

1 **Music Versus No Music Effectiveness On Cognitive Response Time and Typing**
2 **Efficiency**

3
4 JONQUILL HOWLETT, Colorado State University, USA
5
6 SHEA SPALDING, Colorado State University, USA
7

8 The abstract does not get added until after the project is finished or nearly finished.
9

10 CCS Concepts: • **Music, Typing Efficiency, Cognitive Function;**
11

12 Additional Key Words and Phrases: Typing Efficiency with Music, Cognitive Function, Quantified Behavioral Test
13

14 **ACM Reference Format:**
15 Jonquill Howlett and Shea Spalding. 2024. Music Versus No Music Effectiveness On Cognitive Response Time and Typing Efficiency. 1,
16 1 (May 2024), 6 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>
17

18 **1 INTRODUCTION**
19

20 This project will focus on people's ability to type with distractions such as different types of music playing. It will then
21 test their cognitive ability to focus on a hand/eye coordination test in which we will test how well they can match
22 shapes by measuring speed and accuracy. The two-part test aims to help test if the music is too distracting or will help
23 the people be more efficient at their work. This is important because many people do their homework or jobs while
24 listening to music and should they make a mistake, it could end up costing someone their grade or the mistake at work
25 has a cascading effect to cause more errors in their work. The two-part test will help determine if there is a correlation
26 between the effectiveness of music versus no music on cognitive response time and typing efficiency.
27
28

29 **1.1 Eye Tracking**
30

31 Eye tracking technology, such as the EyeWriter 2.0, has become increasingly valuable in cognitive research, allowing for
32 precise measurement and analysis of visual attention and eye movements. In this study, we incorporate the EyeWriter
33 2.0 to track participants' eye movements during the QBTest, a hand-eye coordination task. The EyeWriter 2.0 offers
34 high-resolution tracking, capturing gaze patterns and fixations with accuracy. By analyzing participants' eye movements
35 during the QBTest under different music conditions, we aim to understand how distractions, such as music, influence
36 visual attention and cognitive performance. Understanding the impact of music on cognitive response time and typing
37 efficiency, as measured by the QBTest and eye tracking, can provide valuable insights for improving work and study
38 environments where music is commonly used as a background stimulus.
39
40

41
42 Authors' addresses: Jonquill Howlett, jonquill.howlett@colostate.edu, Colorado State University, Berthoud, Colorado, USA, 80513-0650; Shea Spalding,
43 Shea1@colostate.edu, Colorado State University, Fort Collins, Colorado, USA, 80521-1873.
44

45 Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not
46 made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components
47 of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to
48 redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.
49

50 © 2024 ACM.
51

52 Manuscript submitted to ACM
53
54 Manuscript submitted to ACM

53 1.2 QBTest

54 The Quantified Behavioral Test (QBTest) is a well-established tool for assessing cognitive function, particularly in
55 measuring hand-eye coordination, speed, and accuracy. Developed as a standardized measure, the QBTest provides
56 valuable insights into cognitive performance across different tasks and conditions. In this study, the QBTest serves as
57 a central component for evaluating participants' cognitive response time and typing efficiency under various music
58 conditions. By administering the QBTest alongside eye tracking using EyeWriter 2.0, we aim to understand the impact
59 of music on cognitive function and task performance. The QBTest's ability to quantify cognitive performance makes
60 it an ideal tool for this study, allowing us to measure the effects of music on participants' ability to focus, process
61 information, and perform tasks accurately. Through this research, we seek to provide insights that can enhance our
62 understanding of how environmental factors, such as music, influence cognitive processes.

