

Background

Everyday people multitask at hon and at work. Despite its prevalence, decades of research have shown that there are significant cognitive limitations associated with multitasking behavior, most notably the significantly increased response times (Sanbonmatsu et al., 2013)

Additionally, research has repeatedly shown that there is general tendency for individuals believe that they have above average abilities to multitask (McKenna, 1993). In the context driving, multitasking can be fata

Purpose

The proposed research seeks to examine the effectiveness of using a traditional computer-based task-switching paradigm versus a driving simulator intervention in an attempt to enlighten drivers about their actual multitasking skills, thus challenging their previously held beliefs and decreasing overconfidence.

Heightening Awareness about Our Inability to Effectively Multitask

Claire Bowman-Callaway, Sydney Tetzlaff & Dr. Stephanie Payne

	Resu	Its	
The current results alone does NOT rec	suggest that duce overcor abilitie	t an online mu fidence in one	ltitask e's mul
Paired <i>t</i> -tests revealed ability compared to o and self-efficacy did no	that mean sco ther college st t differ betwee	ores of self-repor udents, the gene en time 1 and tin	rted mu eral pop ne 2 for
control group and t	he experiment	al group. (See Ta	ables 1 a
Control group and t Table 1 Comparison of Pre- and P	he experiment	ontrol Group	ables 1 a
Control group and t Table 1 Comparison of Pre- and F Variable	he experiment Post- Means for the Co Pre- Mean (SD)	ontrol Group Post- Mean (SD)	ables 1 and the second
Control group and t Table 1 Comparison of Pre- and F Variable MT College Students MT College Students	he experiment Post- Means for the Co Pre- Mean (SD) 54.83 (19.32)	ontrol Group Post- Mean (SD) 54.43 (22.42)	ables 1 <i>t</i> value 08
Control group and t Table 1 Comparison of Pre- and P Variable MT College Students MT General Population MT Salf Efficiency	Post- Means for the Co Pre- Mean (SD) 54.83 (19.32) 56.43 (24.09)	ontrol Group Post- Mean (SD) 54.43 (22.42) 53.74 (21.05)	ables 1 <i>t</i> value 08 .54 .54
Control group and tTable 1Comparison of Pre- and FVariableMT College StudentsMT General PopulationMT Self-Efficacy	Post- Means for the Co Pre- Mean (SD) 54.83 (19.32) 56.43 (24.09) 2.87 (.86)	ontrol Group Post- Mean (SD) 54.43 (22.42) 53.74 (21.05) 2.78 (.85)	ables 1 <i>t</i> value 08 .54 .58
control group and tTable 1Comparison of Pre- and PVariableMT College StudentsMT General PopulationMT Self-Efficacy $*p < .05. **p < .01$ Note: $MT = multitasking$,	he experiment Post- Means for the Co Pre- Mean (SD) 54.83 (19.32) 56.43 (24.09) 2.87 (.86) N=23.	al group. (See Ta <i>Introl Group</i> <u>Post- Mean (SD)</u> 54.43 (22.42) 53.74 (21.05) 2.78 (.85)	ables 1 <i>t</i> value 08 .54 .58
control group and tTable 1Comparison of Pre- and PVariableMT College StudentsMT General PopulationMT Self-Efficacy $*p < .05. **p < .01$ Note: $MT =$ multitasking,Table 2Comparison of Pre- and P	Post- Means for the Concern Pre- Mean (SD) 54.83 (19.32) 56.43 (24.09) 2.87 (.86)	ontrol Group Post- Mean (SD) 54.43 (22.42) 53.74 (21.05) 2.78 (.85)	ables 1 : <i>t</i> value 08 .54 .58
control group and tTable 1Comparison of Pre- and PVariableMT College StudentsMT General PopulationMT Self-Efficacy $*p < .05. **p < .01$ Note: $MT =$ multitasking,Table 2Comparison of Pre- and PVariable	he experiment Post- Means for the Co Pre- Mean (SD) 54.83 (19.32) 56.43 (24.09) 2.87 (.86) N=23. Post- Means for the Ex Pre- Mean (SD)	ontrol Group Post- Mean (SD) 54.43 (22.42) 53.74 (21.05) 2.78 (.85)	ables 1 <i>t</i> value 08 .54 .58 <i>t</i> value
