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Abstract

Gamification research has for a long time been interested in determining its definition and in which fields it works. By combining several game design elements and applying them in different non-game contexts it has been proven to successfully enhance certain activities, partly depending on the users and the contexts. Modern gamification research has started looking into how it works and in doing so, examining the individual effects of the game design elements. In this study, feedback and clear goals have been chosen as the game design elements to be examined when implemented individually in to-do lists. Feedback was represented as emoticons that changed from neutral to happy as tasks were checked off the list. Clear goals were implemented in the lists as an explicit goal. Together with a plain to-do list, nine participants used the three lists for nine days while keeping a visual diary. Afterward, they were subjected to interviews regarding their experiences. The framework of the self-determination theory was used in analyzing the results. The results showed that when using the list with feedback the participants were slightly better at clearing tasks but that the motivation, sometimes, seemed to come from trying to avoid negative feelings that the neutral emoticons seemed to invoke. The list with clear goals showed that in many cases the participants were actively trying to reach the given goal, seemingly, even when the participants mentioned not doing so. It was also, more often than not, experienced as controlling.
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1. Introduction

The idea of using game elements in order to enhance the user experience in systems, applications and so forth is a concept often referred to as gamification. Gamification is commonly defined as the use of game design elements in non-game contexts (Deterding et al., 2011). The popularity of games is such that in the US alone, 63% of the households have at least one person playing three hours or more a week (ESA, 2016). By using these game design elements, or motivational affordances (Deterding, 2014a), there is an expectation of tapping into the very aspects that make these games so attractive and use them to increase enjoyment and performance. This, combined with the hope of affecting the behavior of users makes gamification an attractive tool for many, designers and companies included.

Gamification has also been proven to work, although this is somewhat dependent on the users and the contexts it is used in (Hamari, Koivisto and Sarsa, 2014). Furthermore, it has also been shown to have potential in impacting people’s behavior (Seaborn & Fels, 2015) showing that its demand is at least somewhat justified.

Nacke & Deterding, (2017) mentions that the gamification research is in need of looking at the effects, moderators, and mediators of individual game design elements. While studies of this have been made on a small scale and using a limited number of different design elements, (Hamari, 2015; Landers, Bauer & Callan, 2015; Mekler et al., 2013, 2015) they are few in between and therefore the gamification community is still urging for more. (Nacke & Deterding, 2017)

Furthermore, modern gamification research has seemingly adopted SDT (Self-determination theory) (Deci & Ryan, 2000a) as one of the more prominent choices of frameworks used for gamification studies (Seaborn & Fels, 2015). Which could be seen as a response to the call to the research community for incorporating theories that can help us explain why the observed effects of gamification befall in the first place (Deterding, 2014b; Nacke & Deterding, 2017).

This study can be seen as a response to this, as it sets out to examine the individual effects of two different game design elements, namely feedback, and clear goals. In order to tease out any potential effects, these game design elements are used, individually, in prototypes acting as to-do lists. Altogether, three to-do lists are to be used with two of them containing one of the two game design elements with the third being without. The decision to use feedback and clear goals come from the both outspoken and seemingly implied urgings of Nacke & Deterding and Hamari, Koivisto & Sarsa, (2014) respectively. To keep in line with much of the other modern research in the area, the self-determination theory is applied in order to explain the findings.

The research question is thus:

Do the game design elements feedback and clear goals affect a non-game activity such as using to-do lists when used individually and, if so, how does this differ depending on the game design element that is used?
2. Review of current literature

Gamification has over the years received much attention from both industry and academia and have been studied in various ways, with various methods and has been proven to be working. Furthermore, much of the studies that have been done have been using combinations of multiple game design elements and in specific contexts such as education and health (Hamari, Koivisto & Sarsa, 2014; Seaborn & Fels, 2015).

Some studies, such as Mekler et al., 2015; Landers, Bauer & Callan, 2015; Hamari, (2015) have isolated certain game design elements and applied them to specific contexts in order to observe any changes the elements might bring. Mekler et al. set out to explore the hypothesis that the game design elements points, leaderboards, and levels, when perceived as informational, may enhance intrinsic motivation, thus increase performance. To test this, they used an image annotation task to examine these elements individually and compared the results with a control group performing the same task without any implemented game design elements. The result of the study was that the game elements did not affect the participants’ intrinsic motivation, it did, however, lead to them performing better.

Hamari, (2015) in turn conducted a two-year study which reports the effects that the implementation of the game design element badges had on a utilitarian trading service. The study showed that not only did the implementation of badges increase the general activity of the users, the results were lasting. This is an interesting finding since it has previously been reported that the effects of gamification might be a result of novelty (Koivisto & Hamari, 2014).

Another study regarding the effects of badges comes from Cruz, Hanus & Fox, (2015). They gathered video gamers who participated together in focus groups and discussed meta-game reward systems in order to understand how badges affect intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Self-determination theory (Deci & Ryan, 2000b) was one of the frameworks used in order to answer this. The results showed that badges functioned as both rewards and assignments, and depending on how one perceives the difference between the two, influenced whether the badge would be seen as controlling or informational. Clarifying further, when seen as controlling it is, according to STD, harmful for intrinsic motivation while when informational it is more likely to be beneficial. Furthermore, whether these meta-game systems are seen as motivating or not, was shown to be dependent on individual factors such as a need for achievement as well as game characteristics and the badge system itself.

In the case of Landers, Bauer & Callan, (2015) they set out to test how the addition of leaderboards would affect the participants’ performance on a brainstorming task. For this task, they used the theory of goal setting (Locke & Latham, 1990). In the study, participants were given twelve minutes to come up with as many uses for a knife as possible. There were five conditions, do your best, leaderboard, easy, difficult, impossible. For the latter three, the participants were asked to list a specific number of uses and for the first, they were simply told to list as many as they could. In the condition of a leaderboard, the participants faced a leaderboard with pre-recorded scores on it. Three of the scores on the leaderboard functioned as an "easy, difficult and impossible" marker. The results show that the leaderboard did in fact increase performance and was comparable to the difficult to the impossible goal. This finding suggests that those faced with a leaderboard tend to set those top spots as a personal goal.
In a study that explicitly made use of the game design element clear goals, Dong et al., (2012) set out to study how complex software could be learned through the use of discovery-based learning games. They developed a virtual jigsaw game where the participants were expected to solve the puzzles by using tools from Adobe Photoshop. The study made use of eleven participants and had them transform or adjust the color on puzzle pieces. The results found that the game was successful in helping the participants learn to use these tools and techniques, indicating that these types of games have a certain value as a learning medium.

While both the study and the results are interesting, the fact that this study made use of jigsaw puzzles are perhaps even more interesting. As the researchers mention in their article, the choice of using jigsaw puzzles was to provide clear goals. This was achieved, they argue, through the fact that those familiar with these puzzles would immediately understand the goal of their game which seemed to be the case for their study. Furthermore, due to the nature of their game, one could imagine that even individuals not familiar with jigsaw puzzles would quickly understand the goal as there is not much room for confusion.

There are few studies regarding the game design element feedback, as highlighted by Hamari, Koivisto & Sarsa, 2014; Seaborn & Fels, (2015). Which might be due to the "fuzzy boundary between gamification, play, and games." Seaborn & Fels, (2015, 25). There are however a few studies regarding this and in one Jung, Schneider & Valacich, (2010) studied, in a laboratory setting, how the addition of performance feedback and designing for optimal challenges end up affecting a group collaboration environment such as a computer-mediated idea generation system. In other words, how feedback and optimal challenges affect a digital group brainstorming setting. For this, they used groups of students in slightly different settings and monitored their performance. Both the number of ideas produced but also their quality. The students were either anonymous or pseudo-anonymous and were either given feedback or not. Their study showed that when users are pseudo-anonymous and receive feedback on their performance, they are the most effective in supplying ideas.

One of the more interesting findings from their study is how it confirms how feedback (when used as informational) can be an effective tool for motivation. This is also in line with the framework of STD as it argues that informational and relevant feedback can enhance intrinsic motivation. (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999).

In another study Berengueres et al., (2013) developed a recycle bin called emoticon-bin in a test to try and increase recycling behavior. The designed bin was accompanied with an LCD screen displaying a poker face emoji. Whenever a bottle was recycled, the emoji switched from a poker face to the Japanese emoticon for happy. Furthermore, when the bin recognized the recycled bottle it would produce a Nintendo coin sound. The researchers compared the emoticon-bin with a standard bin by placing them, at different times at the same place which increased the recycling by a threefold. When the two bins were placed next to each other at the same time, the emoticon-bin enjoyed a large preference. Important to note is that the researchers conducted the test by using a standard bin for four weeks and thereafter replacing it with the emoticon-bin. The results indicate that a combination of visual and audible feedback may very well have direct influences on behavior. This is interesting also due to the fact that the test spanned over a longer period of time, which might imply that it was not entirely due to
a novelty effect. It would have been interesting to see a similar study being done while comparing the effects of visual and audible feedback.

In *GamiCAD: a gamified tutorial system for first-time AutoCAD users*. Li, Grossman & Fitzmaurice, (2012), as the title implies, presented a gamified tutorial for first-time AutoCAD users. It was designed to support extensive real-time feedback both visually and audibly. Furthermore, the system was used as a learning tool to test how well it could assist learning and in order to study this it was compared to a non-gamified system. The non-gamified system was identical with the exception of it having the game design elements removed. This kind of testing is consistent with the recommendations from Seaborn & Fels, 2015; Webb, (2013). The study used a mixture of quantitative and qualitative data where the quantitative part came from the completion time and rate of the tasks and the qualitative came from subjective questionnaires. The results show that the gamified version led to shorter completion times and higher completion rates. A majority of the participants also preferred the gamified tutorial as they felt it to be more effective and fun. Responses regarding the use of visual feedback were somewhat mixed as some participants felt it to be distracting while others regarded it as appealing. For audible feedback, participants felt it to be distracting or too rushing. These results indicate that feedback has potential to improve the experience for users in learning situations but more conclusive studies are needed in order to understand the effect different kinds of feedback can lead to and also in which contexts.