63 1.3 Typing Test

64 Typing proficiency is a fundamental skill in today's digital age, essential for academic and professional success. However,
65 various factors can influence typing efficiency, including environmental stimuli such as music. Understanding how
66 music affects typing speed and accuracy is crucial for optimizing work and study environments. This study uses a
67 typing test to assess participants' typing performance under different music conditions. The test presents participants
68 with lyrics from popular songs, simulating a real-world typing scenario where individuals may listen to music while
69 working or studying. By measuring typing speed and accuracy under conditions of music with lyrics, music without
70 lyrics, and no music (silent condition), we aim to determine the impact of music on typing efficiency. This research will
71 contribute to our understanding of how environmental factors, such as music, can affect cognitive processes related to
72 typing and may have practical implications for improving productivity in various settings.

73 2 RELATED WORKS**74 2.1 Music While Working**

75 While there is not necessarily a concrete answer for whether music or background noise is effective on cognitive
76 function, there have been many studies that attempt to determine the answer. The other studies attempted to search
77 for this answer by focusing on word processing on a computer with the background music and the user's ability to
78 formulate sentences [9], or determining if background music helps users to keep their attention on their task at hand [5].
79 Similar to Kiss and Linnell [5], Mathew [7] also examined how motivation and music were used hand-in-hand on "a
80 time-consuming task and task performance". A different study done in 2010 again found similar results of music both
81 being a hindrance and benefit [10]. According to Gonzalez and Aiello [4], the degree of cognitive function may be based
82 on an individual's personality. Furnham et al., also determined this was based on personality in a study done between
83 extraverts and introverts although "no significant interactions were found" [3].

84 The research done by Komlao found that music or background music was again based on an individual's personality
85 but that music, even music that the participants were familiar with, were a distraction and "was found to negatively
86 impact task performance" overall [6]. This was contrary to the previous studies found by Komlao where the "music could
87 help increase productivity for simple, monotonous tasks" [6].

88 Although Ransdell and Gilroy [9] suggests that the music is a detriment, those with "musical training and high
89 working memory span wrote better essays with longer sentences". This suggests that while the music slowed down the
90 participants, it did not necessarily lower their cognitive ability in typing on their computer while focusing on forming
91

text for the written essay for this particular study. For Silverberg [10], the music caused enough of a difference in the time that was taken for writing a paragraph but “there were no significant differences in typing speed between the audio distractions”. This again may suggest that the participant’s cognitive ability was not hindered when typing and may transfer directly after should the participants have taken a test measuring their cognitive function. The slow timing was again seen by Gonzalez and Aiello [4] in which “music generally impaired performance on a complex task but improved performance on a simple task”.

The study done through Kiss and Linnell [5] saw opposite results as to Gonzalez and Aiello [4]. The music or background noise “enhanced” the reaction time and performance of the tasks that are given to be completed. The results from Mathew [7] were split. The music was a detriment for logic puzzles in the user’s accuracy but aided in the efficiency of a writing task. According to Bramwell-Dicks et al., the instrumental music used in their study had better results on typists in speed and accuracy whereas music with vocals, the participants fared worse [1]. While only a quasi-experiment, Oldham et al., found that personal headphones and Walkmans for employees had a positive correlation if the job complexity was not complex but also that employee satisfaction at this company was higher if they were allowed to use their walkman while working [8]. Dobbs et al., also found the correlation that while music produced lower scores than silence it was better than just “noise” [2].

2.2 Eye Tracking and Quantified Behavioral Test

CITATIONS ABOUT EYE TRACKING AND QBTEST HERE

3 METHODOLOGY

3.1 Equipment

Participants used two different MacBook Pros in this study due to the nature of the eye tracker setup although both were running on Sonoma or MacOS 14. One MacBook Pro was used to administer the QBTest, and it had the eye tracker mounted on it. The positioning of the eye tracker made it challenging to use this MacBook Pro for the typing test and QBTest. Participants used the MacBook Pro with the eye tracker for the QBTest to ensure that the eye tracker could accurately track their eye movements during the test. A bluetooth keyboard allowed participants to press the space bar in the Quantified Behavioral test easily as the mounting of the eye tracker made it harder to access the space bar on the MacBook. Using two separate MacBook Pros allowed for the independent administration of the QBTest and typing test, ensuring that participants could perform each task without any physical hindrance from the eye tracker.

