

1 **TITLE:**

2 It's all in the mind: the relationship between mindfulness and nomophobia on technology engagement
3 while driving and aberrant driving behaviours.

4 **AUTHORS:**

5 Sjaan Koppel¹, Amanda N. Stephens¹, Fareed Kaviani¹, Sujanie Peiris¹, Kristie L. Young¹, Richard
6 Chambers², & Craig Hassed^{2,3}

7

8 **AFFILIATIONS:**

9 ¹Monash University Accident Research Centre, Monash University, AUSTRALIA

10 ²Monash Centre for Contemplative & Consciousness Studies, Monash University, AUSTRALIA

11 ³Faculty of Medicine, Nursing and Health Sciences, Monash University, AUSTRALIA

12

13 **KEYWORDS:**

14 Mindfulness; Nomophobia; Distraction; Driver Behaviour; Road safety

15

16 **ABSTRACT:**

17 This study investigated the relationship between mindfulness and nomophobia on technology
18 engagement while driving and aberrant driving behaviours. Nine hundred and ninety participants
19 completed an online survey (Female: 68.6%; Age: M=51.2 years, SD=15.7, Range=18.0-84.0 years)
20 that assessed mindfulness, nomophobia, technology engagement while driving, aberrant driving
21 behaviour, and self-reported crashes and infringements during the past two years. Structural equation
22 modelling (SEM) was used to examine the relationships between mindfulness and nomophobia, on one
23 hand, with self-reported engagement with technology while driving and general aberrant driving
24 behaviours (combination of errors, lapses and violations) on the other. The results of the SEM showed
25 that, as expected, mindfulness shared negative relationships with nomophobia, engagement with
26 technology and aberrant driving behaviours, while all other relationships were positive. In terms of
27 engagement with technology, there were direct and indirect paths between nomophobia and
28 mindfulness and engagement with technology. The results of this study demonstrate the positive
29 influence mindfulness can have on nomophobia, engagement with technology while driving, and

1 dangerous driving behaviours that have been associated with crash risk. Mindfulness practices may
2 reduce the effect of nomophobia on engagement with technology while driving and increased
3 dangerous behaviours as a result. This will be increasingly important as modern work and social
4 practices encourage people to increasingly use the phone while driving, and the technology within
5 smart devices, and connectivity of these to the vehicle, increase. More research is needed to
6 understand whether mindfulness-based interventions can reduce nomophobia, and thereby improve
7 driving behaviours and reduce crash rates.

1 INTRODUCTION

2 Distraction and inattention are increasingly emerging as a leading cause of crashes, especially
3 amongst younger age groups (Bingham, 2014; World Health Organization, 2018). Distraction can be
4 caused by external factors (i.e., engaging in tasks secondary to driving such as smartphone use) (Huemer
5 et al., 2018; Young et al., 2018), or emerge from internal factors (i.e., mind-wandering distracting from
6 the act of driving) (Yanko & Spalek, 2014).

7 In-vehicle distractions caused by technology, such as on-board and portable devices, increase
8 the likelihood of visual and cognitive impairment and risks associated with poor driver performance and
9 attention. The ubiquity of smartphones worldwide has led road safety agencies to introduce varying
10 restrictions on mobile phone use, however, high daily use and growing problematic dependency are
11 leading to an increased likelihood of using the device in various problematic and dangerous
12 circumstances, such as while crossing a road or while driving (Kaviani, Robards, et al., 2020). More
13 insidiously, even if a driver avoids engaging with their technological devices while driving, merely having
14 a mobile phone in the vehicle (even while it is off) decreases attention toward the driving task (Toch et
15 al., 2020). Indeed, simply having a smartphone within eye-shot was enough to reduce performance on a
16 whole range of measures of cognitive performance (Ward et al., 2017). In short, smartphone presence
17 has been shown to increase the likelihood and frequency of engagement with the smartphone, and
18 therefore, aberrant driving behaviours.

19 Aberrant driving behaviours include unintended errors or lapses in attention, and deliberate
20 violations of driving rules. These can increase crash risk (Parker et al., 1992). These behaviours have
21 been captured in the Driving Behaviour Questionnaire (DBQ), developed by Reason et al. (1990) to
22 measure drivers' engagement in various risky driving behaviours. The DBQ has since been adapted in
23 terms of item numbers and factor structure to better capture a variety of road user cohort behaviours. A
24 common version contains 28-items that sit within four broad types of dangerous driving behaviours known
25 to increase crash risk, including: 1) violations, 2) aggressive violations, 3) errors, and 4) lapses (Lawton
26 et al., 1997; Parker et al., 1995; Stephens & Fitzharris, 2016). While errors and lapses originated mostly
27 from driver inattention, violations coincide with deliberate transgressions (Stephens & Fitzharris, 2016).
28 Whether a result of intentional risk-taking or habitual behaviour, the DBQ captured both internal and
29 external factors. Mindfulness, a practice of being actively attentive and aware of one's present moment,
30 has been shown to reduce the likelihood of these aberrant behaviours (Koppel et al., 2018).

31 Mindfulness has its origins in ancient Eastern and Buddhist philosophy, with roots also in other
32 wisdom traditions (Trousselard et al., 2014). During the early 2000s, after decades of increasing


1 disenchantment (Mackinnon, 2001), stress, poor mental health and distraction in many Western countries
2 (Turner, 2011), mindfulness has grown in popularity and scope (Baer, 2003). This was largely driven by
3 the development of mindfulness-based cognitive therapy (MBCT; Segal et al., 2001) and subsequent
4 meta-analyses showing mindfulness is efficacious for improving mental health in clinical (Khoury et al.,
5 2013) and nonclinical (Querstret et al., 2020) settings. In clinical settings, various models of mindfulness-
6 based were shown to be efficacious (Kabat-Zinn, 2003) in reducing a range of psychological ailments, in
7 particular depression, stress and anxiety.

8 Within the context of road safety, conceptualisations of mindfulness were adopted that enhanced
9 self-awareness and were concerned with increasing and sustaining attention and awareness towards
10 one's environment and behaviour. A recent systematic review found that mindfulness can play a
11 significant role in improving aspects of road safety by increasing situational awareness (Kass et al., 2011).
12 Other studies have shown mindfulness may be effective in reducing driving violations (Koppel et al.,
13 2018), and aggression (Deffenbacher et al., 2016; Stephens et al., 2018, 2020) and, ultimately, reducing
14 crashes (Koppel et al., 2019). Studies revealed that higher levels of mindfulness were also associated
15 with lower levels of engagement with distracting technology while driving (Regan et al., 2020; Young et
16 al., 2019) which may be a major contributing factor to reduced crash rates. Specifically, mindfulness has
17 been shown to reduce distraction caused by smartphones (Throuvala et al., 2020), with degrees of
18 success varying between male and female drivers (Kita & Luria, 2020). As such, mindfulness techniques
19 and programs were considered effective interventions for increasing attention toward the driving task and
20 potentially improving driving performance (Reynaud & Navarro, 2019). Studies often encouraged further
21 research into pertinent psychological traits that may impact the effectiveness of mindful techniques as an
22 intervention for preventing distracted driving.

