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**1. Neo test 120: In today's fast-paced world, companies expect employees to be able to handle multiple tasks and responsibilities at the same time. While a certain amount of multitasking is unavoidable, many neuropsychologists have expressed doubts about the benefits of encouraging workers to take on even more multitasking. Think about an example of multitasking in a workplace that might be problematic. Explain how your example of multitasking could be disadvantageous to an employee or their employer.**

Answer:

Personally speaking, I firmly advocate the idea that too much multitasking has adverse effects. To be more specific, consider a programmer who is involved with implementing several web pages at the same time that each of them has a unique set of variables and constants. Thus, too much switching between the tasks results in not completing any of the projects as desired. On the other hand, by serializing the tasks, the programmer can concentrate on a single task at a time and can finish them properly. While multitasking boosts the speed, it diminishes the quality. In addition, I totally agree with Claire's viewpoint about the cost of context switching when multitasking. Recent research demonstrates that multitasking is beneficial only when the cost of context-switch doesn't exceed the time spent on each task. An illustration of this concept can be seen in computers when CPU tries to run several applications at once. By doing so, the performance of CPU tangibly decreases which is noticeable by the user.
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**2. Neo test 121: As we've discussed, urbanization, or the shift in population from rural areas to cities, has many causes. Now, let's think about the effects of urbanization. Obviously, the increase in the number of people living in an area has a profound impact on the environment. But what about the impact on people who live in urban areas? In your opinion, does urbanization have a positive effect on city inhabitants? Why or why not?**

Answer:

Personally, I firmly advocate the idea that urbanization is beneficial for city inhabitants. One significant reason is that by different people gathering together in a shared area to settle, their proficiencies will be gathering together too. To be more specific, people living together gain a vast variety of skills to fulfill the demands of job market. Thus, they themselves are required to meet the demands of job market. In addition, dwellers will have abundant opportunities to expose their skills and get the close attention of numerous audiences. For example, consider an artist who cannot flourish in a village due to the restrictions and overlooked value of art in rural life. However, by immigrating to the cities, where art is valued properly, they can find appropriate customers for their art works. Although Kelly's viewpoint about over-urbanization and its catastrophic consequences is plausible at the first glance, it does not seem convincing after more throughout thinking, considering the fact that alongside the growth of the population, the job market demands inherently increase.
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