3.1.1 *EyeWriter 2.0*. The IR camera captures the eye movements of the participant. It is mounted on the laptop that participants use for the QBTest, allowing for the tracking of eye movements during the test. IR LEDs are used to illuminate the eye to enhance the visibility of the eye for tracking purposes. These LEDs are also mounted on the laptop along with the IR camera. The mounting system holds the IR camera and IR LEDs in place relative to the participant’s eye. It ensures that the camera has a clear view of the eye for accurate tracking. Cables are used to connect the IR camera and IR LEDs to the laptop. These cables transmit data and power between the components. An Arduino microcontroller allowed the computer to communicate with the camera, infrared LED lights, and computer.

3.1.2 *Typing Test*. The typing program was written in Python and compiled using Python3.9. While python can run on any device that has python installed, this study only used the two Macbook Pros. The singularity of the devices was

157 used as the center of the screen for the typing test was hard coded when setting the starting position of the window for
158 the typing test.
159

160 3.1.3 *Quantified Behavioral Test.* The Quantified Behavioral Test program was written in Python and compiled using
161 Python3.9. The package pygame was used for this interface compared to the package tkinter used for the typing test.
162 The bluetooth keyboard allowed the participant to hit the space bar when the QBTest said to hit the space bar.
163

165 3.2 Procedure

166 Each participant was instructed to read and then sign the consent form. While the consent form had the basis of what
167 they would be doing, they were given more detail as to the instructions when they were ready to begin. The two
168 computers were set up side by side so that it would be easy for the participant to switch between the typing test and
169 QBTest. This setup also made it simple for the music component as the participants did each level together (e.g. typing
170 test then QBTest without having to change the music or swapping to no music) before moving on to the next level.
171 Because of the way that the heatmap was coded, we had to make sure that each level was done in the same order for all
172 the participants. We made sure to always do instrumental music, lyrical music, then no music.
173

176 3.3 Participants

177 Tweleve participants were recruited from Colorado State University or Fort Collins, Colorado. Two males and eight
178 females all in the age range of 18-23. There were no restrictions in regards to their major as long as they were able
179 to type on a keyboard with no tilt on the keys. They have all previously either learned to type at primary school or
180 through necessity.
181

184 3.4 Design

185 After obtaining consent from all participants, they proceeded to take the typing test. The test presented lyrics from
186 popular songs within a graphical user interface (GUI). The interface automatically calculated typing accuracy and the
187 time the attempt took in the program's backend, allowing participants to focus solely on completing the test. Each
188 participant completed the typing test under three conditions: music with lyrics, music without lyrics, and no music
189 (silent condition). Multiple levels of music intensity were utilized within each condition to assess varying degrees of
190 distraction. The GUI of the typing test was built with simplicity in mind. The starting window was pulled up so as not
191 to confuse participants with the code as seen in Figure 1a. The participants saw Figure 1b while the test is running,
192 while Figure 1c is the signifier that the typing portion is finished.
193

194 They were given the instructions in the GUI with the text area where their text is clearly visible and the only button
195 in the window to start the test and timer. After they hit the "Get the Typing Test" button, the lyrics of the randomly
196 selected songs were displayed for the user to type. The text box for the users was already in focus with a "Done" button.
197 After the users hit "Done", their accuracy and speed were presented.
198

199 Following the typing test, participants proceeded to the cognitive task component of the study, which was also
200 conducted under the three aforementioned conditions. While the participants did the cognitive task of a quantified
201 behavioral test, their eye movement will be tracked by the EyeWriter 2.0 camera that we specially built for this study.
202 The EyeWriter system consists of a camera mounted on the participant's laptop, which tracks eye movements and
203 allows for precise measurement of gaze direction and fixation duration. This can be seen in Figure 2.
204




Fig. 1. Images of what the user will see in the typing test




Fig. 2. EyeWriter 2.0 Setup

Participants were seated in a comfortable position facing the laptop screen. The laptop is placed on top of a laptop stand while the eye tracker is mounted on a wooden frame. While the eye tracker is on a moveable slider, it is centered in front of the screen. At the ends of the wooden frame are infrared lights that flashes at sixty frames per second. Although not pictured, a bluetooth keyboard is used by the participant for the quantified behavioral test (QBTest).