Both the emoticon-bin and the GamiCAD article represent one of the most prominent types of research that have been done regarding gamification, namely research that examines whether gamification works or not. And as stated earlier gamification does indeed work, although with some mixed results and somewhat dependent on users and context (Hamari, Koivisto & Sarsa 2014; Seaborn & Fels, (2015). Researchers have instead been encouraging studies that use theories to explain why and how it works as well as broadening the research to include more design elements than just points, leaderboards, and badges (Deterding 2014a; Deterding, 2014b; Nacke & Deterding, 2017; Seaborn & Fels, (2015).

### 2.1 Motivation

As a key aspect of gamification is its ability to motivate users through the use of game design (Kapp, 2012; Deterding, 2012), understanding how this works and why should be important for anyone designing or planning to design for gamification. One way of looking at motivation is by separating it into two categories, namely intrinsic and extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation comes from a person’s own thoughts, such as finding an activity interesting by itself and thus wanting to perform it. On the other hand, extrinsic motivation comes from the outside and can be tangible rewards or even due to threats and pressure (Ryan & Deci, 2000b). Furthermore, researchers have found that when someone is given a reward for performing a task, their extrinsic motivation increases while their intrinsic decreases (Deci, Koestner & Ryan, 1999). Also, if this process of giving out rewards stop individuals are less likely to keep on performing the activity (Vansteenkiste, Niemiec & Soenens, 2010).
2.2 Self-determination theory

The self-determination theory is a framework regarding motivation. It, as mentioned before, separates motivation into two parts, extrinsic; motivation coming from "outside" such as tangible rewards and intrinsic; the motivation that comes from within, e.g. personal interests. The self-determination theory mentions three psychological needs that when fulfilled results in increased intrinsic motivation. These are autonomy, competence, and relatedness. (Ryan & Deci, 2000b)

The self-determination theory itself consists of six sub-theories which address different aspects of motivation. Due to the directions of this study, two of these sub-theories are used in order to explain the results.

The cognitive evaluation theory (CET) is regarding intrinsic motivation. It makes use of two of the three mentioned needs, namely competence and autonomy. And in doing so, using them to explain how they, in turn, affects intrinsic motivation. According to CET, how feedback and rewards affect intrinsic motivation depends on how it is perceived. If they are perceived as controlling, it will inhibit intrinsic motivation as it does not conform to a sense of autonomy. On the other hand, if it is perceived as informational and relevant it may enhance the intrinsic motivation (Ryan & Deci 2000a; Deci & Ryan 2000; Ryan & Deci 2000b).

The second sub-theory that will be used is the organismic integration theory (OIT). OIT is concerning extrinsic motivation and the different types of it. These types include external regulation; behaviors that are performed to gain external rewards or satisfy external demands. Introjected regulation; behavior that is performed in order to avoid feelings such as guilt or to maintain self-esteem. Another form of extrinsic motivation is called identification. Identification happens when a behavior and its importance becomes clear for a person and they accept its regulation as their own. The last and final form of extrinsic motivation is called integrated regulation. This, the most self-directed type of extrinsic motivation happens when identified behaviors also become integrated with one's self. (Deci & Ryan 2000; Ryan & Deci 2000b).

The choice of using CET and OIT came from them being concerned about intrinsic and extrinsic motivation respectively.

2.3 Feedback

NE, (2017) defines feedback as the process of when information about a controlled system's behavior is returned to the controlling mechanism. In other words, it is the process of someone (or something) getting information on what they are and have been doing. This shows that feedback can take numerous different forms e.g. visual, audible, positive, negative, performance, in real-time or during specific times etc. Feedback will also be perceived differently depending on how it is implemented. For example, it can be used in a way in which it is perceived as a reward, (Deterding, 2014b) or in other cases, progress markers (Flatla et al., 2011). For this study, feedback will be used similarly to how Berengueres et al., (2013) used it for their emoticon-bin, meaning it will be real-time visual feedback in the shape of a reward.

As mentioned earlier, how the participants perceive the given feedback will affect the impact it will have on their motivation. (Ryan & Deci, 2000a). When used correctly, as the study from Jung, Schneider & Valacich, (2010) pointed out, feedback can be a powerful tool for
motivation. Furthermore, as Mekler et al., (2015) found in their study, the addition of badges, points, and leaderboards did not affect intrinsic motivation in an image annotation task, but it increased performance. These studies and their results show that feedback, when presented as informational and relevant can enhance intrinsic motivation.

Figure 1. The relation between feedback and motivation. Figure adapted from Deterding, (2012).

Also, certain game design elements other than feedback have been shown to increase the performance of participants even when they are not affecting their intrinsic motivation which leads to my first hypothesis; The prototype using the game design element feedback will record a higher rate of activity clearing than the others and if perceived as informational be reported as more motivating than if not.

2.4 Clear goals

Clear goals are in this study understood literally, meaning that they represent explicit aims, e.g. something that one should try and complete. There should be little, or preferably no room for confusion on whatever the goal or target of the activity is. As in the case of Dong et al., (2012) this can be achieved by expanding on goal containing activities that the participants are already familiar with or from which there is little room for bewilderment. Another way is to explicitly state the goal(s) and by doing this letting them know what is expected of them.

As the study on badges in video games from Cruz, Hanus & Fox, (2015) found, some players perceived badges in games as assignments or goals to complete and that this was influencing their behavior. According to STD, when something is perceived as controlling a person's
intrinsic motivation decreases (Ryan & Deci, 2000a). Furthermore, once again referring to the findings of Mekler et al., (2015) which showed that some game design elements may increase performance while not affecting intrinsic motivation leads to my second hypothesis; *The prototype using the game design element clear goals will have obvious influences on the amount of activity clearing and will be perceived as controlling by the participants.*
3. Method

To test the hypotheses, experiments were conducted. Three to-do lists were created. One illustrating a plain to-do list, one which has the game design element feedback added to it, and lastly one with the game design element clear goals implemented (see Fig. 2, 3 & 4). Nine participants were gathered, put into groups of three while each group was handed one prototype at a time. Each group used all prototypes but in different orders, meaning one group started with the prototype which included feedback while another started with the plain one and so on. Their usage of the prototypes was recorded through a visual diary, for which the participants themselves were responsible for. After the participants had used the prototypes they were interviewed.

As mentioned there were nine individuals participating in the study, five men and four women. Their ages ranged from 22 to 60 years old. The participants were chosen through a convenience sample, partly in order to get informants that normally uses to-do lists, and partly to make it more likely that the participants would not quit in the middle of the study. All but two of the participants are users of to-do lists normally, although in different amounts.

3.1 The prototypes

When designing these prototypes and the implementations of the game design elements, there were several aspects to take into consideration. These aspects included, for example, how feedback was to be used and the number of clear goals the participants would be exposed to. In a light pilot study, different versions of prototypes using these game design elements in different manners were designed and used by a few users (3). A short focus group interview followed this and the final prototypes were designed based on the gathered input.

As the two game design elements, feedback, and clear goals were chosen to be used together with a plain to-do list, three different prototypes had to be made. The prototypes were designed to be exactly the same, with the only difference being that one includes feedback, one includes clear goals and one includes neither.
Figure 2. Picture of the plain to-do list.

As the picture showcases, the plain prototype is an ordinary to-do list with room for writing down activities and checking them off when completed.

Figure 3. Picture of the to-do list with feedback.

The picture shows how the game design element feedback was implemented in this to-do list. As shown, the checkboxes have poker face emoticons next to them which when checked turns into the Japanese emoticon for happy. This method of using feedback was inspired by the study from Berengueres et al., (2013).
Clear goals were implemented in such a way that a goal was always visible for the user. The goal was always explicitly stated in the bottom of the prototype and it was also always asking the user to complete all but a random number of activities. The number was randomized between one to three every time the prototype loaded. In other words, every time the participants opened the list, they received a goal to complete all but one, two, or three of the activities they chose to list.

### 3.2 Procedure

The study was done by placing all the participants into three different groups, A, B, and C. Group A started by using the plain list, afterward the feedback list, and lastly the list with clear goals. Group B started with feedback, afterward clear goals and lastly the plain list. Group C started with the clear goals list, afterward plain and, lastly feedback. Each participant was given clear instructions on the study and how it would progress. They were told that they were supposed to use three different to-do lists for a three-day period each before switching to the next. Furthermore, at the last day of use for each to-do list, they were given access to the next one. For example, group A was given access to to-do list number two on the third day that they were using to-do list number one and so on. They were also asked to keep a visual diary on their usage of the lists, meaning that they were supposed to take screen dumps on how they were used. The number of screen dumps and when the screen dumps should be taken was their own decision, though they were asked to take at least two per day to record their progress. Otherwise, during this period of time, they were left to their own devices. At the end of the nine-day study, individual interviews were conducted with each participant.

### 3.3 Interviews
As mentioned, semi-structured interviews were conducted individually with all nine participants. These interviews were recorded and transcribed. Afterward, they were subjected to thematic analysis inspired by Braun and Clarke (2006). Seven of the nine interviews were conducted in Swedish and the remaining two in English.

