**WK14 READING-Unit 7 Text II**

*Complete the following tasks and submit your answers in a single Word file named “student number + name”, e.g. “1120180000LIMING.*

***Task 1: Skim through Text II to identify the basic strategy for organizing the Results and Discussion sections.***

**Answer： C**

**Note:**Depending on the complexity of the issue being addressed, most research papers use one of the following basic strategies to organize Results and Discussion sections.

1. Strategy 1: Presenting all the results/findings in one section, followed by a discussion section of the results.
2. Strategy 2: Presenting one result and the discussion of the result in one section, followed by a second result and the discussion of it in another section, etc.
3. Strategy 3: Presenting the results one by one in separate sections, followed by a brief discussion of the findings.
4. Strategy 4: Presenting the key findings in one section, followed by a thorough discussion of the findings one by one in separate sections.

***Task 2: Identify and highlight the sentences in the Abstract of Text II that summarize the key findings of the study.***

**Text II**

**A Parametric Duration Model of the Reaction Times of Drivers Distracted by Mobile Phone Conversations [[1]](#endnote-0)**

Md. Mazharul Haque, Simon Washington

**Abstract:** The use of mobile phones while driving is more prevalent among young drivers—a less experienced cohort with elevated crash risk. The objective of this study was to examine and better understand the reaction times of young drivers to a traffic event originating in their peripheral vision whilst engaged in a mobile phone conversation. The CARRS-Q advanced driving simulator was used to test a sample of young drivers on various simulated driving tasks, including an event that originated within the driver’s peripheral vision, whereby a pedestrian enters a zebra crossing from a sidewalk. Thirty-two licensed drivers drove the simulator in three phone conditions: baseline (no phone conversation), hands-free and handheld. In addition to driving the simulator each participant completed questionnaires related to driver demographics, driving history, usage of mobile phones while driving, and general mobile phone usage history. The participants were 21–26 years old and split evenly by gender. Drivers’ reaction times to a pedestrian in the zebra crossing were modelled using a parametric accelerated failure time (AFT) duration model with a Weibull distribution. Also tested where two different model specifications to account for the structured heterogeneity arising from the repeated measures experimental design. The Weibull AFT model with gamma heterogeneity was found to be the best fitting model and identified four significant variables influencing the reaction times, including phone condition, driver’s age, license type (provisional license holder or not), and self-reported frequency of usage of handheld phones while driving. The reaction times of drivers were more than 40% longer in the distracted condition compared to baseline (not distracted). Moreover, the impairment of reaction times due to mobile phone conversations was almost double for provisional compared to open license holders. A reduction in the ability to detect traffic events in the periphery whilst distracted presents a significant and measurable safety concern that will undoubtedly persist unless mitigated.

***Task 3: The author's greatest concern in the discussion of Text II is the detrimental effect of driver distraction. Highlight the words and expressions in the following sentences that contribute to increasing the impact of the study.***

1. The event duration for distracted conditions lasted for about 3.4 s, implying that the reaction times of drivers distracted by mobile phone conversations were more than 40% greater than those of non-distracted drivers. (Para. 5)
2. In general, the reaction times of provisional licence holders were about double that of open licence holders. The deterioration of reaction times due to mobile phone conversations was about 1 s for open licence holders, while the corresponding deterioration for provisional licence holders was about 2 s. Hence the effect of mobile phone conversations on reaction times was about double for provisional licence holders. (Para. 10)
3. This study confirmed the detrimental effects of mobile phone conversations on the reaction times of drivers while responding to a routine traffic event that originates in their peripheral vision. (Para. 5)
4. It is also evident from Fig. 2 that there were marginal differences in reaction times between hands-free and handheld phone conditions while they responded to a typical traffic event such as a pedestrian entering a zebra crossing from a sidewalk. (Para. 8)
5. In summary, both hands-free and handheld phone conversation conditions had similar detrimental effects in responding to a very common peripheral event of a pedestrian entering a zebra crossing from the sidewalk.
6. It raises a serious question on the appropriateness of existing legislation on the use of mobile phones while driving in Queensland, Australia, which only imposes a ban of handheld mobile phone but allows drivers using mobile phones with a hand-free device. (Para. 9)
7. It implied that the detrimental effects of mobile phone distraction on both the reaction times and the probability of failing to detect a pedestrian were more severe for provisional licence holders. (Para. 10)
8. Importantly, the provisional licence holders are banned from using mobile phones in any form of hands-free or handheld options during their first year of provisional licence but they are allowed use a mobile phone while driving with a hands-free option during the subsequent two years of provisional period.

***Task 4: Use Text II as example to discuss which of the following features are applicable to the Results or Discussion, or both.***

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Features** | R | D |
| 1. Using non-textual elements, such as, figures, charts, photos, maps, tables, etc. to further illustrate the findings, if appropriate. | √ |  |
| 1. Engaging in creative thinking about issues through evidence-based interpretation of findings and infusing the results with meaning. |  | √ |
| 1. Focusing only on findings that are important and related to addressing the research problem and highlight observations that are most relevant to the topic under investigation | √ | √ |
| 1. Explaining why some of data fail to support your hypothesis, or why a negative result emerged from your study. |  | √ |
| 1. Presenting the importance of the study and how it may be able to contribute to and/or fill existing gaps in the field, how the findings from the study revealed new gaps in the literature. |  | √ |
| 1. Relating the study findings to those of other studies, point out whether the study supports the claims of other studies or how the study differs from other similar studies. |  | √ |
| 1. Developing creative solutions to problems based on the findings and formulate a deeper, more profound understanding of the research problem being studied. |  | √ |
| 1. Systematically explaining the meaning of the findings and why they are important. |  | √ |
| 1. Commenting on whether or not the results were expected or unexpected or especially profound, noting any unusual or unanticipated patterns or trends that emerged from the results and explain their meaning. |  | √ |
| 1. Describing the major findings of the study clearly, directly, and objectively without bias or interpretation and arranging the findings in proper sequence. | √ |  |
| 1. Interpreting the significance of the findings in light of what was already known about the research problem being investigated, and explaining new understanding or fresh insights about the problem after you've taken the findings into consideration. |  | √ |
| 1. Briefly reminding the reader of the research problem underpinning the purpose of the study. | √ | √ |
| 1. Summarizing the key findings arranged in the same logical sequence as the Method section. | √ |  |
| 1. Explaining the implications of the findings and the possible improvements that can be made in order to further develop the concerns of your research. |  | √ |
| 1. Providing data that is critical to answering the research questions. | √ | √ |

1. [↑](#endnote-ref-0)