During the cognitive task component of the study, participants performed a Quantified Behavioral test or QBTest while their eye movements were tracked by the EyeWriter 2.0. The QBTest is a computerized test designed to assess various aspects of cognitive function, including attention, impulsivity, and response control. The user will then see Figure 3. Figure 3a is the screen that will be displayed before the participant is ready to begin the QBTest. Figure 3b is what the user will see during the test. Figure 3c also displays what the user will see when they are correct and incorrect. Figure 3c displays for only two minutes but shows the user their score.




Fig. 3. Images of what the user will see in the QBTest

4 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Within-subjects testing was used for our ten participants. Individually the typing test and QBTest scores were not statistically significant, whereas the ANOVA from the heatmap with the eyetracker, the results were statistically significant. The ANOVA for the typing test was done twice for the dependent variables, time and accuracy, as GoStats did not allow for multiple dependent variables. Both were not statistically significant although their *p* values were different.

5 CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORKS

Conclusion

REFERENCES

- [1] Anna Bramwell-Dicks, Helen Petrie, and Alistair Edwards. 2016. Can listening to music make you type better? the effect of music style, vocals and volume on typing performance. In *International Community on Auditory Display*. School of Music, Australian National University, Canberra, Australia, 109–116. <https://doi.org/10.21785/icad2016.029>
- [2] Stacey Dobbs, Adrian Furnham, and Alastair McClelland. 2011. The effect of background music and noise on the cognitive test performance of introverts and extraverts. *Applied Cognitive Psychology* 25, 2 (2011), 307–313. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.1692> arXiv:<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/acp.1692>
- [3] Adrian Furnham, Sarah Trew, and Ian Snaede. 1999. The distracting effects of vocal and instrumental music on the cognitive test performance of introverts and extraverts. *Personality and Individual Differences* 27, 2 (1999), 381–392. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869\(98\)00249-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-8869(98)00249-9)
- [4] Manuel F. Gonzalez and John R. Aiello. 2019. More than meets the ear: Investigating how music affects cognitive task performance. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied* 25, 3 (Sep 2019), 431–444. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xap0000202>
- [5] Luca Kiss and Karina J Linnell. 2021. The effect of preferred background music on task-focus in sustained attention. *Psychological research* 85, 6 (2021), 2313–2325.
- [6] Norawat Komlao. 2018. *Variations Of Auditory Distractions: The Effect Of Familiarity With Background Music On Cognitive Performance On The Concept Shifting Task*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Dublin, National College of Ireland.
- [7] Jeff K Mathew. 2022. Inherently Distracting, Yet So Enjoyable. Can Music Improve Our Cognitive Endurance? <http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12648/11602>
- [8] Greg R Oldham, Anne Cummings, Leann J Mischel, James M Schmidtke, and Jing Zhou. 1995. Listen while you work? Quasi-experimental relations between personal-stereo headset use and employee work responses. *Journal Applied Psychology* 80, 5 (oct 1995), 547–564.
- [9] S.E. Ransdell and L. Gilroy. 2001. The effects of background music on word processed writing. *Computers in Human Behavior* 17, 2 (2001), 141–148. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-5632\(00\)00043-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0747-5632(00)00043-1)
- [10] Ashley Silverberg. 2010. The Effects of Audio Distractions on Typing Speed. *Undergraduate Psychology Research Methods Journal* 1, 11 (2010), 2. https://digitalcommons.lindenwood.edu/psych_journals/vol1/iss11/2