23 Recent research has identified a phenomenon associated with smartphone users that may be
24 confounding the psychosocial dynamic between mindful driving and technology engagement.
25 'Nomophobia'—the fear of being without a mobile phone—is an emergent condition impacting the
26 behaviour of smartphone users globally (Rodríguez-García et al., 2020; Yildirim & Correia, 2015), with a
27 recent study revealing that over 99.2% of Australians experience some form of nomophobia (Kaviani et
28 al., 2020). Studies have demonstrated that nomophobia can lead to poor decision making (Márquez-
29 Hernández et al., 2020), is associated with negative lifestyles and other psychological conditions
30 (Gonçalves et al., 2020), increases distraction among employees and students (Gutiérrez-Puertas et al.,
31 2019; Mendoza et al., 2018; Osorio-Molina et al., 2021; Wang & Suh, 2018), and increases the likelihood
32 of problematic smartphone behaviours such as dependent, dangerous, and anti-social use (Kaviani,
33 Robards, et al., 2020). Indeed, nomophobia has been shown to increase smartphone use while driving,

1 with the fear of being without information predicting the likelihood of illegal use (Kaviani, Young, et al.,
2 2020). Recent systematic reviews showed that nomophobia particularly impacts women, younger people,
3 and people that spend more time on their devices (León-Mejía et al., 2021; Notara et al., 2021).
4 Mindfulness is also linked to decreased nomophobia (Arpaci et al., 2019), while psychological resilience
5 — defined as the ability of individuals to withstand and continue evolving in the face of adversities
6 (Fletcher & Sarkar, 2013) — had a mediating effect on the success of mindfulness as an intervention for
7 nomophobia (Arpaci & Gundogan, 2020). Although mindfulness has been shown to improve driving
8 performance and reduced the likelihood of nomophobia or engaging with technology while driving, there
9 has been no research exploring the relationships between mindfulness, nomophobia, technology
10 engagement while driving, and aberrant driving behaviour.

11 The aim of the current study was to address this gap. Figure 1 demonstrates the proposed
12 relationships between mindfulness, nomophobia, engagement with technology and aberrant driving
13 behaviours based on the theoretical reasoning provided above. This figure builds upon Arpaci et al.
14 (2017) by considering relationships between mindfulness and nomophobia, on one hand, with self-
15 reported engagement with technology while driving and general aberrant driving behaviours (combination
16 of errors, lapses and violations) on the other. As can be seen in this figure, and based on the literature
17 above, mindfulness is expected to share negative relationships with nomophobia, engagement with
18 technology and aberrant driving behaviours (i.e., mindfulness reduces nomophobia etc.), while positive
19 relationships are expected between the other latent variables. That is, a higher frequency of aberrant
20 driving behaviours is expected to be explained by a combination of lower levels of mindfulness, higher
21 levels of nomophobia and engagement with technology while driving.



22
23 *Figure 1: Proposed relationships between mindfulness, nomophobia, engagement with technology and*
24 *aberrant driving behaviours (+ and – indicate hypothesised direction of the relationship)*

1 **METHODS**

2 ***Participants***

3 Participants were eligible to participate in the current study if they: a) were aged 18 years and older; b)
4 had a valid driver's licence; c) were an 'active' driver (i.e., at least once per week in the pre-COVID19
5 period), d) used a smartphone, and e) lived in Australia. The demographics of participants who completed
6 the survey are described in the Results.

7 ***Materials***

8 Participants completed an online survey (taking approximately 25 minutes) which is described below.

9 *Socio-demographic characteristics*

10 Participants were asked to provide information about their: age, sex, residential state, highest level of
11 completed education, and current annual household income.

12 *Driving and licensing characteristics*

13 Participants were asked to provide information on their pre-COVID19: annual mileage, frequency of
14 driving (where: 1=Daily; 5=<once per week). They were also asked to provide information on their:
15 licensing history, previous motor vehicle crash involvement, and/or driving infringements.

16 *Aberrant driving behaviours*

17 Participants' aberrant driving behaviour was measured using the Driver Behaviour Questionnaire (DBQ)
18 (Reason et al., 1990). A common version of the DBQ contains 28-items which relate to four broad types
19 of dangerous driving behaviours that have been associated with an increased motor vehicle crash risk:
20 1) violations, 2) aggressive violations, 3) errors, and 4) lapses (Lawton et al., 1997; Parker et al., 1995;
21 Stephens & Fitzharris, 2016). For each DBQ item, participants were asked to indicate how frequently
22 they had engaged in each behaviour on a six-point Likert response scale (where: 0=Never, 5=Always).
23 Higher DBQ subscale scores represent more frequent aberrant driving behaviours. The DBQ has good
24 internal consistency (Composite reliabilities ranging from 0.79 to 0.89) (Stephens & Fitzharris, 2016).

25 *Mindfulness*

26 Participants' trait mindfulness, or their awareness of and attention to what is occurring in the present
27 moment, was measured using the Mindful Awareness and Attention Scale (MAAS) (Brown & Ryan,
28 2003). The MAAS contains 15-items related to mindful attention and awareness. For each MAAS item,
29 participants were asked to indicate how frequently they experienced each situation on a 6-point Likert
30 response scale (where: 1=Almost always, 6=Almost never). Higher MAAS scores equate to higher levels

1 of mindful attention and awareness. The MAAS has good internal consistency (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.87$;
2 Brown & Ryan, (2003)).

3 *Nomophobia*

4 Participants' nomophobia, or their fear of being without their mobile phone, was measured using the
5 Nomophobia Questionnaire (NMP-Q; Yildirim & Correia, 2015). The NMP-Q contains 20-items which are
6 broadly related to: 1) not being able to communicate, 2) losing connectedness, 3) not being able to access
7 information, and 4) giving up convenience. For each NMP-Q item, participants were asked to indicate
8 their level of agreement on a 7-point Likert scale (where: 1=Strongly disagree, 7=Strongly agree). Total
9 nomophobia scores were calculated by summing item responses (Range: 20-140), where higher scores
10 represent a higher level of nomophobia severity (where: scores<20 = 'absence' of nomophobia; scores
11 between 21-59='mild' level of nomophobia; scores between 60-99='moderate' level of nomophobia; and
12 scores>100 = 'severe' level of nomophobia. The NMP-Q has excellent internal consistency (Cronbach's
13 $\alpha=0.95$) (Yildirim & Correia, 2015).