### 3.4 Analysis
The data collected through the interviews were as mentioned, transcribed, and then subjected to a thematic analysis. The thematic analysis ended up identifying key themes and the data of these themes were then subjected to an analysis based on the frameworks of CET and OIT.

### 3.5 Ethical considerations
All informants were told about the study and were also aware that all personal information would be kept anonymous. They were told that they could, whenever they felt like it, end their participation. Furthermore, they were informed that none of the data gathered from them would be used without their permission. They were explicitly told that any personal information gathered would be solely used for research purposes and it would not be possible to identify them in any way.
4. Results

The results are divided between the visual diary and the interviews. The visual diary highlights the way the lists were used and by which participant, the number of activities they listed and how many they ended up completing. The participants are recognizable through the number they were given and this number is the same as in the results of the interviews. In other words, participant 1 in the visual diary is referred to as participant 1 in the interviews etc.

4.1 Visual Diary

The visual diary was, as mentioned before, the product of the participant's individual recordings. Below the results from these are presented through the use of tables in which the number of activities that they wrote up in the beginning of the day and the number of activities they had cleared at the end are shown.

The colored cells represent the order in which the prototypes were used. The green cells indicate that the prototype was the first to be used, blue that it was the second and red the third.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ptc.</th>
<th>Data</th>
<th>Plain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Day 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Start</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. The results from the participants’ recordings of the plain to-do list.

The table above illustrates how the participants were using the plain to-do list. As it shows, the participants completed all their tasks on 12 of the total 27 days. Eight of these days comes from the group who started the study with the plain to-do list. The to-do list experienced a total of 103 listed activities with 82 of them ending up completed.
Table 2. The results from the participants’ use of the to-do list which included feedback.

The table above displays how the to-do list with the element feedback implemented was used. The to-do list experienced a total of 97 listed activities with 85 of them ending up completed. It was used almost the same in all groups, showing that, for the most part, the participants completed the tasks they set for themselves.

Table 3. Results of how the participants used the to-do list which included clear goals.
As illustrated in the table above, participants 2, 4 and 6 did not complete the goal during any day. Participant 8 cleared the goal during one of the three days and participants 3, 5 and 9 cleared it twice during these days. Participant 1 and 7 finished it during all three days. Group C, shown here as green, were slightly better than the other groups at completing the goal, while group B, shown as blue were slightly worse than the rest. Interestingly, informant 1 did, as seen, complete the goal every day. The same informant also mentioned not striving to complete the goal.

The list with clear goals experienced the highest amount of listed activities at 110. It also experienced the lowest completion rate of all lists at 81. In total, the participants were asked to complete all but 48 of the activities. In the case that all participants had completed the goal on every day, the total number of completed activities would be 62.

Of all the participants, two of them, namely 4 and 8 had slightly different ways of using to-do lists than the others. Participant 4, as shown in figure 4 and 6, sometimes added activities that she had done at the end of the day. In the case of participant 8, he did not remove the activities that he listed but kept them for the following days. Only, when it was time to change lists, did he clear them of previous activities. Put differently, when he started using a list, he added several activities that he continuously kept checking off during the three days that the list was used. After these three days, and he switched to a new list he used it in the same way. This was thus regardless of the lists themselves but more of a personal preference in how to use to-do lists.

4.2 Interviews

As the interviews were first transcribed and then coded into themes, the chosen themes are the ones presented below. As mentioned earlier, the participant numbers are the same as shown in the results of the visual diary.

4.2.1 Background information

The individuals participating in the study were five men and four women. The median age of the participants was 25 years old while the oldest participant was 60 and the youngest 22. Of the nine participants, seven of them thought of themselves as gamers in one sense or another. Of these individuals, there were five men and two women. Three of the men deemed themselves as hardcore gamers while the rest saw themselves as playing casually. The oldest, informant 4 (60) and the youngest, informant 6 (22) were the ones who did not play any games.

As mentioned previously, seven of the nine participants were regular users of to-do lists. Six of these uses them on a weekly basis or more often. Three participants mentioned that, except the traditional role of to-do lists, they also use them as reminders. For example, if all the activities for the day were not finished, the list could be used the day after as a reminder of the things that still needs to be done. Or, as one of the participants (6) mentioned,

“... normally I tend to do all of the points on the list, or I just use it as a reminder, not a must-do.”

4.2.2 General experience

When asked about their experience in using these to-do lists, all the participants felt it was generally pleasant. Two of the informants would have liked the lists to better accommodate
phone usage since this would have made it more flexible for them. One of the participants brought up the feedback list and how smileys improved the overall clearness as a positive experience.

On the question whether the participants experienced any differences between the lists, and if so, if these differences, in that case, affected how they used them, they ended up answering very differently. Firstly, all the participants answered that there were differences between the lists, but three participants meant that they did not experience any differences between them. One of the participants (7) described it like this,

“I mean, I saw the differences between them, but I did not experience any difference myself... Even if I saw that there were some visual elements that were different.”

Interestingly, as in the case of informant 7 and several other participants not experiencing differences between the lists, was something that for most them seemed to change during the course of the interviews. This suggests that the addition of the design elements did not lead to any drastic changes in the perception of the activity.

Several informants mentioned here that they preferred the feedback function on their lists. Participant 8 did, for example, mention that the advantage of the smiley primarily came from how it made it even more clear when something was checked off.

### 4.2.3 Smileys - informational or controlling?

How the emoticons were perceived, influenced their role. For example, several participants viewed the smileys as positive. That they made it clearer when something was checked off. Some participants also mentioned that it made them happy getting smiling faces back after finishing a task. This suggests that the feedback was perceived as helpful. Others mentioned that they perceived them as angry, judging etc. which makes it controlling feedback for these participants. Informant 7 experienced that the neutral emoticons made him feel ill at ease. He mentioned that the fact of having staring emoticons that make him feel ill at ease when opening the to-do list made him a bit less inclined to do so. At the same time, due to the this, he also felt that he was more likely to complete simple to moderately simple tasks since the consequence of doing so would lead to the removal of neutral smileys. On the more complex and arduous tasks, he did not believe that a change of smileys was enough to motivate him into doing something.

“Mmh. I mean for me it was a bit that I disliked the figure that had a straight face, even if it was supposed to be neutral. Maybe a motivation based in, not fear but discomfort or something. Like that I did not like them, so, therefore, they pushed me to remove them to become happy figures or something.”

A key aspect that participant 7 describes here is the fact that the smileys are portrayed as negative until they end up smiling. This suggests that the role the emoticons played, for participant 7, were as negative reminders. It is also coherent with introjected regulation from OIT. He was seemingly trying to rid himself of unpleasant feelings by completing tasks. Similar experiences were seen among other participants. Both informant 3 and 5 mentioned the smileys as making them feel guilty. As the emoticons were always visible on the list.
informant 3 mentioned feeling pressured into writing down activities, and also to complete them.

"I wanted to write more stuff when it was smileys since otherwise, it felt like when they had a non-reactive figure when you had not done anything since it was also there when you had not filled in anything. So, it was like they were angry because I did not set more goals."

The fact that participant 3 felt that she should have written down more activities on her list of smileys, indicates a perceived demand that could be fulfilled by having more goals. In the case of informant 5, the fact that the smileys made her feel guiltier when she did not complete the list suggests that they could have made her more likely to complete her tasks. Both cases speak of, primarily internal processes in the sense that they were interested in avoiding being judged. This is also coherent with introjected regulation from OIT.

4.2.4 Clear goals – a personal challenge or a means to control?
The fact that there was something that the participants had no say over which, at the same time was explicitly sending them a message that there was a goal and what was needed to achieve it was met with mostly indifference and disapproval. Informant 5 was the only one who preferred the list with clear goals and was one of the few that experienced that the function strongly affected how she used the list.

"It made me feel less stressed. I had things I had to do, but I knew that I wouldn't have to do all of them since the goal told me otherwise. Yeah, so there was a goal so I tried to complete it. Like, in normal to-do lists you have the goal to complete the list. But here you had another goal to do instead."

What informant 5 is speaking of is essentially a shift in goals, from the personal goal of completing the tasks one set for him or herself to completing most of them as to be in line with the given goal. Informant 5 did not experience any loss of control from the goal feature as it was still her pulling the strings so to speak, or how she put it,

"I mean, I made the list so I decided what I wanted to do. I mean I wouldn't write anything that I wouldn't have to do anyway so."

Informant 1 was, on the other hand, critical towards the goal function in the list. He considers that type of function to be annoying in many application and means that it feels like one is getting pressured. When asked if it is the aspect of the application telling one what to do, he confirmed and explained that it is not a feature he cares for in an application.

"Yes, exactly! I do not want the application to demand something, it should be reminding me of what I need to do rather than demand things of me. But now I am talking a lot about feelings, but that's how it is when using applications, you go on feelings a lot.
The way informant 1 is so critical to the goal feature, and how he suggests it to be limiting his autonomy is according to CET highly likely to inhibit his intrinsic motivation as autonomy is strongly related to intrinsic motivation.

Interestingly, several participants mentioned feeling indifferent regarding the feature. It was something that they noticed, but not really something they believe affected how they used the list. There were several reasons for this, but the perhaps most notable one was them having an inner motivation since before to complete the list. The goal feature was thus contrary to their own feeling of motivation. As informant 7 put it,

"Yeah. So, I tried, but sometimes it was not possible because the goal was unreasonable or something. And I do not think there was a big difference in my endeavor in the plain glossy application to this one. But I think it might be quite personal too because I think ... like in both of them, I try as much. When I'm giving hundred percent to clear everything, then this does not push so much extra. If you understand how I mean. Like if you're already thinking, "I'll have to clear it today, I have to do what I have to do and then that thing says "Yeah, do everything but one" It does not give that much extra like I've already got the attitude that I will finish everything within myself, no matter what the list says or not."

