

UNITED WISDOM

Task switching and the cost of constant availability

Human Nature and Inner World

Andrey Zarinsh & Maria Evilkut

I-23-N01 · EN

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

Task switching and the cost of constant availability

Epigraph

> *one thing is needful*

Luke, 10:42. King James Version, BibleGateway, displayed line 32; a short exact fragment, with our own RU rendering. The selected account has a religious genre rather than the status of research on work time or a norm for distributing household duties.

What this article is about

Someone is preparing a list of things for a small shared trip. They check what is already available and what still needs to be packed. A question arrives about the meeting time. They answer, return to the list, and try to remember whether they checked the charger. Another participant sends a clarification about the route. Then comes a request to look at a photograph of the place. All the messages concern the shared trip, but require different actions. At the hour's end, the conversation looks lively while the list contains two unchecked lines. The person was available. Participants received several answers. Packing still requires a separate completion.

There is no culprit assigned in advance to this scene. The clarifications may genuinely have helped. Some questions may reasonably have received an immediate answer. Others could have waited. Being able to receive messages does not mean someone must immediately finish every new question; wanting to concentrate does not remove responsibility already accepted toward others either. Constant availability becomes difficult to discuss when these meanings merge: the channel is open, a message arrived, its recipient saw it, understood the request, agreed to take it on, and completed it. Each event requires its own grounds. One visible answer does not establish every subsequent result.

We will consider switching through the subjects that have to be left and clarified again. An experiment on the costs of alternating tasks, a letter by Seneca, and the account of Martha and Mary do not form a shared productivity program. They offer different grounds for questions about sequence, attention, and the chosen activity. The everyday note below belongs to the editors. It does not measure brain processes, promise a certain number of minutes saved, or require abandoning relationships for uninterrupted work. Its possible result is a clearer next step and an honest status for the shared preparations, rather than proof that all switches are harmful or every kind of unavailability useful.

@andrey.zarinsh @ilkutki

I. Two tasks can belong to one undertaking

The packing list and the message about meeting concern the trip. But this does not make them the same next action. Checking the things requires comparing a line with what is actually present. Answering about the time requires clarifying an agreement among participants. We can attend to the conversation while leaving a line unchecked. We can finish the list carefully but forget to communicate the time. Naming the shared purpose does not replace a separate result. For a small note, it is useful to indicate what was underway before the transition and what new subject appeared afterward.

Not every change of action means a new task. Someone may open a photograph to check whether the destination has the equipment needed. If this directly addresses an unfinished line, it continues the chosen check. In another case, the photograph prompts a discussion of impressions that concerns the trip but does not finish the list. The content determines the difference, rather than the application in which the material opens. Switching between screen and table may belong to one activity; a long stay in one chat may involve many subjects. Observation does not require treating every tab as a separate task or every message as a separate violation.

Sometimes the shared process is deliberately organized as alternation. One person supplies information, another checks the list, and the first clarifies a discrepancy discovered. Here the transition is needed for the work. If every alternation is called a loss, the method of cooperation itself disappears. We can ask which transitions belong to the chosen sequence and which arose additionally. The answer depends on the particular agreement and can change when a new condition is found. This article does not establish an ideal number of transitions. It proposes retaining their subjects so that usefulness and consequences can be discussed in relation to the real task rather than a predetermined image of a flawlessly uninterrupted activity.

In the scene with the list, beginning with one unchecked line is enough. What needed to be confirmed? What happened instead of that check? What is known now? These questions do not reconstruct the entire evening or turn it into a research procedure. They help us avoid declaring the shared trip prepared merely because conversation about it continues. If a line has been checked, it can be marked. If not, the appropriate status should remain. The number of messages received does not replace this simple result, just as the absence of conversation does not prove that things are actually packed and the meeting arrangements clear to everyone.

II. Returning means finding the unfinished place

After answering about the time, the person sees the list but does not remember whether the charger line was checked. Returning includes clarifying this point. The charger may already be in the bag, or merely mentioned so far. Its presence can be checked instead of trying to convince oneself that memory ought to be exact. This action occupies its own interval, but the article does not measure it as the previous answer's pure cost. It may involve a search, another check, or correcting an earlier uncertainty. Naming what actually had to be done matters, without assigning the entire remaining interval to one cause.

A small mark before a transition may preserve the task's state: this line is still unchecked, and the next action will be to check its presence. This is an editorial suggestion rather than a scientifically tested method of eliminating costs. It does not suit every occasion or replace an actual check. If the mark is wrong, returning to it does not make the result reliable. If a task is interrupted urgently, recording may be unavailable. The relevant place can be recovered later from the material. The absence of a mark is not a new personal failing; what matters is the action now available and what needs to be communicated about the unfinished part.