14 *Engagement with Technology while Driving*

15 Engagement with technology was measured with ten technology-related activities (modified from Young
16 et al., (2019). Given the focus on nomophobia, these activities focussed primarily on technology-related
17 tasks, including: 1) Talked on your smart phone (handheld); 2) Read a text message on your smart phone
18 (handheld); 3) Wrote a text message on your smart phone (handheld); 4) Accessed social media (e.g.,
19 Twitter, Facebook, Instagram etc.) on your smart phone (handheld); 5) Taken a photo or video on your
20 smart phone (handheld); 6) Used an App on your smart phone (handheld); 7) Entered a new destination
21 into a route navigation system on your smart phone (handheld); 8) Accessed the Internet on your smart
22 phone (handheld); 9) Wore headphones while listening to your smart phone (handheld); 10) Interacted
23 with your smart watch (e.g., Apple Watch, Fitbit etc.). For each activity, participants were asked to indicate
24 how frequently they engage in each while driving using a five-point Likert scale (where: 0=Never,
25 4=Always). Participants were also provided with a "not applicable" option for each item. A total average
26 engagement with technology while driving score was calculated on frequency of use across only
27 applicable items.

28 **Procedure**

29 The study was approved by the Monash University Human Research Ethics Committee (MUHREC).
30 Participants were recruited through a range of online and social media advertising; including the MUARC
31 Facebook page and Twitter feed, the Monash University Insider newsletter etc. The advertising directed
32 participants to an online survey link. To improve recruitment, participants who completed the online

1 survey were able to opt into a draw to win one of five \$100 gift vouchers. The online survey was
2 administered from July–August 2020.

3 **Data Analysis**

4 Descriptive statistical analyses were conducted to describe the sample. Bivariate correlations explored
5 the relationships between demographic characteristics and DBQ, MAAS, and NMP-Q scores. Mann-
6 Whitney U tests were conducted to explore the relationships between DBQ and MAAS, NMP-Q scores
7 and self-reported crashes and speeding infringements.

8 Factor analysis was conducted to determine the most appropriate factor structure for the engagement
9 with technology while driving items. Principal axis factoring was used, with direct oblimin rotation to
10 consider correlated factors. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's
11 Test of Sphericity were used as measures of appropriateness determined by KMO values greater than
12 0.70 (Kaiser, 1974) and significant test of sphericity ($p < 0.05$). The number of factors retained were
13 determined by the scree plot. The factor analysis confirmed a unidimensional one factor structure with all
14 items having loadings above 0.45, except for interacting with a smart watch and wearing headphones
15 (loadings of 0.20). Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant $p < 0.001$ and $KMO = 0.91$. Cronbach's α was
16 0.87 indicating good reliability.

17 Structural equation modelling was conducted to test the model proposed in Figure 1. Latent variables for
18 mindfulness (MAAS), nomophobia (NMP-Q) and engagement with technology while driving were
19 constructed from parcelled items. Three parcels were made for each variable combining items specific
20 to that scale. This helped to reduce the number of observed variables in the model (Little et al., 2002).
21 Two models were tested. First a measurement model, containing the latent variables only, followed by a
22 full structural model with endogenous latent variables. Model fit was determined by a combination of fit
23 statistics. These included the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) (values > 0.90 are considered good fit; (Hu &
24 Bentler, 1999) and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) (values < 0.06 are considered
25 to be good fit, while values between 0.06-0.08 are considered fair fit; (Browne & Cudeck, 1992)). The 90
26 percent confidence intervals around the RMSEA were also included. The Chi-Square (χ^2), degree of
27 freedom and significance are also reported, however not used as a measure of fit given the large size of
28 the sample. A Maximum Likelihood estimation was run and Bollen-Stine bootstrapping on 2000 samples
29 was also used to account for violations of multivariate normality. All statistical analyses were conducted
30 using IBM SPSS v. 28 and AMOS version 27.

31

32

1 RESULTS

2 *Participants' socio-demographic characteristics*

3 Nine hundred and ninety participants completed the online survey. As shown in Table 1, most commonly
4 participants: were aged between 56 and 65 years (26.1%; M=51.2 years, SD=15.7, Range=18.0-84.0
5 years); were female (68.6%); had completed an undergraduate or postgraduate university degree
6 (28.7%, 30.6%, respectively); lived in the Australian state of Victoria (42.4%), and had a yearly household
7 income (\$AUD) of between \$50,001-75,000 before tax (15.9%).

8 **Table 1: Socio-demographic characteristics**

Socio-demographic characteristics	% (n)
18-25	8.8 (87)
26-35	11.6 (115)
36-45	13.3 (132)
46-55	19.9 (197)
56-65	26.1 (258)
66-75	17.4 (172)
76+	2.9 (29)
Male	30.2 (299)
Female	68.6 (679)
Other	0.6 (6)
Prefer not to say	0.6 (6)
Primary/Intermediate (Year 10 equivalent)	5.3 (52)
High (Year 12 equivalent)	9.9 (98)
Technical/Trade (incl. apprenticeship)	12.2 (121)
Diploma	13.3 (132)
Undergraduate degree	28.7 (284)
Postgraduate degree	30.6 (303)
<\$25,000	10.2 (101)
\$25,001-\$50,000	14.8 (147)
\$50,001-\$75,000	15.9 (157)
\$75,001-\$100,000	11.4 (113)
\$100,001-\$125,000	7.6 (75)
\$125,001-\$150,000	7.7 (76)
\$155,001-\$175,000	5.1 (50)
\$175,001-\$200,000	4.1 (41)
\$200,001-\$250,000	3.1 (31)
>\$250,001	2.9 (29)
Prefer not to say	17.2 (170)

ACT	3.5 (35)
NSW	22.0 (218)
NT	0.4 (4)
QLD	14.2 ()
SA	6.4 (63)
TAS	3.8 (38)
VIC	42,4 (420)
WA	7.2 (71)

1 **Driving and licensing characteristics**

2 All participants reported that they held a valid driver's licence and most reported that they did not have a
3 conditional or restricted licence. As shown in Table 2, most participants drove between 10,001 to 15,000
4 kilometres per year and drove daily. Most participants had not been involved in a crash or received a
5 traffic infringement notice in the previous two years.

