing normative articulations of its significance.

Finally, the analysis of technology in Section 5 has focused primarily on Stiegler's account of tertiary retention and grammatization [4, 5], to the relative neglect of other philosophical approaches to technology that would also repay engagement here, notably Don Ihde's postphenomenological analysis of human-technology relations [15], which offers a more fine-grained typology of the ways technologies mediate perception and action than Stiegler's account by itself provides. A fuller treatment would situate the analysis of distraction within this broader postphenomenological literature, examining in particular how different technologies of attention capture (the smartphone notification, the autoplaying video, the algorithmically curated feed) might correspond to different modes of human-technology relation in Ihde's typology [15], with correspondingly different phenomenological profiles of distraction.

7. Conclusion

I have argued that distraction should not be understood merely as the absence or failure of attention, but as a positive phenomenon with its own structure: a dispersal of the intentional field in which thematic focus migrates from a host situation to discontinuous guest content, while a marginal, ambient, and bodily form of presence continues to operate within the host situation. Drawing on Husserl's account of the horizon and passive affection, Heidegger's analysis of absorbed coping and falling, and Merleau-Ponty's phenomenology of the body and intercorporeality, I have distinguished several modes of distracted presence (ambient presence, split intentionality, and the half-turned body) that reveal distraction to be a differentiated, structured phenomenon rather than a simple deficiency.

I have also argued, drawing on Stiegler's theory of tertiary retention, that contemporary digital technologies do not merely compete for a fixed quantity of attention but actively reorganize the temporal and technical conditions of retention and protention, systematically exploiting and amplifying structural possibilities of consciousness that phenomenology allows us to identify with some precision. This suggests that an adequate response to contemporary distraction must address both the individual and the technical-institutional dimensions of the phenomenon, and that what is ultimately at stake is not attention considered as a scarce cognitive resource, but thick presence: an integrated mode of bodily, temporal, and intentional engagement with the world and with others that chronic, engineered split intentionality threatens to make structurally unavailable.

If this analysis is correct, it suggests a reorientation of both philosophical and practical inquiry into distraction. Philosophically, it suggests that phenomenology has more to contribute to our understanding of contemporary technological life than is often recognized, precisely because its patient attention to the structure of lived experience allows us to see distinctions (between ambient presence and split intentionality, between absorbed coping and dispersed cogito, between attention as a scarce resource and presence as a structured field) that are invisible to accounts operating with a simpler, binary model of attention and its absence. Practically, it suggests that the question we should be asking is not simply "how can we pay more attention?" but "what forms of technical, institutional, and social life make thick presence possible, and what forms systematically undermine it?" This is a question that exceeds the resources of individual self-discipline alone, and one that calls, ultimately, for a renewed and explicitly phenomenological engagement with the design of the technical environments in which contemporary consciousness increasingly, and perhaps irreversibly, finds itself.

There is, finally, something worth preserving in the ordinary language with which this article began: the observation that a bodily present person can nonetheless be, in some important sense, "not really here." What this article has tried to

show is that this ordinary observation, far from being a loose or merely metaphorical way of speaking, tracks a genuine and describable structure of experience, one with its own varieties, its own temporal shape, and its own ethical weight. To say that presence can come apart from attention is not to say that presence, in such cases, disappears; it is to say that presence is more layered, more differentiated, and more fragile than a simple binary of attending and not-attending can capture. Recovering the conditions for thick presence, in a world increasingly organized around the profitable capture of its opposite, may be among the more pressing, if underappreciated, philosophical tasks of the present moment, one for which phenomenology, with its patient fidelity to the textures of lived experience, remains an indispensable resource.

Author Contributions

Mohamed Zeinu Hassen: Conceptualization, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflicts of interest.

References

[1] Husserl, E. (2001). Analyses Concerning Passive and Active Synthesis: Lectures on Transcendental Logic (A. J. Steinbock, Trans.). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

[2] Heidegger, M. (1962). Being and Time (J. Macquarrie & E. Robinson, Trans.). Oxford: Blackwell. (Original work published 1927).

[3] Merleau-Ponty, M. (2012). Phenomenology of Perception (D. A. Landes, Trans.). London: Routledge. (Original work published 1945).

[4] Stiegler, B. (1998). Technics and Time, 1: The Fault of Epimetheus (R. Beardsworth & G. Collins, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

[5] Stiegler, B. (2010). Taking Care of Youth and the Generations (S. Barker, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

[6] Dreyfus, H. L. (1991). Being-in-the-World: A Commentary on Heidegger's Being and Time, Division I. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

[7] James, W. (1890). The Principles of Psychology. New York: Henry Holt and Company.

[8] Husserl, E. (1991). On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time (1893–1917) (J. B. Brough, Trans.). Dordrecht: Kluwer.

[9] Sartre, J.-P. (1956). Being and Nothingness: An Essay on Phenomenological Ontology (H. E. Barnes, Trans.). New York: Philosophical Library. (Original work published 1943).

[10] Stiegler, B. (2013). Uncontrollable Societies of Disaffected Individuals: Disbelief and Discredit, Volume 2 (D. Ross, Trans.). Cambridge: Polity Press.

[11] Crawford, M. B. (2015). The World Beyond Your Head: On Becoming an Individual in an Age of Distraction. New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

[12] Killingsworth, M. A., & Gilbert, D. T. (2010). A wandering mind is an unhappy mind. Science, 330(6006), 932.

[13] Schooler, J. W., et al. (2011). Meta-awareness, perceptual decoupling and the wandering mind. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 15(7), 319-326.

[14] Weil, S. (1951). Waiting for God (E. Craufurd, Trans.). New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

[15] Ihde, D. (1990). Technology and the Lifeworld: From Garden to Earth. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Biography

Mohammed Zeinu Hassen is a lecturer in the Department of Social Sciences at Addis Ababa Science and Technology University in Ethiopia. His research focuses on Continental Philosophy, Ethiopian Philosophy, Comparative Philosophy, and the philosophy of technology, with recent publications examining artificial intelligence, ethics, and education. The present article emerges from his continuing interest in phenomenology and its capacity to illuminate the structures of attention, distraction, and presence in digitally saturated environments.

Research Field

Mohammed Zeinu Hassen: Continental Philosophy, Phenomenology, Ethiopian Philosophy, Comparative Philosophy and Religion, Philosophy of Technology, Ethics of Artificial Intelligence, Multiculturalism, Political Philosophy, Philosophy of Education, and Attention and Digital Culture.