Returning may reveal that the earlier step is no longer needed. A participant has clarified that equipment is already provided, so checking the item can be reconsidered. It then makes sense to change the list while retaining the new information's source. This does not mean the previous plan was pointless or that every request immediately outranks the current activity. The change concerns a condition received. If the information is unreliable, the line still needs clarification. A new message's availability, its reading, and confirmation of its content differ. A quick transition can bring useful material, but does not establish its accuracy or finish preparations by itself.

If someone returns to the same place several times, the sequence can be considered without necessarily counting every minute. What information had to be recovered each time? What remained visible? Which messages actually changed the task? Answers may suggest a next working order, but do not prove that a universal routine has been found. One suitable way to mark the unfinished can be retained while an unnecessary log is declined. The aim is to deal with a particular list rather than create another permanent task of tracking one's attention. When marking takes more work than the chosen check, the format can be reduced or stopped.

III. Receiving a message, accepting a request, and completing it

An open communication channel indicates the possibility of delivery. It does not promise that its recipient is free now. A visible answer may acknowledge receipt without accepting an entire request. A trip participant can write that they will look at the photograph after checking the list. This is a specified future action if it can genuinely be promised. We can state immediately that only a brief clarification is currently available. There is no need to portray a full solution to maintain an impression of constant responsiveness. The more precise the answer's scale, the clearer what another person can rely on and which part still requires a separate action.

However, a brief acknowledgment is not always necessary. If the shared format permits later answers, someone may simply continue the present work. If a request is urgent and waiting creates a substantial problem, another order may be needed. The word “availability” alone does not determine these circumstances. It is useful to clarify who expects what, and by when. Not every demand for an immediate answer is well grounded; not every silence means an agreed break. Our note does not replace the shared agreement. It only helps notice when an answer's author has promised more than current information, time, and the ability to complete the accepted subject actually permit.

We can answer immediately and remain responsible for the previous unfinished task. We can defer a new request and be responsible for its relevant deadline. Choosing one action does not erase the other from the shared situation. If a deferred request has not been accepted, this should be stated where clarity is needed. If accepted, the promise needs a suitable limit. No single communication template is required for every relationship. Talking with someone close, an organizational chat, and an agreed coordination shift have different grounds. They cannot be equated merely because messages arrive on one device and appear in one notification list.

The form of an answer can also change the transition's size. Sometimes communicating the time found is enough; elsewhere, material has to be opened, a condition checked, and several participants consulted. This difference concerns the request's content. It does not prove that a short text is always cheap and a long one always difficult. A single sentence may require a complex check, while several lines may merely pass on what is already known. For observation, naming the action required is more useful than assessing load by message length. Discussing constant availability then has a concrete subject: not how many characters were typed, but which tasks someone actually accepted and completed between returns to the original list.

IV. What the research calls switching costs

In their 2001 article, Joshua S. Rubinstein, David E. Meyer, and Jeffrey E. Evans compared task alternation and repetition in four experiments. The available abstract describes classification tasks and arithmetic operations, along with switching-time costs that depended on conditions. We read the complete abstract and bibliographic information in the indexed PubMed record rather than the full text, experiments' methods, or data. This offers narrow grounds for distinguishing switching from repetition. It does not calculate losses in our evening, provide a measure of relationship quality, or prove that every new message reduces the trip's overall benefit.

Our everyday scene contains other subjects: objects, deadlines, people's questions, and the need to check real information. We do not reproduce laboratory tasks or assign ourselves a research measure. We can notice that returning required finding a line and checking it again. This does not yield a universal proportion of lost time, a brain's working speed, or a participant's diagnosis. The abstract does not become a full article because its conclusion seems familiar. The available reading scope remains in the sources. Unread methods and calculations are not presented as verified; the everyday exercise is not declared validated by this research.

Even the ordinary word “cost” needs clarification. We can discuss the interval before the list's completion, checking an item again, an unfulfilled request, or the need to change a promised deadline. These are different consequences, some of which may remain unknown. They cannot automatically be added to a single bill of damage. The conversation may have removed an important uncertainty and prevented an unnecessary action. It may have left another task without enough time. Assessing this requires a particular result and context. The presence of a transition does not tell us whether it was justified, and the laboratory term for costs does not remove the need to check what actually happened in shared preparations.