6 **Table 2: Driving characteristics**

Driving characteristics		% (n)
Frequency of driving	Daily	41.1 (407)
	4-6 times per week	31.1 (308)
	2-3 times per week	20.0 (198)
	Once per week	7.8 (77)
Estimated kms driven in their vehicle over the past year	≤5,000 km	22.6 (224)
	5,001-10,000 km	22.5 (223)
	10,001-15,000 km	25.5 (252)
	15,001-20,000 km	14.0 (139)
	20,001-25,000 km	8.2 (81)
	>25,001 km	7.2 (71)
Involved in a crash while driving (including minor crashes) in the past two years?	No	85.7 (848)
	Yes	14.3 (142)
Involved in an at-fault crash while driving (including minor crashes) in the past two years	No	93.4 (925)
	Yes	6.6 (65)
Over the past two years, cited for failing to stop at a stop sign or traffic signal (including red light cameras)	No	97.0 (960)
	Yes	3.0 (30)
Over the past two years, cited for speeding	No	84.7 (839)
	Yes	15.3 (151)
Over the past two years, cited for other driving offences such as using a mobile phone illegally while driving	No	97.1 (961)
	Yes	2.9 (29)

1 **Aberrant driving behaviours**

2 Participants' self-reported aberrant driving behaviours, as measured using the DBQ, are presented in
3 Table 3.

4 **Table 3: Self-reported aberrant driving behaviours**

Participants' responses	N	Cronbach's α	Mean (SD)	Range
DBQ: Errors (Max=55)	990	0.91	0.42 (0.51)	0.00-5.00
DBQ: Lapses (Max=30)	990	0.77	0.98 (0.66)	0.00-5.00
DBQ: Aggressive violations (Max=15)	990	0.67	0.69 (0.71)	0.00-5.00
DBQ: Violations (Max=40)	990	0.82	0.75 (0.65)	0.00-5.00

5 **Mindfulness**

6 Participants' mean MAAS score was 3.94 (SD=0.88, Range=1.00-6.00) and their responses to this
7 scale had excellent internal consistency (Cronbach's α =0.92).

8 **Nomophobia**

9 Most participants were classified as having a 'moderate' level of nomophobia (49.1%; see Table 4). The
10 mean nomophobia score was 72.4 (SD=26.5, Range=20.0-140.0) and participants' responses to this
11 questionnaire had excellent internal consistency (Cronbach's α =0.96). Approximately one percent of
12 participants had an 'absence' of nomophobia (1.1%), while 16.9 percent of participants were classified
13 as having a 'severe' level of nomophobia.

14 **Table 4: Nomophobia severity level**

Severity level	% (n)
Absence (\leq 20)	1.1 (11)
Mild (21-59)	32.9 (326)
Moderate (60-99)	49.1 (486)
Severe (100-140)	16.9 (167)

15 **Engagement with technology while driving**

16 Table 5 shows the self-reported frequency of engaging in technology while driving. As can be seen, the
17 majority of participants reported that they 'never' talked on a handheld device while driving, or
18 interacted with their device for social media, internet or other functions. However, 31 percent reported
19 reading text messages on their handheld device while driving.

20

1 **Table 5: Participants' engagement with technology while driving**

Activity	n*	M (SD)					
		Range 0 - 4	Never	Occasionally	Sometimes	Often	Always
Talked on smart phone (handheld)	963	0.35 (.76)	81.3 (783)	3.7 (36)	14.1 (136)	0.5 (5)	0.3 (3)
Read text message on smart phone (handheld)	968	0.60 (0.93)	68.5 (663)	5.2 (50)	24.5 (237)	1.3 (13)	0.5 (5)
Wrote text message on smart phone (handheld)	968	0.33 (0.78)	83.1 (804)	2.6 (25)	12.8 (124)	1.0 (10)	0.5 (5)
Accessed social media (e.g., Twitter, Facebook, Instagram) on smart phone (handheld)	928	0.21 (0.68)	90.1 (836)	1.2 (11)	6.9 (64)	1.0 (9)	0.9 (8)
Taken photo or video on smart phone (handheld)	931	0.26 (0.71)	87.1 (811)	2.1 (20)	9.1 (85)	1.2 (11)	0.4 (4)
Used App on smart phone (handheld)	945	0.37 (0.82)	81.3 (768)	3.0 (28)	13.8 (130)	1.3 (12)	0.7 (7)
Entered new destination into a navigation system on smart phone (handheld)	962	0.74 (0.99)	58.9 (567)	13.2 (127)	23.1 (222)	4.3 (41)	0.5 (5)

Accessed Internet on smart phone (handheld)	965	0.29 (0.76)	86.1 (831)	1.7 (16)	10.1 (97)	1.6 (15)	0.6 (6)
Wore headphones while listening to smart phone (handheld)	930	0.26 (0.74)	87.3 (812)	3.2 (30)	6.7 (62)	1.9 (18)	0.9 (8)
Interacted with smart watch (e.g., iWatch, Fitbit etc.)	655	0.03 (0.76)	83.2 (545)	4.6 (30)	9.9 (65)	1.8 (12)	0.5 (3)
Total Average	982	0.04 (0.55)					

1 *number of participants for whom this was applicable

2 **Relationships between mindfulness, nomophobia, engagement with technology and aberrant**
3 **driving behaviours**

4 The relationships between mindfulness, nomophobia, engagement with technology while driving, and aberrant
5 driving behaviours are presented in Table 6.

6

1 **Table 6: Correlation matrix for participants' demographic characteristics (age and gender), DBQ**
 2 **subscale scores, MAAS average scores, NMP-Q total scores, and engagement with technology while**
 3 **driving¹**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1 Age									
2 Gender	-.208**	--							
3 DBQ: Errors	-.223**	.055	--						
4 DBQ: Lapses	-.225**	-.069*	.723**	--					
5 DBQ: Violations	-.257**	-.137**	.534**	.658**	--				
6 DBQ: Aggressive Violations	-.093**	-.086**	.391**	.533**	.532**	--			
7 MAAS	.361**	-.080*	-.518**	-.402**	-.344**	-.232**	--		
8 NMP-Q	-.321**	.131**	.274**	.319**	.190**	.196**	-.382**	--	
9 Engagement in Technology while Driving	-.241**	-.064*	.403**	.464**	.517**	.329**	-.283**	.208**	--


4
 5 Age was negatively correlated with DBQ violation scores, with older participants reporting lower levels of
 6 violations. Age was positively correlated with MAAS scores, with older participants reporting higher levels
 7 of mindful attention and awareness in everyday life and in generalized situations. MAAS scores were
 8 negatively correlated with all DBQ subscales, however the relationship between MAAS scores and lapse
 9 and error subscale scores were strongest. That is, participants with lower levels of mindful attention and
 10 awareness in everyday life were more likely to report higher levels of errors and lapses. Gender was not
 11 significantly related to DBQ or MAAS scores. Based on high correlation between DBQ violations and
 12 aggressive violations, these factors were combined for the structural model.