This way of thinking, that the goal did not serve any purpose for oneself as it was contrary to the own person’s thoughts was shared among several of the participants. The goal was perceived as a gimmick without purpose or as an unsuccessful way of trying to establish control, in which case it was mostly ignored.

The fact that most participants felt indifference or were critical to the goal feature, however, did not mean that the participants did not strive to complete the given goal. Four of the nine participants said that they did not care about the goal whatsoever. Two mentioned that tried somewhat to complete the goal. One of these were informant 7 that felt the goal to be unreasonable.

"…. I tried, but sometimes it was not possible since the goal was unreasonable or something."

The remaining participants strived to complete the goal, even if they disliked the feature in general. As informant 2 described it,

"Yeah, partly. I want to try and finish the goal as that is part of what you should do when you have one."

Participant 5, who liked the feature, enjoyed the list, and thought it felt good to reach the goal and informant 9 described is as a strive to perform adequately instead of doing one’s best.

It is like striving for a pass instead of a pass with distinction for example. It becomes a bit like, I will do what I need to and not, not everything."

Furthermore, in his case, the action of completing the goal was not something he experienced that he had or even should do. It was more a thing that was perceived to just happen.
“The things I had on it was what I had to do, there was no underlying thought that I “had” to complete the goal of the list, it just simply happened that way.”

When asked if they felt the goal feature affected how they used the list, five of the participant said that they perceived that this was not the case. Informant 6 for example, mentioned that the addition of a goal did not affect her so much. Informant 3 said that the differences between the lists were so subtle that she had a hard time recognizing them and that this led to her not believing it affected the usage so much.

“I did not think so much about the differences, I had a hard time even noticing the differences. The thing you reacted the most to was the smileys since they were so obviously different. And when there, suddenly, were a goal that I hadn’t noticed and realized "shit, maybe it's been a goal all the time and I just haven’t seen it". So, no, not really.”

Participant 9 felt that the addition of the goal led to that when he was finished with the goal he felt satisfied and did not want to complete the rest of the list while Informant 2 described the feature as a bit controlling.

During the discussion, three informants mentioned that the goal function affected how many activities they wrote down during a day. Participant 5 described it as she wrote down more activities so she would not reach the goal to quickly, she saw it as a personal challenge.

"Yeah, I wrote down more on the one in this one with the clear goal because when I just wrote down four and I shouldn't do 3, then I have the goal pretty soon and I want to challenge myself as well a bit. So, I wrote down more like, detailed things. Um. Yeah, just more stuff that I wanted to do.”

Informant 5 was seemingly trying to challenge herself and used the given goal as something to actively pursue. This suggests that goal was perceived as an opportunity in which she could test her competence. From the point of view of CET, this is likely to be intrinsically motivating as activities that lets one verify their own competence most often is.

### 4.2.5 Activities and influences

The participants believed themselves to have written down roughly 4 (3,94) activities on average during a day. Which is close to how much they actually wrote down (3,82) according to the visual diaries. Five of the participants also meant that the number of activities did not change depending on which list they used. Instead, they meant that this depended on other reasons, like coincidence and such.

"No, it is probably just coincidence whether or not it is more or fewer things since I always write down everything that I should do." – Informant 8

At the same, three participants mentioned the goal feature to have partly affected the number of activities they wrote down. Informant 2 described this as him trying to write down more activities when he used the list with the goal feature, this to be able to reach the goal.
"Yes, with the goal I tried to write down more since there was a goal regarding that. Otherwise, I tried to keep it as a 3, 4 or 5 things that I would do. With the goal, I almost had to write down more things it felt like if I were to reach the goal."

Here, Informant 2 is speaking about satisfying an external demand – reaching the goal. According to OIT, this is an example of external regulation. He mentions the action of writing down more activities to complete on purpose as a way of reaching the goal of the list. It is interesting to note since informant 2 also mentioned a lack of interest in the goal feature and did not complete the goal a single day.

Participant 7 mentioned that he felt it was possible that it did. This so that he would feel that he put enough activities on the lists. This would then be on all the lists and was, according to him, not dependent on anything else.

Participant 3 mentions that she felt the feature to influenced how she used the list as it was somewhat controlling in the sense that it affected what she chose to write down to ensure that she would complete the goal.

“It felt that it didn’t, or yes it affected how you used the list, it felt like it was, a bit controlling regarding what you wrote for stuff that you would do since you knew that you had to complete some things of the things. So, you wrote down things that you would most likely do, like during the day anyway to complete the goal.”
5. Discussion

This study was performed in order to examine the potential changes that the addition of feedback and clear goals in to-do lists could lead to, and how these changes could differ. In this exploratory study, nine participants were using three different to-do lists for three days each while keeping a visual diary of their use. Afterwards, they were subjected to semi-structured interviews so that I could learn of their thoughts and experiences regarding the lists and the differences between them. As the visual diary pointed out, the participants were using the to-do lists similarly with a few exceptions. Some participants felt like the goal should be completed and therefore they also showed a higher tendency to complete the goal. Other participants did not react at all towards the goal feature and were using the list as if it did not exist. There were also some participants that tried to reach the goal but did not manage to do it every day. Interestingly, several participants who disliked the feature ended up completing the goal every day. This includes one participant who mentioned not trying to complete the goal.

It is revealed in the visual diary that four of the informants, namely 1, 7, 8 and 9 all had the same goal during all three days using the clear goal to-do list. While this is theoretically possible it is not very likely. When asked, they all mentioned that they only closed the list when it was time to change. This was, however, asked of them in the instructions they received prior to the study taking place. It is somewhat difficult to speculate on how this might or might not have impacted the study. It is interesting though, that two of these informants were the only ones completing the goals during all of their days.

Below, the results and their implications are discussed and the discussion continues with the limitations of this one particular study. Lastly, recommendations for future studies are discussed based on the needs and the issues that were identified during the course of time that this study was conducted.

5.1 Differences between groups

As the visual diary showed there were, for the most part, no real differences in how the three groups used the lists. The biggest difference was that the participants from group A were far more likely to complete their activities when using the plain to-do list compared to those in group B or C. It is likely that this is an effect of group A starting the study with using the plain to-do list and therefore feeling more concerned about completing everything. Another possibility is that it’s related to their own person, who they are. For example, several participants mentioned that they have an innate inner motivation of completing tasks they set for themselves and even if all the participants in group A were not among them it is possible that they, none the less, feel the same way. There was also a slight difference in the group performance with the to-do list featuring clear goals. In this case, the participants from group C were slightly better at completing their goals than the other groups. This can also be explained by the fact that, due to them starting with this list they might have felt that they should complete it.

5.2 Differences between gamers

As mentioned, two of the informants described themselves as non-gamers. These were informants 4 and 6. Neither of them enjoyed or cared much about the goal function and
informant 6 also mentioned she preferred the plain list. Participant 4 on the other hand, liked the emoticons but were overall quite indifferent towards the features as she felt they were all just to-do lists.

The remaining seven participants described themselves as gamers, with informant 7, 8 and 9 being hardcore gamers and 1, 2, 3 and 5 being casual. The self-described, casual and hardcore gamers used the lists similarly and there was no obvious difference in their usage. Compared to the two non-gamers, they were more enthusiastic about the features from the modified lists. This was also noticeable in the interviews as they had more to say about the features, but also the lists in general.

Interestingly, the two individuals who did not identify themselves as gamers of any kind, namely informant 4 and informant 6, were also the two individuals who expressed most indifference towards the to-do lists with added game design elements. It is likely that part of the different perceptions on the game design elements come from the fact that they are different types of users, and a closer look at player types could help explain that (Bartle, 1996). This is also consistent with the perspective of Tuunanen and Hamari (2012).

5.3 Feedback

In the list with feedback the participants wrote down slightly fewer activities overall compared to the plain one, but they were somewhat better at clearing them. This result is somewhat interesting as it is rather coherent with the interviews where several participants felt that the smileys gave them some sort of motivation to clear simple tasks. Both by removing negative feelings, but also to receive positive feedback. At the same time, one participant felt that she wanted to write down more tasks since she perceived the neutral smileys to be angry at her for not having enough tasks written down. These different perceptions of the same emoticons that the participants showed were interesting, especially since the feature was well regarded from them all.

The hypothesis for the to-do list with feedback was that the prototype using the game design element feedback will record a higher rate of activity clearing than the others and if perceived as informational be reported as more motivating than if not. The hypothesis was partly correct, as the list of the emoticons did record a higher rate of activity clearing than both the others. Its second part, regarding being reported as more motivating if perceived as informational proved to be arguably false. As several participants experienced the neutral emoticons as negative or at least invoking negative emotions in them and that, for some, this spurred them to complete their tasks suggest otherwise. At the very least it hints at the fact that the opposite, that it could be perceived as more motivating if it is not seen as informational, could be true.

5.4 Clear goals

In the case of the clear goal feature, the hypothesis was that the prototype using the game design element clear goals will have obvious influences on the amount of activity clearing and will be perceived as controlling by the participants. As the visual diary illustrated, the to-do list with clear goals did show obvious influences on the activity clearing. Five of the participants completed the goal during at least two of the days, while only three did not
complete it during a single day. One of those three also expressed that he made a certain amount of effort to complete the goals, even though it was not something he regarded as important. The results regarding it being controlling or not differ a bit. Some participants outright mentioned the feature as controlling or described it in similar terms while other did not experience the addition to affect how they used the list at all. To conclude, the feature did show obvious influences on the participants’ activity clearing and was more often than not experienced as controlling.