If we want to compare two working arrangements, we can limit this to the chosen task and available result. For example, on one occasion the person marked the unchecked line; on another, they recovered it after a conversation. This observes two occasions rather than repeating an experiment or establishing the difference's sole cause. Conditions may have changed; information may have become clearer. We can acknowledge the mark's usefulness for this list without promising the same result to everyone. The research source helps retain a question about switching conditions; the editorial decision about the note's format remains ours and requires a separate content check, rather than an automatic transfer of scientific authority to every everyday suggestion.

V. Seneca: lingering with a selected text

In the second letter to Lucilius, Seneca discusses hasty movement among authors and the value of assimilating selected reading. We read the entire letter II in Richard M. Gummere's translation and the 1925 title information, rather than the whole collection. This is philosophical counsel using historical images, not research on notifications. The letter's medical, dietary, and plant comparisons are not adopted as contemporary facts here. Its sharp characterization of restlessness is not used to diagnose the reader. We retain a question about what remains of the selected activity without making an ancient evaluation mandatory for someone who has to respond to several real requests.

Applying this to a packing list belongs to the editors. After several transitions, we can ask which check has actually been completed and what remains merely mentioned. A list does not become ready through the number of trip-related materials viewed. But completing one line does not require abandoning all other questions. Sometimes the sequence means first clarifying information with another participant. Seneca's letter lets us ask about remaining with a subject rather than prescribing our particular schedule. If shared preparations need discussion, conversation may belong to the work. A historical quotation does not make one interaction arrangement correct under all circumstances.

A limited section can be chosen without promising to finish everything without interruption. For example, checking one item, then looking at a trip-related message. This boundary is meaningful only if the task actually permits it. A different condition may require an earlier answer. Our practice does not assign uniform time intervals or demand that fidelity to a philosopher be proved through the duration of solitary activity. The subject can remain small. Declining endless jumps among materials is not the same as declining new information, help, or shared work. What matters is how the chosen order relates to an available result and accepted responsibility, rather than how strictly it reproduces an elegant historical formula.

Every message need not become a source of a new inner struggle. We can specify in advance which question is being resolved now and revise that decision when a significant circumstance appears. This guarantees no ease. It merely lets us name a change rather than expand work covertly. If someone finds the previous section too large, it can be reduced. If an unsuitable deadline has been promised, the agreement needs clarification. Retaining a subject has meaning relative to a result; it does not require continuing a wrong check to demonstrate steadfastness. Even a finished line remains subject to correction if it is later discovered that the wrong item was checked or outdated information used.

VI. Martha and Mary: genre and comparison's limits

In the selected account of Luke 10:38–42, Martha is occupied with serving and Mary listens to Jesus; a request for help and an answer follow. We read all five selected verses and the KJV version, rather than the entire chapter or Gospel. This is a religious narrative rather than an experimental recommendation about distributing work. We do not derive from it that household duties do not matter, that a woman must serve silently, or that requesting help proves improper attention. The characters, genre, and counsel's subject remain separate from our shared-trip scene. The evangelist's historical personal authorship and an exact reconstruction of the event are not established here.

Comparison lets us ask about a chosen activity and its relation to others' expectations. It does not remove participants' real workload. If one person packs while the others discuss details, this does not yet mean the preparations are distributed fairly. A separate conversation about who does what may be needed. That decision is not automatically extracted from a short religious phrase. Actual duties, people's availability, and consent must be considered. Our article does not assign the ancient account a ready-made answer to today's organizational problem, still less one participant's right to force another to do everything for the sake of their own uninterrupted attention.

Being present with someone and being available for every new task are not identical either. We can listen to a conversation without accepting another organizational request. We can help through action while temporarily not joining the chat. The suitable format depends on the conversation's subject and the agreement. Care should not be measured only by response speed or endless readiness to switch. Nor should our own concentration be declared a sufficient justification for every refusal. A specific conversation about available action is needed here. It may end in agreement, a different form of help, or refusal; a religious image does not predetermine another person's answer.

The connection between traditions remains editorial. Seneca discusses reading, the Gospel account retains its religious meaning, and the experimental article compares specific tasks. They do not provide a single scale of proper availability. Their proximity helps us retain several questions without declaring the answers identical. What has been chosen? What has been finished? Which conditions allow a transition? What does someone else expect? These questions can be considered without religious self-identification or taking on a research measure. If a language does not suit the reader, it can remain in the historical section while their particular task is discussed in ordinary words, preserving the boundary between a source and a contemporary decision.