13 Both the measurement model and the structural model showed good fit to the data. The measurement
 14 model showed that all indicator variables significantly loaded onto their factors, with standardised
 15 regression weight >0.64. The composite reliability for each factor was good with Rho greater than 0.70
 16 (MAAS and NMP-Q=0.97, Engagement with technology=0.76; DBQ=0.86) demonstrating construct
 17 reliability. Convergent reliability was also good with average variance explained (>0.50 for all variables).
 18 The full structural goodness of fit statistics were: $\chi^2(48)=279.38$, Bollen-Stine $p < 0.001$; CFI=0.98,
 19 RMSEA =0.07; 90% CI=0.06-0.08. Sex, age, and annual mileage were initially included in the model,

¹ Gender codes were male = 1; female = 2; * = $p < 0.05$, ** = $p < 0.01$, *** = $p < 0.001$.

1 however, were removed due to lack of significant loading onto aberrant driving behaviours (sex, annual
 2 milage) and poor performance (age which did not increase the variation explained in the model).

3 Figure 2 shows the final full model. As expected, mindfulness shared negative relationships with
 4 nomophobia, engagement with technology and aberrant driving behaviours, while all other relationships
 5 were positive. In terms of engagement with technology, there were direct paths between nomophobia
 6 and mindfulness and also with engagement with technology. The combination of the nomophobia and
 7 mindfulness explained 13% of the variance in engaging with technology. Overall, the combination of
 8 mindfulness, nomophobia and engagement with technology explained 51 percent of the variance in
 9 aberrant driving behaviours.



**p<.001; *p<.01

10

11 *Figure 2: Final full model of relationship between mindfulness, nomophobia, engagement with technology*
 12 *and aberrant driving behaviours*

13 Mann-Whitney U tests were also conducted to explore the relationships between mindfulness,
 14 nomophobia, engagement with technology while driving, aberrant driving behaviours and self-reported
 15 crashes (see Table 7). Although self-reported crashes were unable to be included in the structural model,
 16 it is important to understand if relationships exist between these variables.

1 **Table 7: Medians (IQRs) for DBQ subscale scores, MAAS average scores, NMP-Q total scores,**
 2 **and engagement with technology while driving across self-reported crashes in previous two**
 3 **years**

	Self-reported crash		Significance
	Median (Q1, Q3)		
	Yes (n=139)	No (n=822)	
DBQ: Errors	.364 (0.18, 0.73)	.273 (0.11, 0.55)	U = 45472.00, z = -3.87, p<0.001
DBQ: Lapses	1.00 (0.67, 1.50)	.833 (0.50, 1.33)	U = 49006.50, z = -2.70, p<0.01
DBQ: Violations	.818 (0.45, 1.10)	.546 (0.27, 0.91)	U = 45728.00, z = -3.78, p< 0.001
MAAS: Average	56.00 (48.00, 65.00)	61.00 (51.00, 68.00)	U = 48522.00, z = -2.85, p<0.01
NMP-Q: Total	76.00 (57.00, 94.00)	71.50 (50.00, 90.25)	U = 52078.00, z = -1.67, p=0.095
Engagement with technology while driving: Average	2.50 (1.33, 3.67)	2.00 (1.00, 3.00)	U = 48620.00, z = -2.82, p< 0.01

4
 5 Table 7 shows that there was a significant relationship between aberrant driving behaviours and self-
 6 reported crashes; Drivers who had been involved in a crash reported significantly more errors, lapses
 7 and violations than drivers who had not been involved in a crash. Mindfulness was also related to self-
 8 reported crashes; Drivers who had been involved in a crash had significantly lower levels of mindfulness
 9 than those who had not been involved in crash. While there was no significant relationship between
 10 nomophobia scores and self-reported crashes, drivers who had been involved in a crash reported
 11 significantly higher levels of engagement with technology while driving compared to drivers who had not
 12 been involved in a crash.

13 **DISCUSSION**

14 The current study explored the relationships between mindfulness, nomophobia, technology engagement
 15 while driving, and aberrant driving behaviour. Although previous research revealed how mindfulness
 16 reduces aberrant driving behaviours, no research to date has evaluated whether mindfulness can still
 17 improve driving performance when the fear of being without a mobile phone is considered.

18 Nomophobia was the focus for this study because the fear of being without a mobile phone has
 19 been shown to increase the likelihood of poor decision making (Márquez-Hernández et al., 2020),
 20 distraction (Gutiérrez-Puertas et al., 2019; Mendoza et al., 2018; Osorio-Molina et al., 2021; Wang & Suh,
 21 2018), dangerous, risky, and more frequent smartphone engagement (Kaviani, Robards, et al., 2020),
 22 and illegal smartphone use while driving (Kaviani, Young, et al., 2020). Previous research has shown
 23 that higher levels of mindfulness are associated with less nomophobia (Arpaci et al., 2019; Arpaci &
 24 Gundogan, 2020). Further, higher levels of mindfulness are also related to less errors, lapses and

1 violations and fewer self-reported crashes (Koppel et al., 2018). In this study, the relationship between
2 mindfulness and nomophobia was explored to determine the aggregate impact on engagement with
3 technology and aberrant driving behaviours, including the direct link between nomophobia and aberrant
4 driving behaviours. Understanding these dynamics may allow for the development of mindfulness
5 interventions that take into consideration the possible confounding impact of nomophobia on engagement
6 with technology and resulting aberrant driving behaviour.

7 As expected, participants with higher mindfulness reported less nomophobia, less frequent
8 engagement with technology while driving, and less frequent aberrant driving behaviours. Regarding
9 nomophobia, the results of this study showed 98.9 percent of participants experienced some level of
10 nomophobia. This aligns with previous studies that found nomophobia impacted 99.2 percent of
11 Australian drivers that own a smartphone (Kaviani, Robards, et al., 2020). Although previous studies also
12 showed nomophobia increased the likelihood of illegal smartphone use while driving (Kaviani, Young, et
13 al., 2020), the current study is unique in that it illustrated a direct relationship between higher levels of
14 nomophobia and more frequent aberrant driving behaviours such as errors, lapses, and violations.
15 Although no significant relationship between nomophobia and crashes were established, aberrant driving
16 behaviours have been shown to increase crash risks (Lawton et al., 1997; Parker et al., 1995; Stephens
17 & Fitzharris, 2016). Given a recent systematic review (León-Mejía et al., 2021) found nomophobia is
18 prevalent across the world, with severe levels impacting women and younger individuals more than older
19 individuals and males, this finding has global implications for already at-risk drivers. Additionally, COVID-
20 19 has increased the need to always be with our devices to show vaccination status, check into venues,
21 or maintain social connection while in isolation or lockdowns (David & Roberts, 2021).