In general, the interviews gave valuable insights into how the participants experienced these to-do lists as well as the game design elements themselves. There were several differences in what they thought of, and how they experienced these elements. One key difference was how the smileys were seen as positive by some, and negative by others. Put differently, some participants experienced the neutral smileys as negative, either due to a lack of other feelings being available but also because they made them feel judged. Other participants did not perceive the smileys as negative whatsoever and just felt that it was positive that they smiled when checked off.

The goal function was seen almost entirely as a negative addon. It was perceived as both controlling and as a contradiction to the participants’ inherent inner motivation of completing the tasks they set for themselves. Only one participant expressed a sense of enjoyment from the feature and experienced it as something positive. In this particular case, the participant did not express feeling controlled or influenced by the feature but rather viewed it as something that she could use to challenge herself. This could very well, as another informant mentioned, be based on personal factors. For example, differences in pre-existing mental models of how to-do lists should be used, or even just differing opinions on the matter.

A somewhat peculiar matter regarding the clear goal function is that excluding informant 5 the participants did not really appreciate it. At the same time, it is a common feature in many applications such as, for example, RunKeeper as one participant mentioned. It is thus, somewhat interesting as to why the feature is given as much space as it is in applications today. Could this be explained by the framework of player types as Tuunanen and Hamari (2012) mentions, or could it be, disregarding the point of view of informant 1, that the clear goal feature in combination with other elements is more likely to produce positive effects? Or is it perhaps used as a way of sparking interest in order to gather users, such as informant 5, to the application?

5.5 Limitations

As an exploratory study with a high focus on qualitative data through the use of semi-structured interviews, the rewards were fresh and rich. The downside comes from the lack of generalizability that comes from said choice of method. Worth mentioning is that it took the shape of an A/B study, in other words, testing the plain to-do list versus the modified lists in order to tease out any potential effects the game design elements might have brought. This proved to be helpful for getting insights into what actual effects these elements bring to the activity when implemented individually. While this was the aim of the study, a limitation is that it only shows how these elements have worked individually and in this particular context.
and not how they work individually in general. Although the results should be useful for
drawing educated guesses regarding its effects in other contexts.

It should be mentioned that the process of having the participants keeping a visual diary
might perhaps not be the optimal method to gather data regarding their use of the lists. While
it lets one gather the, perhaps, most essential data it does not allow one to gather data regarding
the whole use. Put differently, it does not let one observe the full experience of how the
participants used the applications. This could have been interesting as it would add, for
example, time spent on each list etc.

Another aspect is that this study focused on a specific type of feedback, real-time visual in
the shape of a reward. As feedback can, and is, being represented in different ways and in
different forms, e.g. visual, audible, positive, negative etc. one should be careful before
generalizing how the addition of feedback could change an activity. For example, if we take the
to-do list with emoticons and change the emoticons to something sound based, it is likely that
some participants would have perceived it as an annoying feature and instead of being positive
towards the feature they could be skeptical.

Furthermore, Hamari (2013) mentions that users might need enough time on a gamified
service in order to actually become interested in it. A longer study which would have the
participants using these to-do lists for a longer period of time would, therefore, be preferable
as it is possible that some of the participants required more time to get interested in the
different features.

As mentioned earlier, the self-determination theory contains six different sub-theories and
two were chosen for this study. The choice of sub-theories was due to the specific direction of
the study. That said, the inclusion of a third sub-theory or more particularly, the inclusion of
causality orientation theory could have increased the number of insights gained. Especially
regarding feedback. As stated by the causality orientation theory people vary to what extent
they perceive their actions as self-determined, which additionally affect if they perceive
feedback as informative or controlling (Vansteenkiste et al., 2010).

Overall, the results, although not generalizable should work as a reference point for both
designers and researchers when using these design elements. They also add to the
understanding of feedback and clear goals as game design elements.

5.6 Future research

The study set out to examine how the addition of two, of the more uncommon, game design
elements would influence the activity of using to-do lists. The results showed that the
participants had somewhat mixed experiences, caused by both the elements themselves but
also due to the own person’s different perception of what and how a to-do list should be used.
A deeper understanding of how different target groups and user types embraces different types
of game design elements, and in different contexts is, I would argue, important for designers.
A thought echoed by Kim (2015), as he brings up Bartle’s (1996) player types in order to
showcase how different users prefer different types of games.

Furthermore, the design element feedback is not limited to how it was used in this study
meaning that it would be a point of interest that studies using different forms of feedback,
preferably, in isolated contexts to investigate how they individually can affect different activities.

As mentioned in the discussion, clear goals were an overall disliked feature while being a common addition in many applications. It could, therefore, be of interest for future research to investigate when and how clear goals should be implemented in applications. What makes it a feature worth implementing and what benefits it might bring. It should also be of interest to examine if the dislike for clear goals in this study were mostly due to it being connected to this specific activity or if these participants in general just dislike the feature.

It was mentioned in the limitations, but a longer study in which the participants used these lists for extended periods of time would also be meaningful as it would remove doubts whether the effects were mostly stemming from novelty factors or not (Koivisto and Hamari, 2014). It would also ensure that the participants had enough time using the service, which is advocated by Hamari, (2013) to ensure that users get the opportunity to become interested in them. Furthermore, as Curry, Wagner, and Grothaus, (1990) noticed in their study regarding individuals quitting smoking, that handing out rewards, in the beginning, does indeed aid the process. Their study also showed that after a period of time individuals that were not rewarded surpassed the rewarded ones in the performance of quitting. Based on this, a longer study that collected data on how the participants used the list over a longer period of time would have been interesting. This would give information on how these game design elements might work when used in practice for a longer period and if these longer-term results would be similar to those of the smokers. Put differently, it would give insights to whether or not the game design elements feedback and clear goals, as they were used in this study, would decrease the participant’s performance.

Furthermore, since this study was concerned with the implications of the game design elements when applied individually, the potential effects a combination of the two could have was evidently disregarded. A look at how they would have worked in a combination might have brought valuable insights which could have further assisted in understanding their potential and value, at the very least in the context of to-do lists. Future research that decides on similar types of studies would do well pondering whether including a combination of the selected game design elements would add value to the study.

As research has shown, increasing individuals’ extrinsic motivation is doable by rewarding them. Much of the applications using gamification is adept at doing this, and while this might be appreciated, it might also be a short-term solution in the design. Research delving deeper into how gamification can aid intrinsic motivation among individuals continue to be an important aspect of design as this is still a topic with a lot of unknown factors.
6. Conclusion

The study was conducted for the purpose of addressing already identified gaps in current gamification research. These gaps included the lack of studies done on individual game design elements in general, but more specifically the game design elements of feedback and clear goals. (Nacke & Deterding 2017; Hamari, Koivisto & Sarsa, 2014)

This was studied through the use of to-do lists where these elements were implemented individually and tested against non-altered lists. How the lists were used was recorded by the participants themselves and after they had used them for the appointed time they were interviewed regarding their experiences and perceptions of the lists. With the help of the motivational framework of the self-determination theory, more specifically, CET and OIT, the findings were interpreted and tested against the hypotheses.

The results, although somewhat context limited, show that feedback did indeed raise the participant's ability to clear the tasks they set for themselves. It was also found that when perceived as informational it was not necessarily more motivating as for several participants the opposite seemed to be the case. Clear goals were also found to lead to influences on the activities. It was also, more often than not, perceived as controlling. These results spawn interesting questions by themselves but the topic is in need of more studies to help further the understanding of individual game design elements and the phenomenon known as gamification in general.
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Interview with informant 1

Ålder och kön?
Man, 27.

Brukar du vanligtvis använda att göra listor?
Japp, det gör jag.

I så fall hur ofta använder du dom?
Mm, 2 gånger i veckan, i snitt.

Okej, är det någon speciell anledning till två gånger i veckan?

Brukar det vanligtvis vara i pappersform eller är det på datorn eller mobilen eller?
Mobil app.

Hur var din upplevelse med att använda dom här listorna?
Den var bra, speciellt den med smileys, den gillade jag. Den tyckte jag var lättast och överskåda.


Så att man inte glömt någonting.
Mm

Upplevde du några skillnader mellan de här listorna och om du gjorde det påverkade dom här skillnaderna hur du använde listorna?

Jag förstår
Jag använder ju runkeeper och då har den hela tiden att jag ska goals och hur mycket man ska göra och, nå jag vet inte det är liksom inte.

Är det den där grejen att den säger till dig vad du ska göra för något som är störande?
Ja exakt, jag vill inte att appen ska bli som ett krav på, den ska mer vad som att minnas vad jag behöver göra än att den ställer krav på mig.
Okej.
Men nu pratar jag ju känslor väldigt mycket, men det är ju så när man använder appar, att man går på känslor väldigt mycket.

Om vi går tillbaka till det här med smileys. Hur uppfattar du, du sa att det var som att det gav dig en mer överskådlig blick typ, men hur uppfattar du själva smileysna i sig?

Det här har vi gått in på en del. Men hur uppfattade du listan när clear goals blev introducerade?
Vad sa du?

Du har egentligen redan sagt rätt mycket om det här men hur uppfattade du när listan med målen kom till? Hur uppfattade du dom?

Skulle du säga att du strävade efter att uppnå målet?

Var det några speciella skillnader mellan de här listorna du tänkte på?
Ja, det var väl som jag sa, den första kände jag inte, den andra blev jag glad av och den tredje hade jag inte brytt så mycket i goals grejen. En känsla säger att jag gillar den andra bäst, med smileys bara. Jag gillar att det inte var en ledsen mun, utan en rak mun.