VII. Availability can be an accepted duty

Not everyone can simply choose a no-message routine. Someone has agreed to coordinate the trip and answers organizational questions. Another participant is merely preparing their own things. They have different work subjects and availability, although both want to finish preparations. This article does not propose a single right to disappear from communication in every case. It allows clarification of what has been accepted, what is realistically possible, and where the order needs changing. If someone holds many duties simultaneously, distribution among participants may be needed. That is a shared decision rather than proof that they should try harder or that an individual desire for quiet automatically removes collective responsibility.

We can name a condition under which someone is available for clarification and one under which another participant is needed. That format should not promise more than the group can actually provide. If no one accepts the replacement, the duty cannot be declared transferred. If the message about the new order remains unread, we cannot assume everyone already follows it. The relevant response needs checking. Unavailability chosen independently and an agreed change of duties have different consequences. Clarifying this distinction is sometimes more important than configuring the device: it concerns whose action others actually rely on and what they know about preparations' current state.

Conditions may include important exceptions. If a question cannot be deferred in the chosen format, it should be distinguished from ordinary discussion of impressions. Our article does not list universal urgency criteria or replace a particular activity's rules. It proposes discussing an exception by its subject: what requires an answer, who needs it, and how information will be conveyed. Every new message need not be declared an emergency, and everything need not be ignored for one working section. Safety and actual duties have their own grounds. In a genuinely urgent situation, necessary action should not be delayed to complete an editorial exercise about attention.

If availability is a standing accepted role, its organization also needs a separate conversation. The scope of questions, handover order, and available resources can be clarified. This does not promise that an individual exercise will repair the whole arrangement of shared work. Someone may see a constraint without being able to change it immediately. It is then useful to communicate honestly what remains unfinished rather than conceal the problem behind a feeling of constant occupation. Observation does not place on one participant a duty to compensate for every condition through personal discipline. It helps name a particular point where an individual next step requires a shared decision rather than another unnoticed promise.

VIII. A communication boundary needs understandable content

In the trip scene, participants can agree to collect timing questions in one place and consider other material later. This is merely one possible arrangement. It guarantees no lower costs and fits only if participants understand the subject and accept the format. Communicating the order is not their consent. We may receive a clarification, discover an inconvenience, and change the proposal. What matters is retaining which questions remain open and who is responsible for the next step. Configuring a channel does not by itself confirm that information became clearer or that packing now proceeds without mistakes and delays.

Sometimes changing a personal promise's scale is enough. Someone can say they are checking the list now and will return to one question after the chosen section, if that timing is feasible. This does not require others to stop having needs. They may propose another order, find another participant, or decline to wait. A boundary does not gain meaning solely from a firm tone. Its content should fit actual duties and possibilities. If an existing promise changes, that should be named. Wanting steady attention does not erase the previous deadline or turn the recipient's silence into agreement to postpone shared work.

Observation can remain private. There is no need to copy others' messages, track everyone's response speed, or rank those who distract us most often. Our note only needs the subject of our own task and the transition chosen. If shared organization needs assessment, an appropriate format and participants' consent are required. A personal exercise should not become a covert test of other people's closeness or usefulness. A question about availability concerns possible actions; it does not expose others' intentions. An actual request can be discussed without deciding from it how much someone respects or cares for us, or how well they generally manage attention.

If a communication boundary did not work, the particular event should be considered. The message may not have arrived. The format may have been unclear. An exception may genuinely have required a different sequence. Or the agreement may not have been fulfilled. These possibilities differ and require different actions. We can check an available fact, clarify a promise, or acknowledge a breach. There is no need to blame insufficient firmness automatically or demand an even stricter routine. The cause may remain unknown. Our note allows that limit; it does not force an unsuitable interaction method to be retained to prove the original decision correct and require every later event to fit it.

IX. Completion is checked against the undertaking

At the chosen section's end, we can return to one line and check the item. We may discover that information remains incomplete. We may hand a question to someone who has actually accepted it. These are particular actions' results rather than a certificate of successful attention management. A prepared mark does not mean the item is present; a request sent does not mean it has been completed. If the shared result depends on another person's answer, that is checked separately. Our own note can finish earlier. This boundary prevents completed reflection on availability from being confused with completed trip preparations, which have actual subjects and several participants.

We can notice that the selected order was inconvenient and change it without a general verdict. A mark before transitioning may have helped find the place yet be unnecessary for another list. A quick answer may have removed uncertainty but require more time on the next occasion. These differences do not require observation to continue endlessly. One confirmed result and one remaining question can be retained. There is no need to calculate the exact cost of all availability to take a small next step. If the accounting requires unavailable information and overly confident causes, it is better to leave it unfinished than present an attractive number as a reliable assessment of one's life.