22 As expected, participants with higher trait mindfulness reported less nomophobia, less frequent
23 engagement with technology while driving, and less frequent aberrant driving behaviours. Despite
24 mindfulness reducing nomophobia—a finding that is consistent with previous research (Arpaci et al.,
25 2019)—nomophobia increased engagement with technology. This is consistent with previous studies
26 that found individuals with higher levels of nomophobia are more likely to use their smartphones illegally
27 while driving (Kaviani, Robards, et al., 2020; Kaviani, Young, et al., 2020). Higher mindfulness was,
28 however, associated with a reduced overall impact of nomophobia on engagement with technology.
29 Regarding nomophobia's direct relationship with aberrant driving behaviours, this study found
30 nomophobia was related to the tendency to report more frequent errors, lapses, and violations (although
31 a distinction should be drawn between complex multitasking (i.e., non-driving related phone use such as
32 making phone calls while driving) and driving-related phone use which is not multitasking (e.g., using the
33 phone for navigation while driving). This may be due to both internal (i.e., mind-wandering) and external

1 (i.e., secondary task engagement) factors. Indeed, research has shown that, even if an individual does
2 not engage with their smartphone while driving, its mere presence, even while switched off, can still
3 negatively impact attention (Chee et al., 2021). As such, when employing mindfulness as an intervention
4 for mitigating engagement with technology while driving, an understanding of a driver's reasons for
5 needing to be with their smartphones should be developed and considered. Nomophobia should be
6 understood as a common and conditioned response to the modern world, where the perceived negative
7 consequences of a missed phone call may be significant. Formal attention training through mindfulness
8 meditation along with training in the informal practice of mindfulness (maintaining attention on-task while
9 engaged in an activity) may be particularly helpful for drivers to be more conscious of where their attention
10 is focused while driving, and to be more able to redirect it when it is distracted from the driving task.

11 Examining the impact of mindfulness on engagement with technology while driving, the findings
12 were consistent with previous research that demonstrated mindful drivers were more likely to focus their
13 attention on the primary task of driving rather than engaging with technology, especially smartphones
14 (Regan et al., 2020; Throuvala et al., 2020). Additionally, mindful drivers had less frequent driving-related
15 errors, lapses, and violations, a finding that was consistent with previous research (Koppel et al., 2018).
16 In contrast, a higher frequency of aberrant driving behaviours was explained by a combination of lower
17 levels of mindfulness and higher levels of nomophobia and engagement with technology while driving.
18 This study also found the average mindfulness scores among drivers who self-reported being involved in
19 a crash over the past two years were lower than those who reported that they had not been involved in
20 a crash. This finding is supported by previous studies that reported that drivers with greater trait
21 mindfulness were less likely to be involved in a crash over the same timeframe (Koppel et al., 2018). It is
22 important to note that while this study cannot suggest lower crash rates are due to trait mindfulness, the
23 consistent relationship between mindfulness and safe driving practices are found across the literature
24 and should therefore be the focus of further research for developing mindfulness-based interventions
25 designed toward reducing crash rate.

26 Several limitations should be noted. Firstly, the findings regarding mindfulness, nomophobia,
27 aberrant driving behaviours, distracted driving and crashes are based on self-report. Previous research
28 has suggested that participants tend to minimise the extent or frequency of their behaviours if they are
29 not considered to be socially acceptable (e.g., distracted driving; Adams et al., 2005). However,
30 underreporting of socially unacceptable behaviours is likely to have been reduced for the online survey
31 given that participants were assured of confidentiality and anonymity. Further, DBQ scores obtained in
32 this study were similar to those reported in previous research (Stephens & Fitzharris, 2016). While the
33 current study investigated the simultaneous relationships between the MAAS and the DBQ, because the

1 MAAS has been widely used in the area of driving behaviour, this analysis considered mindfulness as a
2 single construct - whereas previous research has suggested that mindfulness may be better
3 conceptualised as a multidimensional construct (Baer et al., 2006; Bishop et al., 2004). Future research
4 should specifically explore these relationships with mindfulness when viewed as a multidimensional
5 construct. Finally, the findings from the current study are based on a convenience sample and may be
6 the result of a volunteer bias (i.e., individuals who agreed to participate in the online survey may be more
7 interested in driving or road safety more generally). Future research should validate the self-reported
8 responses with more objective measures such as those collected through naturalistic driving study (NDS)
9 methodology.

10 **CONCLUSION**

11 In summary, the results of this study demonstrate the positive influence mindfulness can have on
12 nomophobia, engagement with technology while driving, and dangerous driving behaviours that have
13 been associated with crash risk. Mindfulness practices may reduce the effect of nomophobia on
14 engagement with technology while driving and increased dangerous behaviours as a result. This will be
15 increasingly important as modern work and social practices encourage people to increasingly use the
16 phone while driving, and the technology within smart devices, and connectivity of these to the vehicle,
17 increase. More research is needed to understand whether mindfulness-based interventions can reduce
18 nomophobia, and thereby improve driving behaviours and reduce crash rates.

19

20

1 **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

2 This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-
3 for-profit sectors.

4 Dr Kristie Young's contribution to this manuscript was funded by the ARC Discovery Early Career
5 Researcher Award (DE160100372).

6 **REFERENCES**

- 7 Adams, S. A., Matthews, C. E., Ebbeling, C. B., Moore, C. G., Cunningham, J. E., Fulton, J.,
8 & Hebert, J. R. (2005). The effect of social desirability and social approval on self-
9 reports of physical activity. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, *161*(4), 389–398.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1093/aje/kwi054>
- 11 Arpaci, I., Baloğlu, M., & Kesici, Ş. (2019). A multi-group analysis of the effects of
12 individual differences in mindfulness on nomophobia. *Information Development*,
13 *35*(2), 333–341. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0266666917745350>
- 14 Arpaci, I., Baloğlu, M., Kozan, H. İ. Ö., & Kesici, Ş. (2017). Individual Differences in the
15 Relationship Between Attachment and Nomophobia Among College Students: The
16 Mediating Role of Mindfulness. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, *19*(12), e8847.
17 <https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.8847>
- 18 Arpaci, I., & Gundogan, S. (2020). Mediating role of psychological resilience in the
19 relationship between mindfulness and nomophobia. *British Journal of Guidance &*
20 *Counselling*, *0*(0), 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03069885.2020.1856330>
- 21 Baer, R. A. (2003). Mindfulness training as a clinical intervention: A conceptual and
22 empirical review. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *10*(2), 125–143.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1093/clipsy.bpg015>