Hur uppfattade du den?
Det var, det var ju en rak mun så det var ju inga sura miner att jag inte hade gjort den haha.

Tror du att det hade gjort någon skillnad om det var en sur mun istället för en rak mun?
Mm det tror jag för jag listar ju ofta filmer och sånt jag vill se där och musik och, det är ju inget dåligt att jag inte sett en film liksom, en sur mun. Det hade jag kanske tyckt var lite neggit.

Hur många aktiviteter skulle du säga att du skriver ner på dom här listorna i snitt per dag?
Vi kan säga så här, nu använder jag det mer än vad jag hade gjort annars för man skulle använda det i 9 dagar. Vänta vad var frågan?

Hur många aktiviteter skulle du säga att du skriver ner på dom här listorna i snitt per dag?
Hmm. I snitt per dag är det nog 0.2. Men säg ett par tre grejer i veckan använder jag en sån här. Men nu använde jag det mer, eftersom det var uppgift att använda det lite mer. Så jag skulle inte använda det så här mycket.

Skulle du säga att det skulle påverkas om du använde en av de här listorna med smileys, mål eller sånt där?

Det slog mig nu att, man skulle, jag vet inte, jag använder ju listor för även att typ minnas som inte aktiviteter som filmer och musik och då är kanske inte smileys nödvändigt då kanske plain hade varit lättare ändå men, nä jag vet inte faktiskt.

Och slutligen, är du en gamer?
Ja, haha!

Hur skulle du kategorisera dig själv som gamer? Casual, hardcore?
Det är casual i så fall.

Det var allt, tack!
Interview with informant 2

Ålder och kön?
24 och man.

Använder du att göra listor vanligtvis?
Ibland, oftast inte. Jag kan göra det ibland.

Hur ofta är det? Om du kan säga?
2–3 gånger i månaden.

Hur är din upplevelse med att använda dom här listorna?
Jaa... Det känns väl mycket att gå in på en hemsida och klottra på, men, det var ganska lätt, lätt att hantera.

Upplevde du några skillnader mellan de här listorna? Och i så fall påverkade dom här skillnaderna hur du använde dom?
Nä, jag märkte ingen större skillnad på dom faktiskt.

Du märkte att det var smileys på ena? Och att det var ett mål på botten av ena?

Skulle du säga att det påverkade hur du använde listorna? Att det var ett mål eller att det var en smiley?
Ja att det var ett mål påverkade ju att man ville uppfylla målet men det är väl det, men jag tror inte att det är något jag gillar i sig.

Skulle du säga att dom här tillskotten, var, upplevde du dom som att de försökte kontrollera ditt användande eller skulle du säga att dom var informella eller varken eller?
Målen kontrollerade lite grann. Smileys var bara ett annat sätt för mig att bocka av någonting.

Hur upplevde du de här smilisarna? Du svarade kanske lite på det här.
Ja, det är väl som en avbockning bara, bara att dom ser lite annorlunda ut.

Såg du det som någon sorts belöning i hur dom var utformade eller var det som att detbara var ett sätt att kryssa av vad du har gjort?
Mm. har inte tänkt på det där. Ja men det var väl skönare att ha en sån, i kryssning än det skulle vara att bara trycka på en, alltså fylla i en rund prick liksom eller liten ruta det är skönare att ha en sån där större effekt när man är klar med någonting. Så ja lite belöning skulle jag säga att det är.

Hur tolkar du, additionen av målet där nere?

Skulle du säga att du strävade efter att utföra målen?
Ja, till viss del. Jag vill försöka göra målet också då det är del av det man ska göra när man har ett. Det är ju dumt att ha ett mål som man inte behöver uppfylla.

Upplevde du några skillnader mellan de här prototyperna i allmänhet?
Jag föredrog den första, med smileys.

Upplevde du någon skillnad mellan den, målet och den vanliga listan?
Vilken var den vanliga listan?
Den som varken hade smileys eller ett mål.

*Hur många aktiviteter skulle du säga att du skrev ner på dom här listorna i average?*

3

*Skulle du säga att det här påverkades när du använde vissa av de här listorna?*
Ja på målet försökte jag skriva in mer för det var ju ett mål som hade med det att göra. Annars försökte jag hålla mig till en 3, 4, 5 saker som jag skulle göra. Med målet var jag nästan tvungen att skriva in mer kändes det som, om jag skulle nå målet.

*Slutligen, är du en gamer?*
Ja.

*Hur mycket spelar du? Eller vilken kategori av gamer skulle du placera dig själv i?*
Casual.

*Så, hur mycket spelar du?*
En 2 till 3 timmar per dag.

*Det var allt, tack!*
Interview with informant 3

Ålder och kön?
25, Kvinna

Brukar du använda att göra listor vanligtvis?
Nej det gör jag inte.

Varför inte?
För jag glömmer bort dom.

Hur var din upplevelse med att använda dom här att göra listorna, under den här studien?
Jag tyckte det gick bra, men det var svårt att komma ihåg dom.

Upplevde du några skillnader mellan dom här listorna, och i så fall påverkade dessa skillnader i hur du använde listorna?
En lista hade ju smileys som belöning om man gjorde rätt. Och det var väl trevligt antar jag, att man fick bekräftelse att man hade gjort sakerna. Så det märkte jag av, och sen nån... nej jag kommer inte ihåg skillnaden mellan dom andra.

Det var ju en med mål i.
Juste det kommer jag ihåg.

Om man kollar på hur du använde dom så har du följt målet på dom hära. Är det för att det fanns ett mål eller?
Ja det är för att det fanns ett mål.

Skulle du säga att det skiljde något i hur du använda att göra listan med smileys gentemot den med inget.
Jag upplevde inte någon skillnad i min användning nå, egentligen inte. Om man hade fått en ledsen smiley om man inte hade gjort det, då hade det kanske varit annorlunda.

Varför då?
För att då hade man fått mer ångest om man inte klarade sin uppgift.

Skulle du säga att dom här smileysarna, det här målet. Gav dig information om ditt användande? Eller skulle du säga att ett av dessa eller båda kontrollerade ditt användande?

Hur tänkte du att additionen av smileys, hur upplevde du den. Om du tänker dig, använde du den som en ”progress marker”, en belöning eller något annat?
En belöning. För att man gjorde sak. Eller en bekräftelse.

Hur upplevde du målfunktionen på samma sätt?
Den kändes som att den inte, eller jo den påverkade hur man använde listan, den kändes som att den var, lite styrande i vad man skrev för saker att man skulle göra eftersom att man visste att man var tvungen att klara några saker, och några inte. Så då skrev man upp saker som man visste att man troligtvis skulle göra för att då, alltså skulle klara av under dagen i vilket fall för att klara målet.

Så du skulle säga att du försökte uppnå målet varje gång?
Ja.
I så fall varför ville du uppnå målet, var det någon anledning eller var det bara för att det fanns där?

För att jag ville att det skulle bli rätt i din studie haha! Blir så dumt!

**Hade du inte gjort det om det inte var en studie?**

Nej, då hade jag nog inte brytt mig så mycket. Då kanske jag hade haft något mål för mig själv. Men dom hade jag ju bestämt själv då hade jag ju valt själv om jag skulle göra 3 saker eller om jag skulle göra 1 sak eller om jag skulle klara allt utom nån. Så då hade jag ju kontrollerat målet om jag skulle ha ett mål. Men nu är det någon annan som kontrollerar målet.

**Utöver det, upplevde du några andra skillnader mellan de här prototyperna?**

Umm. Jag tänkte inte så mycket till skillnaderna, jag hade svårt att ens lägga märke till när det blev en ny. Det man mest reagerade på var ju smilisarna för dom var ju mest tydlig i skillnad. Och när det var ett mål, helt plötsligt som jag inte hade lagt märke till och insåg ”shit, det kanske har varit mål alla gånger jag har bara inte sett det”. Så nä egentligen inte, de var ganska lika.

**Hur många aktiviteter skulle du säga att du skrev ner på dom här listerna på en average under en dag.**

En 6 stycken typ.

**Skulle du säga att det här påverkades beroende på listorna?**

Ja, det kanske… Ja det påverkades beroende på målet. Men inte listan utformning i sig. Jag ville skriva in mer saker när det var smileys för att annars kändes det som att när dom hade en typ oreagerande gubbe när man inte hade gjort någonting för den fanns ju också när man inte hade fyllt i någonting. Så det var som att dom var sur på mig för att jag inte hade haft mer mål.

**Upplevde du den här smileyn som sur?**

Nä, som oengagerad, men eftersom det inte fanns någon sur smiley så fick den smileyn stå för alla känslor.

**Slutligen, är du gamer?**

Ja. Till viss del.

**Vilken grad av gamer skulle du kategorisera dig själv som, hur mycket spelar du?**

Kanske 2 timmar i veckan, och när jag har möjlighet ibland 12 timmar och om jag har möjlighet så kan det bli 8 timmar i veckan kanske.

**Det var allt, tack**
Interview with informant 4

Ålder och kön?
60 och kvinna

Brukar du använda att göra listor vanligtvis?
Ja

Hur ofta skulle du säga att du använder dom?
Varje dag på jobbet

Hur var din upplevelse med att använda de här listorna under den här studien?
Det kändes bra eftersom jag är van att göra det.

Märkte du av några skillnader mellan de här listorna och i så fall, påverkade de hur du använder dom?
Nä

Det var det här med smileys på en
Jaa, det var, det var det!

Och så var det en med ett mål i botten
Ja, men det var nog trevligast med smileys när man checkar av att man gjort det man hade tänkt.