In this article, constant availability's cost is a question about particular transitions and consequences. It may include returning to the unfinished, expanding promises, and changing a shared deadline. These are possible subjects of observation rather than assertions that they always occur or are measured alike. Availability can belong to care and work. Sustained activity can also have value. A proportionate decision between them requires the conditions rather than one principle's eternal victory. We can finish a note when the next step is clear, a real duty named, or the unknown honestly stated. The chosen action is then checked against its actual result.

What this means in practice

If the format suits you, choose one ordinary transition already noticed. Name the previous task, unfinished section, and the new request's subject. Distinguish receipt, a decision to take it on, and actual completion. Consider what returning required: finding a line, checking material, or revising a condition. Do not establish a cause where only a sequence is known. This is a voluntary editorial note rather than an experiment, therapy, a productivity test, or a calculation of brain costs. It requires no continuous message tracking and promises no particular amount of time that changing a routine will recover.

One available step can be chosen: finishing a check, marking the unfinished, clarifying timing, accepting a new request at a realistic scale, or changing a shared agreement. Do not take

another's silence for consent or declare a duty transferred without a response. Preserve privacy; do not test others covertly or defer necessary urgent action for the exercise. We can stop when a step is clear, the unknown named, or observation has become an extra task. A prepared list, checked items, and an agreed communication order remain different results. A small clarification of one transition does not establish a universal availability routine for every relationship and activity.

Key quotation

> *Everywhere means nowhere*

Seneca, Moral letters to Lucilius, II, 2. Richard M. Gummere, Wikisource, displayed line 102. A short exact phrase, with our own RU translation; the collection's title page dates from 1925, with First Printed 1918/Reprinted 1925 statements. Philosophical reading counsel, rather than research on notifications or a diagnosis of the reader.

Connections between traditions

Seneca's letter asks about assimilating selected reading; Luke's account retains a religious subject of activity and communication. The experimental abstract describes costs of alternating particular tasks. Comparison is editorial, without historical influence, a shared theory of the brain, or identical conclusions. Everyday observation does not reproduce an experiment or prescribe a uniform relationship routine. The task's result, channel availability, an accepted promise, and others' consent remain separate. A short quotation does not remove duties, determine a fair distribution of work, or make our exercise the original authors' tested program.

Primary sources

1. Seneca, Moral letters to Lucilius, II, Richard M. Gummere; title information: William Heinemann/G.P.Putnam's Sons, 1925, First Printed 1918/Reprinted 1925. Entire selected letter II read, rather than the whole collection. Historical philosophical counsel; medical/plant comparisons are not contemporary facts. A territorial public-domain label is not universal rights clearance; international rights UNKNOWN, no full import. The entire collection, all volumes and hosts have one quotation budget.

2. Luke 10:38–42, King James Version, BibleGateway. All five selected verses and version read, rather than the whole chapter/Gospel. A religious account, not an experiment, household norm, or duty to endure unequal workload. Historical personal authorship unestablished; international rights UNKNOWN, no full import. The whole Luke KJV work combines with the previously used passage without additional quotations.

3. Joshua S. Rubinstein, David E. Meyer, Jeffrey E. Evans, Executive control of cognitive processes in task switching, Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance, 2001, 27(4):763–797, DOI 10.1037/0096-1523.27.4.763. Complete abstract and bibliographic information in the indexed primary PubMed search return actually read; opening the record/APA/PDF did not yield the full text. Article/methods/data/calculations unread; the four-experiment report is not our everyday-note test. International rights UNKNOWN, open license unestablished; limited editorial exposition/link, no full import or direct scientific quotations.

Tags

attention, switching, tasks, availability, message, request, receipt, promise, completion, return, list, check, result, deadline, agreement, responsibility, consent, privacy, boundaries, shared work, Seneca, Gummere, Luke, Martha, Mary, Rubinstein, Meyer, Evans, experiment, United Wisdom

About the authors

Andrey Zarinsh is the author and founder of United Wisdom. He explores inner transformation, unity across traditions, intercultural dialogue, and contemporary spiritual discipline. Instagram: @andrey.zarinsh.

Maria Evilkut is a coauthor of United Wisdom. Alongside her research, she seeks to test these ideas in practice and observe how principles of unity and mutual understanding work in real life between people and cultures. Instagram: @ilkutki.