- 1 Baer, R. A., Smith, G. T., Hopkins, J., Krietemeyer, J., & Toney, L. (2006). Using Self-
2 Report Assessment Methods to Explore Facets of Mindfulness. *Assessment*, *13*(1),
3 27–45. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191105283504>
- 4 Bingham, C. R. (2014). Driver Distraction: A Perennial but Preventable Public Health Threat
5 to Adolescents. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *54*(5), S3–S5.
6 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.02.015>
- 7 Bishop, S. R., Lau, M., Shapiro, S., Carlson, L., Anderson, N. D., Carmody, J., Segal, Z. V.,
8 Abbey, S., Speca, M., Velting, D., & Devins, G. (2004). Mindfulness: A proposed
9 operational definition. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *11*(3), 230–241.
10 <https://doi.org/10.1093/clipsy.bph077>
- 11 Brown, K. W., & Ryan, R. M. (2003). The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role
12 in psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *84*(4),
13 822–848. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.822>
- 14 Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1992). Alternative Ways of Assessing Model Fit.
15 *Sociological Methods & Research*, *21*(2), 230–258.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124192021002005>
- 17 Chee, P., Irwin, J., Bennett, J. M., & Carrigan, A. J. (2021). The mere presence of a mobile
18 phone: Does it influence driving performance? *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, *159*,
19 106226. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2021.106226>
- 20 David, M. E., & Roberts, J. A. (2021). Smartphone Use during the COVID-19 Pandemic:
21 Social Versus Physical Distancing. *International Journal of Environmental Research
22 and Public Health*, *18*(3), 1034. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph18031034>
- 23 Deffenbacher, J. L., Stephens, A. N., & Sullman, M. J. M. (2016). Driving anger as a
24 psychological construct: Twenty years of research using the Driving Anger Scale.

- 1 *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, 42, 236–247.
2 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2015.10.021>
- 3 Fletcher, D., & Sarkar, M. (2013). Psychological Resilience. *European Psychologist*, 18(1),
4 12–23. <https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000124>
- 5 Gonçalves, S., Dias, P., & Correia, A.-P. (2020). Nomophobia and lifestyle: Smartphone use
6 and its relationship to psychopathologies. *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 2,
7 100025. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2020.100025>
- 8 Gutiérrez-Puertas, L., Márquez-Hernández, V. V., São-Romão-Preto, L., Granados-Gámez,
9 G., Gutiérrez-Puertas, V., & Aguilera-Manrique, G. (2019). Comparative study of
10 nomophobia among Spanish and Portuguese nursing students. *Nurse Education in*
11 *Practice*, 34, 79–84. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2018.11.010>
- 12 Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure
13 analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation*
14 *Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1–55.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- 16 Huemer, A. K., Schumacher, M., Mennecke, M., & Vollrath, M. (2018). Systematic review
17 of observational studies on secondary task engagement while driving. *Accident*
18 *Analysis & Prevention*, 119, 225–236. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2018.07.017>
- 19 Kabat-Zinn, J. (2003). Mindfulness-based interventions in context: Past, present, and future.
20 *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 10(2), 144–156.
21 <https://doi.org/10.1093/clipsy.bpg016>
- 22 Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika*, 39(1), 31–36.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291575>

- 1 Kass, S. J., VanWormer, L. A., Mikulas, W. L., Legan, S., & Bumgarner, D. (2011). Effects
2 of Mindfulness Training on Simulated Driving: Preliminary Results. *Mindfulness*,
3 2(4), 236–241. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-011-0066-1>
- 4 Kaviani, F., Robards, B., Young, K. L., & Koppel, S. (2020). Nomophobia: Is the Fear of
5 Being without a Smartphone Associated with Problematic Use? *International Journal*
6 *of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 17(17), 6024.
7 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17176024>
- 8 Kaviani, F., Young, K. L., Robards, B., & Koppel, S. (2020). Nomophobia and self-reported
9 smartphone use while driving: An investigation into whether nomophobia can
10 increase the likelihood of illegal smartphone use while driving. *Transportation*
11 *Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, 74, 212–224.
12 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2020.08.024>
- 13 Khoury, B., Lecomte, T., Fortin, G., Masse, M., Therien, P., Bouchard, V., Chapleau, M.-A.,
14 Paquin, K., & Hofmann, S. G. (2013). Mindfulness-based therapy: A comprehensive
15 meta-analysis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 33(6), 763–771.
16 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2013.05.005>
- 17 Kita, E., & Luria, G. (2020). Differences between males and females in the prediction of
18 smartphone use while driving: Mindfulness and income. *Accident Analysis &*
19 *Prevention*, 140. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2020.105514>
- 20 Koppel, S., Bugeja, L., Hua, P., Osborne, R., Stephens, A. N., Young, K. L., Chambers, R., &
21 Hassed, C. (2019). Do mindfulness interventions improve road safety? A systematic
22 review. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, 123, 88–98.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2018.11.013>
- 24 Koppel, S., Stephens, A. N., Young, K. L., Hua, P., Chambers, R., & Hassed, C. (2018).
25 What is the relationship between self-reported aberrant driving behaviors,

- 1 mindfulness, and self-reported crashes and infringements? *Traffic Injury Prevention*,
2 19(5), 480–487. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15389588.2018.1440083>
- 3 Lawton, R., Parker, D., Stradling, S. G., & Manstead, A. S. R. (1997). Predicting road traffic
4 accidents: The role of social deviance and violations. *British Journal of Psychology*,
5 88(2), 249–262. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8295.1997.tb02633.x>
- 6 León-Mejía, A. C., Gutiérrez-Ortega, M., Serrano-Pintado, I., & González-Cabrera, J. (2021).
7 A systematic review on nomophobia prevalence: Surfacing results and standard
8 guidelines for future research. *PLOS ONE*, 16(5), e0250509.
9 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0250509>
- 10 Little, T. D., Cunningham, W. A., Shahar, G., & Widaman, K. F. (2002). To parcel or not to
11 parcel: Exploring the question, weighing the merits. *Structural Equation Modeling*,
12 9(2), 151–173. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_1
- 13 Mackinnon, M. H. (2001). Max Weber’s Disenchantment: Lineages of Kant and Channing.
14 *Journal of Classical Sociology*, 1(3), 329–351.
15 <https://doi.org/10.1177/14687950122232576>
- 16 Márquez-Hernández, V. V., Gutiérrez-Puertas, L., Granados-Gámez, G., Gutiérrez-Puertas,
17 V., & Aguilera-Manrique, G. (2020). Problematic mobile phone use, nomophobia and
18 decision-making in nursing students mobile and decision-making in nursing students.
19 *Nurse Education in Practice*, 49, 102910. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nepr.2020.102910>
- 20 Mendoza, J. S., Pody, B. C., Lee, S., Kim, M., & McDonough, I. M. (2018). The effect of
21 cellphones on attention and learning: The influences of time, distraction, and
22 nomophobia. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 86, 52–60.
23 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.04.027>