Upplevde du de här smileyserna och det här målet som att det kontrollerade hur de använde de, eller att det var informellt, att det gav dig information? Eller var det inget av dem?
Ingenting.

HUR upplevde du tillskottet av de här smileysna?
Det var ett trevligt tillskott.

Upplevde du att det var som en belöning, eller att det visade dig hur långt du kommit eller?
Jag tror att det kändes ungefär som när man bockar av. Nu har jag gjort det här det. Det var samma känsla.

Jag tänkte inte så mycket på det.

Så du skulle inte säga att du strävade efter att uppnå målet?
Nä.

Är det någon speciell anledning till att du inte gjorde det?
Nä.

HUR upplevde du skillnaderna mellan de här att göra listorna som att smileys och målet jämfört med den som var som en vanlig lista?
Jag upplevde nog inte en sån här jättetestor skillnad det var ju som att göra listor.

Upplevde du någon större skillnad på de här listorna med smiley och målet, mellan dom två.
Nä.

Hur många aktiviteter skulle du säga att du skrev ner på de här listorna i genomsnitt per dag?
Tre.
Skulle du säga att det här ändrades beroende på vilken lista du använde?
Nej.

Varför inte?
Jag vet inte, kan inte svara på det.

Slutligen, är du en gamer?
Nej.

Det var allt, tack!
Interview with informant 5

Age and gender?
24 and I’m a female.

Do you use to-do lists usually? And if so how often do you use it?
I try to use it often, but I’m too lazy sometimes. I use it maybe 2 times a week.

How was your experience in using these to-do lists?
I used it constantly. I structured my day with it. I don’t know.

Did you experience any differences between these lists, and if so did those changes affect how you used the lists?
In comparison to my old to-do lists? Or what?
No, between these three to-do lists.

Ah. Yeah. A bit. So I had the. I liked the clear goal one most. Because I felt not as stressed. I had things that I know that I have to do, but I know I don’t have to do them all. At least I don’t have the feeling since I had the goal do this and this, except of three or something. And then it kinda makes you more lazy but also like “yeah, I did everything I should do this day”. So ehm, I don’t have so much experience from the other ones. Like that I have a checkbox with a smiley behind. I was kind of happy when they smiled, but it didn’t affect me that much I guess. At least I couldn’t feel something.

So, you would say you strived to complete the goal?
I strived to complete the goal. I liked the goal, it felt good, a bit.

Why did you strive to complete the goal?
Yeah so there was a goal so I tried to complete it. Like, in normal to-do lists you have the goal to complete the list. But here you had another goal to do instead.

Did you feel like this goal, try to influence you in how to use your to-do list?
The clear goal thing?

Yeah.
No, actually not. No.
I mean, I made the list so I decided what I wanted to do. I mean I wouldn’t write in anything that I wouldn’t have to do anyway so.

Did you feel that the smileys tried to do that?
I actually looked more often on it.

The one with the smileys?
Yeah, I don’t know why. But then I looked more often that I checked everything, it made me happy.

Would you say that the addition of feedback, smileys, changed something in how you used the list?
No.

Did you experience any general differences between the lists?
I think I already said that. But I can say it again, that I felt like more guilty in the end of the day when I didn’t do something when I had these, for example smileys and even the checkbox I guess. A tiny little bit more with the smiley one when I hadn’t done everything. So it was like stressed myself up with like things I wrote down and I know, that I wouldn’t do everything today.
The smileys, how did you perceive them? Were they angry, sad, happy or?
I just think that they were bored and then they were happy.

**How many activities would you say that you write down on these lists on average during a day?**
4 to 5.

**Would you say that this changed when you used these lists?**
Yeah, I wrote down more on the one in this one with clear goal because when I just wrote down 4 and I shouldn’t do 3, then I have the goal pretty soon and I want to challenge myself as well a bit. So, I wrote down more like, more detailed things. Um. Yeah just more stuff that I wanted to. And the other ones... no I don’t think so.

**And lastly are you a gamer?**
I am a pretty hard gamer right now haha. No in general I play from time to time. I would say I’m not really a gamer but I am not saying no to games when they are interesting and they really can catch me.

**That was all, thank you!**
Interview with informant 6

Questions for the interview
How old are you and what is your gender?
22, woman

Do you use to-do lists usually? And if so how often do you use it? If not, why not?
Yes I do, around once a week

How was your experience in using these to-do lists?
It was good, even though I prefer to do it on a paper in the old fashioned way and not every day

Did you experience any differences between these lists, and if so did those changes affect how you used the lists?
The biggest difference was, that it was on my phone and not on a paper. The differences inside the lists (like “try to do all but two”) you gave me didn’t affect me so much

Did you experience that the goal in the second to-do list had to be completed? If so, why and if not, why not?
It didn’t, normally I tend to do all of the points on the list or I just use it as a reminder, not a must-do.

How was the addition of (emoticons) perceived? (In other words, how did you perceive that the addition of emoticons affected the to-do list?) Follow-up: How did you perceive the emoticons? (happy, sad, neutral, angry etc.)
I didn’t really pay so much attention on the emoticons, but when so, It felt better when it was a smiley.

How was the addition of (clear goals) perceived? (In other words, how did you perceive that the addition of a goal affected the to-do list?) (follow up question “Did you strive to complete the goal? If yes, why and if not, why not?”).
As I said, it didn’t affect me so much.

Differences between the prototypes?
Differences between the to-do list with a goal and the one with emoticons compared to the “plain” one?
I prefer the plain ones so I can concentrate on the essentials

Differences between the to-do list with emoticons and the one with a goal?
How many “activities” would you say that you write down on these lists on average during a day? And follow-up: Would you say that this changed when using these lists? If so, which one(s) and why? If not, why not?
Around four. It didn’t change because normally I don’t need such a list for less activities and I try not to have too many goals on one day

Are you a gamer? If so, what kind of gamer would you categorize yourself as? (casual, hardcore etc.)
I am not.
Appendix 7: Interview 7

Interview with informant 7

Ålder och kön?
Jag är 25 år och är man.

Brukar du vanligtvis använda att göra listor?
Ja det brukar jag faktiskt göra.

Hur ofta brukar du använda dom?
Jag använder dom... flera gånger i veckan. Oftast i alla fall en gång om dagen ibland flera gånger om dagen men det betyder inte alltid att jag skriver något i dom utan jag använder dom också för att påminna mig själv om saker.

Du använder dom inte alltid som traditionella att göra listor?
Nä, alltså jag kan skriva i som, typ tvättid eller recept som jag behöver för att gå och handla eller liknande. Men jag kan också skriva in som, att göra idag och sen har jag en lista på vad jag behöver ha gjort idag och då kanske jag inte hinner göra allt den dagen och då kollar jag på det nästa dag för att påminnas om vad jag behöver göra idag till exempel på morgonen. Så att jag använder dom lite som, att även när jag använder den så betyder det inte alltid att jag skriver in något i listan utan det kan också vara som en påminnelse för mig.

Hur är din upplevelse i att använda de här listorna?
De är (för) simpla... och typ ganska... jag vet inte. Dom är ändå tydliga liksom, det var inte så mycket man kunde göra fel i dom. Men vill du ha mer specifikt i...?

Alltså du får säga hur mycket eller lite du vill, det kommer komma fler frågor som den här.

Ah, okej. Då lämnar jag det där. Att dom var simppla och enkla att använda, tydliga.

Upptävde du någon skillnad mellan de här listorna, och i så fall påverkade de här skillnaderna hur du använde listorna?
Ääh. Alltså jag såg ju skillnaderna i dom. Men jag uppfattade inte någon skillnad själv. Så ingenting medvetet i alla fall. Vad jag vet av. Även om jag såg att det var några visuella element som var annorlunda.

Så du skulle säga att det inte påverkade hur du använde listorna?

Hur skulle du säga att du uppfattade de här smiley gubbarna?
Smiley gubbarna... eh. Ja...

Då menar jag också om du uppfattade dom som sura, arga, glada och så vidare.
Alltså jag vet inte. Som när man kryssade i kryssgrejen så blev den ju glad och annars var den ju. Jag vet inte om den var menad... var den arg när den hade en sån där rak mun?

Hur uppfattade du den?
Okej, alltså när den hade rak mun uppfattade jag den som att jag blev lite illa till mods av den tror jag. Så att ja.. nu när jag tänker efter så kanske det var.. jag vet inte. Det kan ha fått mig
att vilja få bort den så att den blev glad, men samtidigt blev jag också lite avskräckt av den för
att det blev såhär att jag blev, som att jag inte ville kolla på den alls och därför inte ville klicka
upp listan för att den var ful eller vad man ska säga om det nu var alltså att den var såhär aa.
Den med ett rakt streck på munnen i alla fall.

**Den var tagen för att den skulle förespråka ”pokerface” alltså neutralitet.**
Mm. Jo jag förstår den också men jag, jag vet inte ens varför jag uppfattade den som.. men jag
blev lite rädd för den!

**Okej**
Eller inte rädd men alltså. haha

**Haha jag fattar.**
Den glada den kände man ju sig ändå glad för. Men.. men jag vet inte om jag fick någon som
var sur. Kunde den bli sur också?

**Nä.**
Nå okej, det var den och den glada?

**Exakt.**
Ah okej. Men den glada uppfattade jag som reinforcement typ alltså att den var positiv.

**Uppfattade du att dom här smiley gubbarna försökte influera ditt handlade på något sätt? Eller fick du stöd i aktiviteten?**
Hur menar du då? Med stöd i aktiviteten?

**Om den på något sätt underlättrade aktiviteten. Eller om den gjorde på något sätt lättrade för dig att utföra.**
Um. Jag tror i enklare uppgifter så gjorde den det.