control group and tTable 1Comparison of Pre- and PVariableMT College StudentsMT General PopulationMT Self-Efficacy $*p < .05. **p < .01$ Note: $MT =$ multitasking,Table 2Comparison of Pre- and PVariableMT College Students	Pre- Means for the Concernment Pre- Mean (SD) 54.83 (19.32) 56.43 (24.09) 2.87 (.86) N=23. Pre- Mean (SD) 64.00 (23.43)	al group. (See Ta <u>ontrol Group</u> <u>Post- Mean (SD)</u> 54.43 (22.42) 53.74 (21.05) 2.78 (.85) <u>perimental Group</u> <u>Post- Mean (SD)</u> 58.76 (21.28)	ables 1 a <i>t</i> value 08 .54 .58 <i>t</i> value 1.54
control group and tTable 1Comparison of Pre- and FVariableMT College StudentsMT General PopulationMT Self-Efficacy* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$ Note: $MT = multitasking$,Table 2Comparison of Pre- and FVariableMT College StudentsMT General Population	Prest Means for the Construction Prest Means (SD) 54.83 (19.32) 56.43 (24.09) 56.43 (24.09) 2.87 (.86) N=23. N=23. Prest Means for the Experimental (SD) 64.00 (23.43) 62.36 (25.29)	al group. (See Ta <u>Introl Group</u> <u>Post- Mean (SD)</u> 54.43 (22.42) 53.74 (21.05) 2.78 (.85) <u>perimental Group</u> <u>Post- Mean (SD)</u> 58.76 (21.28) 63.00 (19.85)	ables 1 <i>t</i> value 08 .54 .58 <i>t</i> value 1.54 23
control group and tTable 1Comparison of Pre- and FVariableMT College StudentsMT General PopulationMT Self-Efficacy $*p < .05. **p < .01$ Note: $MT = multitasking$,Table 2Comparison of Pre- and FVariableMT College StudentsMT General PopulationMT College StudentsMT General PopulationMT Self-Efficacy	he experiment Post- Means for the Co Pre- Mean (SD) 54.83 (19.32) 56.43 (24.09) 2.87 (.86) N=23. Pre- Mean (SD) 64.00 (23.43) 62.36 (25.29) 2.48 (1.05)	al group. (See Ta <u>ontrol Group</u> <u>Post- Mean (SD)</u> 54.43 (22.42) 53.74 (21.05) 2.78 (.85) <u>perimental Group</u> <u>Post- Mean (SD)</u> 58.76 (21.28) 63.00 (19.85) 2.44 (.92)	ables 1 <i>t</i> value 08 .54 .58 <i>t</i> value 1.54 23 .21
control group and tTable 1Comparison of Pre- and PVariableMT College StudentsMT General PopulationMT Self-Efficacy* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$ Note: MT = multitasking,Table 2Comparison of Pre- and PVariableMT College StudentsMT General PopulationMT Self-Efficacy* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$	Pre- Means for the Concernment Pre- Mean (SD) 54.83 (19.32) 56.43 (24.09) 2.87 (.86) N=23. Pre- Mean (SD) 64.00 (23.43) 62.36 (25.29) 2.48 (1.05)	al group. (See Ta <u>entrol Group</u> <u>Post- Mean (SD)</u> 54.43 (22.42) 53.74 (21.05) 2.78 (.85) <u>perimental Group</u> <u>Post- Mean (SD)</u> 58.76 (21.28) 63.00 (19.85) 2.44 (.92)	ables 1 <i>t</i> value 08 .54 .58 <i>t</i> value 1.54 23 .21

Methods

Participants (N = 200) will be randomly assigned to one of four conditions: 1 - control, 2 - online multitasking test, 3 driving simulator, and 4- online multitasking test + driving simulator. All participants initially complete a questionnaire assessing perceived multitasking ability and overconfidence, which is assessed again at one and two weeks later.

est sking

king on, n the

The findings of the present research could help bolster initiatives that discourage distracted driving in young adults.

Future directions will seek to expand the findings into the organizational context to inform best practices for driving occupations.

We would like to thank all of our study participants and our undergraduate research assistants for their assistance in this project. We would also like to thank Texas A&M AgriLife Extension for allowing us to use their driving simulator for the purposes of this study.

Discussion and Implications

Acknowledgements