- 1 Notara, V., Vagka, E., Gnardellis, C., & Lagiou, A. (2021). The Emerging Phenomenon of
2 Nomophobia in Young Adults: A Systematic Review Study. *Addiction & Health*,
3 *13*(2), 120–136. <https://doi.org/10.22122/ahj.v13i2.309>
- 4 Osorio-Molina, C., Martos-Cabrera, M. B., Membrive-Jiménez, M. J., Vargas-Roman, K.,
5 Suleiman-Martos, N., Ortega-Campos, E., & Gómez-Urquiza, J. L. (2021).
6 Smartphone addiction, risk factors and its adverse effects in nursing students: A
7 systematic review and meta-analysis. *Nurse Education Today*, *98*, 104741.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.nedt.2020.104741>
- 9 Parker, D., Manstead, A. S. R., Stradling, S. G., & Reason, J. T. (1992). Determinants of
10 intention to commit driving violations. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, *24*(2), 117–
11 131. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-4575\(92\)90028-H](https://doi.org/10.1016/0001-4575(92)90028-H)
- 12 Parker, D., Reason, J. T., Manstead, A. S. R., & Stradling, S. G. (1995). Driving errors,
13 driving violations and accident involvement. *Ergonomics*, *38*(5), 1036–1048.
14 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00140139508925170>
- 15 Querstret, D., Morison, L., Dickinson, S., Cropley, M., & John, M. (2020). Mindfulness-
16 Based Stress Reduction and Mindfulness-Based Cognitive Therapy for Psychological
17 Health and Well-Being in Nonclinical Samples: A Systematic Review and Meta-
18 Analysis. *International Journal of Stress Management*, *27*(4), 394–411.
19 <https://doi.org/10.1037/str0000165>
- 20 Reason, J., Manstead, A., Stradling, S., Baxter, J., & Campbell, K. (1990). Errors and
21 violations on the roads: A real distinction? *Ergonomics*, *33*(10–11), 1315–1332.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00140139008925335>
- 23 Reason, J., Manstead, A., Stradling, S., Baxter, J., & Campbell, K. (1990). Errors and
24 violations on the roads: A real distinction? *Ergonomics*, *33*(10–11), 1315–1332.
25 <https://doi.org/10.1080/00140139008925335>

- 1 Regan, T., Harris, B., Van Loon, M., Nanavaty, N., Schueler, J., Engler, S., & Fields, S. A.
2 (2020). Does mindfulness reduce the effects of risk factors for problematic
3 smartphone use? Comparing frequency of use versus self-reported addiction.
4 *Addictive Behaviors*, *108*, 106435. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2020.106435>
- 5 Reynaud, E., & Navarro, J. (2019). Chapter 15 - Is Mindfulness Helping the Brain to Drive?
6 Insights From Behavioral Data and Future Directions for Research. In H. Ayaz & F.
7 Dehais (Eds.), *Neuroergonomics* (pp. 93–97). Academic Press.
8 <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-811926-6.00015-4>
- 9 Rodríguez-García, A.-M., Moreno-Guerrero, A.-J., & López Belmonte, J. (2020).
10 Nomophobia: An Individual's Growing Fear of Being without a Smartphone—A
11 Systematic Literature Review. *International Journal of Environmental Research and*
12 *Public Health*, *17*(2), 580. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17020580>
- 13 Segal, Z. V., Williams, J. M. G., & Teasdale, J. D. (2001). *Mindfulness-Based Cognitive*
14 *Therapy for Depression, First Edition: A New Approach to Preventing Relapse*.
15 Guilford Publications.
- 16 Stephens, A. N., & Fitzharris, M. (2016). Validation of the Driver Behaviour Questionnaire
17 in a representative sample of drivers in Australia. *Accident Analysis & Prevention*, *86*,
18 186–198. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2015.10.030>
- 19 Stephens, A. N., Koppel, S., Young, K. L., Chambers, R., & Hased, C. (2018). Associations
20 between self-reported mindfulness, driving anger and aggressive driving.
21 *Transportation Research Part F: Traffic Psychology and Behaviour*, *56*, 149–155.
22 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2018.04.011>
- 23 Stephens, A. N., O'Hern, S., Young, K. L., Chambers, R., Hased, C., & Koppel, S. (2020).
24 Self-reported mindfulness, cyclist anger and aggression. *Accident Analysis &*
25 *Prevention*, *144*, 105625. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aap.2020.105625>

- 1 Throuvala, M. A., Griffiths, M. D., Rennoldson, M., & Kuss, D. J. (2020). Mind over Matter:
2 Testing the Efficacy of an Online Randomized Controlled Trial to Reduce Distraction
3 from Smartphone Use. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public
4 Health*, 17(13), 4842. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph17134842>
- 5 Toch, E., Chassidim, H., & Hatuka, T. (2020). Can you Turn it Off?: The Spatial and Social
6 Context of Mobile Disturbance. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer
7 Interaction*, 4(CSCW2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3415162>
- 8 Trousselard, M., Steiler, D., Claverie, D., & Canini, F. (2014). [The history of Mindfulness
9 put to the test of current scientific data: Unresolved questions]. *L'Encephale*, 40(6),
10 474–480. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.encep.2014.08.006>
- 11 Turner, B. S. (2011). *Religion and modern society: Citizenship, secularisation, and the state*.
12 Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.
- 13 Wang, G., & Suh, A. (2018). Disorder or Driver?: The Effects of Nomophobia on Work-
14 Related Outcomes in Organizations. *Conference on Human Factors in Computing
15 Systems*, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3173574.3173624>
- 16 Ward, A. F., Duke, K., Gneezy, A., & Bos, M. W. (2017). Brain Drain: The Mere Presence of
17 One's Own Smartphone Reduces Available Cognitive Capacity. *Journal of the
18 Association for Consumer Research*, 2(2), 140–154. <https://doi.org/10.1086/691462>
- 19 World Health Organization. (2018). *Global status report on road safety 2018*.
20 [https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/277370/WHO-NMH-NVI-18.20-
21 eng.pdf?ua=1](https://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/handle/10665/277370/WHO-NMH-NVI-18.20-eng.pdf?ua=1)
- 22 Yanko, M. R., & Spalek, T. M. (2014). Driving With the Wandering Mind: The Effect That
23 Mind-Wandering Has on Driving Performance. *Human Factors*, 56(2), 260–269.
24 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018720813495280>

- 1 Yildirim, C., & Correia, A.-P. (2015). Exploring the dimensions of nomophobia:
2 Development and validation of a self-reported questionnaire. *Computers in Human*
3 *Behavior, 49*, 130–137. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2015.02.059>
- 4 Young, K. L., Koppel, S., Stephens, A. N., Osborne, R., Chambers, R., & Hased, C. (2019).
5 Mindfulness Predicts Driver Engagement in Distracting Activities. *Mindfulness,*
6 *10(5)*, 913–922. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12671-018-1060-7>
- 7 Young, K. L., Osborne, R., Koppel, S., Charlton, J., Williamson, A., Haworth, N., Woolley,
8 J., & Senserrick, T. (2018). *What are Australian drivers doing behind the wheel? An*
9 *overview of secondary task data from the Australian Naturalistic Driving Study.*
10 ARSC, ACT.