**På vilket sätt?**
I att um. Typ om jag hade en typ ”skicka ett mail” till den här personen. Då visste jag att aa den
här gubben som nu var neutral men som jag inte riktigt gillade om jag vet att jag kan få bort
den genom att skicka mailet då kan jag göra det snabbt och sen försvinner det. Medans typ om
det är en svårare uppgift då tror jag inte att det påverkar mig alltså då tror jag inte att den
skillnaden mellan neutral och glad gubbe är tillräckligt stark för att det ska få mig att få
 drivkraften att typ skriva 40 sidor i en skoluppgift. Men i enklare uppgifter då tror jag absolut
att det fick mig att ”aa men jag kan bara skicka det här mailet så byts gubben” för att i såna fall
tror jag att den påverkade mig och hjälpte mig att göra saker. Medan i mer komplexa eller mer
jobbiga uppgifter så har den kanske lite mindre inverkan.

**Så du skulle säga att du framförallt ville byta status på smileyn?**
Aa.

Det var den där med när det var ett sånt där goal?

**Exakt.**
Alltså hur det påverkade?

**Skulle du säga att du uppfattade att det där målet påverkade aktiviteten?**
Ah. Umm. Ja alltså... hmm.

**Förändrade det något med att göra listan för dig?**

Okej.

Skulle du säga att du strävade efter att slutföra målet?

Hur skulle du beskriva den direkta responsen?
Mmh. Alltså för mig var det typ lite att jag ogillade den gubben som hade rak mun, även om den skulle vara neutral. Kanske en motivation baserat i, inte i rädsla men i obekvämhet eller något. Alltså att jag gillade inte dom så därför pushade det mig att få bort dom till de glada gubbarna eller något.

Sen generellt, du har sagt rätt mycket om det här, men om du uppfattade några andra allmänna skillnader mellan prototyperna?
Nä alltså överlag var dom ju tydliga och, dom största skillnaderna. Aa jag har ju tagit upp det också, men att den blanka to-do listan pushade mig nog lika mycket som den to-do listan som i textform försökte typ förbättra ens, eller försökte motivera en. Jag tyckte att dom, den blanka och den goal gör det här fungerade lika bra för jag hade redan en inre motivation att kryssa av alla så det hjälpte inte så mycket för mig för det gav ingen direkt respons medan den med gubbarna gav en mer direkt feedback och det kunde pusha mig på enklare och medelsvåra uppgifter medan på uppgifter som jag tyckte var väldigt jobbiga så gav det nog inte någon effekt för det var inte nog med morot att jaga typ för att skriva en 40 sidors uppsats typ. Alltså att få gubben att bli glad.

Hur många aktiviteter skulle du säga att du skriver ner på de här listorna på en vanlig dag?
Typ 3 tror jag.

Skulle du säga att det här påverkades när du använde de här listorna?
Nä... möjligtvis att jag skrev ner något mer... när jag använde de här, alltså för att få ut mer. Alltså då om man jämför med när jag använder listor normalt. Är det vad du menar?
Ja.
Jag kanske skriver några färre entries i min normala to-do lista. Men annars var det ganska lika.

**Vad menar du med att få ut mer?**

Nä men bara att jag ville.. att det kändes som att det förväntades av mig att jag inte bara kan skriva 1 to do grej i den för att det det... att det inte ger mycket så jag försökte ändå att... inte fylla ut den för det var fortfarande saker som jag behövde göra men kanske saker som jag normalt känner att jag inte behöver fylla i såhär. Typ att "idag ska jag diska". Det kanske jag inte skriver in i min vanliga to-do listan men jag gjorde det här för att aa. För att det är något jag faktiskt gjorde och jag kan fylla i liksom.

**Var det här på alla listorna eller var det en specifik lista?**

Det var alla tror jag.

**Är du en gamer?**

Ja, hardcore.

**Det var allt, tack!**
Interview with informant 8

Ålder och kön?
Jag är 27 och Man

Brukar du använda att-göra listor vanligtvis?
Ja

Hur ofta brukar du använda dem?
Inte lika ofta som under den här tiden, men typ jämt.

Okej,
Men inte lika frekvent som just nu

Hur var din upplevelse med att använda de här listorna?

Upplevde du någon skillnad mellan dom här listorna, och i så fall påverkade dom här skillnaderna hur du använde listorna?
Det påverkade på det sättet att om jag fick välja mellan dom så skulle jag ta den som jag gillade mest.

Vilken var det?
Det var den med en smiley på varje sida om det man hade skrivit. Det blev bara tydligare när man hade kryssat något då.

Vare det som du gillade med den?
Mm

Hur uppfattade du, lite som du sa nu men, hur uppfattade du när man la dit dom här smileys på listan hur gjorde det tillskottet?
Tyckte bara att det var en najs detalj liksom. Man ser tydligt att man kryssat något. Vet inte riktigt om man kan förklara det mer än så.

Du såg det som en tydligare avbockningsfunktion helt enkelt?
Aa, exakt.

Hur uppfattade du när man la dit de hära, listan med målen? Hur förändrade det upplevelsen?
Inte så stor skillnad för mig.

Strävade du efter att följa eller slutföra målen?
Nä.

Varför inte?
Det är för enkelt att vara lat haha.

Såg du några speciella skillnader mellan listorna? Något som du inte sagt.
Inget jag kan komma på.

Hur uppfattade du listorna med smileys och mål, jämfört med den som är mer normal?

Hur många aktiviteter skulle du säga att du skriver ner på dom här listorna i snitt, på en dag?
La till en om dan kanske, hade en 5 i snitt kanske. Alltså som var där hela tiden.
Okej, skulle du säga att det här påverkades när du använda dom här listorna till exempel om du jämför med när du använder dom i vanliga fall?
Näå, det är nog bara slump om det är fler eller färre saker för jag skriver ju alltid ner allt som jag borde göra.
Okej. Är du en gamer?
Ja
Skulle du kategorisera dig som en gamer? Är du casual, hardcore?
Jag är hardcore.
Okej tack! Det var allt.
Interview with informant 9

Ålder och kön?
24, Man

Brukar du använda att göra listor vanligtvis? Och i så fall hur ofta använder du de?
Nej, aldrig.

Varför inte?
För att jag kommer oftast ihåg det jag ska göra. Och om jag inte kommer ihåg det så blir jag påmind när det är försent.

Hur var din upplevelse med att använde de hära, att göra listorna?
Ganska smidiga, men typ ändå inte lika smidigt som att ha det i telefonen. För det liksom kan jag tycka är mycket smidigare, för när jag använder telefonen så är det vid tidpunkter då jag oftast har mer tid till att gå igenom grejer. Istället för när jag sitter vid datorn så har jag oftast typ ett mål till varför jag sitter vid datorn. Men om jag sitter på mobilen så kan det ju va för att jag håller på att göra grejer, betala räkningar eller kolla kalendern och då är jag ändå i samma mode så att säga.

Upplevde du några skillnader mellan dom här listorna, och i så fall skulle du säga att dom här skillnaderna påverkade hur du använda dom här listorna?
Jaa, nummer 3 var bäst, den med feedback för det är roligt att få en glad gubbe när man gör något bra.

Uppfattade du som att dom här målet eller den här feedbacket påverkade ditt beteende på något sätt?
Hmm, jaa. Den gjorde mig typ mer sugen på att slutföra listan än de tidigare listorna. Alltså det var typ såna här tråkiga grejer, eller för mig tråkiga grejer som att städa eller tvätta eller diskra eller något sånt dära. Då hade jag typ mer till att göra det och bli klar med det än att bara lämna det.

Kan du säga varför du tycker så?
För att en glad gubbe är roligare än en typ, ledsen eller typ opåverkat gubbe.

Du har lix, lite svarat på den här men. Hur tyckte du att additionen av en glad gubbe eller smiley påverkade aktiviteten eller att göra listan?
Den påverkade den positivt, den gav en mer sug att slutföra det.

Okej. På samma sätt hur tycker du att additionen av ett mål påverkade att göra listan?
Hm. Additionen av målet gjorde att jag typ, direkt när jag uppnått målet så kände jag mig nöjd jag ville inte slutföra hela listan.

Okej. Så du skulle säga att du strävade efter att slutföra målet?

Varför strävade du efter att slutföra målet?
Men sakerna jag hade på den var sånt jag var tvungen att göra om jag inte minns fel, kan kika på screens sen men det fanns ingen bakomliggande tanke att jag "måste" göra klart målet med listan utan mer att det föll sig så helt enkelt
Okej, är det några andra speciella skillnader du upplevde mellan dom här prototyperna?
Hmm. Nä egentligen inte. Jag tycker att den, den där plain och clear goals var ungefär ganska lika i hur jag typ utförde det och så. Det blev mycket sådär halvgjort. Men ähm, den tredje (feedback) var som sagt bäst.

**Hur många aktiviteter skulle du säga att du skrev när på dom här listorna i snitt, per dag?**
Uhmm. Typ 4 tror jag snittet blir, något sånt.

**Skulle du säga att det här ändrades beroende på vilken lista du använde?**
Nä, egentligen inte det ändrades nog mer på grund av att den tredje listan kom nära påskhelgen så den blev mer, typ, boostad av det och i början skrev jag ner mer grejer för jag hade mer att göra liksom. Så det var nog mer beroende på hur mycket jag faktiskt hade att göra.

**Och slutligen är du en gamer?**
Ja

**Hur skulle du kategorisera dig själv som en gamer? Casual, hardcore eller något annat?**
Hardcore.
**Det var allt, tack!**