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\textbf{ABSTRACT}

Personal task management (PTM) is a common human activity that is supported by a plethora of dedicated e-PTM tools. Yet, little is known about how and why PTM behaviors change over time, and how PTM tools can accommodate such changes. We studied changes in 178 participants’ PTM behaviors in a survey to inform the design of personalizable e-PTM tools that can accommodate changes over time. In follow-up interviews with 12 of the survey respondents, we deepened our understanding of the changes reported in the survey. Based on the reasons behind the reported changes, we identified factors that contributed to changes in PTM behaviors: changing needs, dissatisfaction caused by unmet needs, and opportunities revealing unnoticed needs. Grounded in our findings, we offer implications for design of PTM tools that support changes in behaviors as well as implications for future PTM research.
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\section{1 INTRODUCTION}

Many people manage an ever-increasing number of tasks—loosely defined as “to-dos.” Managing tasks or to-dos varies across individuals: some people have strong tendency toward adopting dedicated PTM tools such as OmniFocus, Remember The Milk, or Wunderlist that are specifically designed for PTM (aka adopters), some are more inclined to make-do with the tools they already use (aka make-doers), some prefer to design their own PTM tool using general purpose tools such as a paper or a word document (aka DIYers), and others have a combination of the above tendencies \cite{11}. To effectively support individuals’ PTM behaviors, PTM tools need to be personalizable to accommodate such differences across individuals’ PTM behaviors. An additional reason for designing personalizable tools is that PTM behaviors are likely to change for an individual over time. Thus, having PTM tools that are personalizable is desirable for both supporting differences across individuals and supporting changes in an individual’s behavior over time.

While there has been some research on how PTM behaviors change across individuals \cite{5,11}, changes in an individual’s PTM behaviour over time have been little explored. Understanding how and why PTM behaviors change can inform the design of personalizable PTM tools that can support such changes.

To investigate changes that occur in an individual’s PTM behavior, we conducted a survey and asked 178 people with various occupations about the changes they made in their PTM behaviors and the reasons behind those changes (Figure 1). To deepen our understanding of PTM changes that were reported in the survey and to see if survey respondents had made any changes to their PTM since their participation in the survey, we conducted follow-up interviews with 12 of the survey respondents about a year later.

We characterized three different types of changes that occurred in individuals’ PTM behaviors over time: strategy changes (changes made in how the user approaches PTM), within-tool changes that are made to a single tool (personalizing a tool), and tool-set changes (adding or removing a tool to the suite of tools used by the user). These changes reflected the adaptability and non-adaptability of the tools used in many cases. We characterized the factors that contributed to these changes as the user’s changing needs, their dissatisfaction caused by unmet needs, and opportunities revealing unnoticed needs. We suggest ways for the
design of personalizable PTM tools to utilize these contributing factors to better support changes in PTM behaviors over time. In addition, we offer some implications for future PTM research.

The contributions of this paper are 1) the characterization of the aforementioned changes, 2) their contributing factors, 3) implications for design of personalizable PTM tools that can support changes in PTM behaviors over time, and 4) suggestions for future PTM research.

2 RELATED WORK

Although no study has specifically targeted changes in PTM over time, a number of personal information management (PIM) studies have investigated changes in PIM behaviors which we review below given that PIM and PTM are related to each other [12]. First, we begin with a brief review of the research on task management.

2.1 PTM studies

Blandford and Green studied how paper-based and electronic PTM tools are used together [5], and concluded that there is no perfect PTM tool and instead of designing e-PTM tools that replace paper based tools, the weaknesses and strengths of different tools should be understood and seamless integration of the tools should be supported. Bellotti et al. investigated how busy professionals and managers manage their tasks [2] and reported the type of PTM activities that a PTM tool should support. Haraty et al. studied PTM behaviors of academics focusing on understanding individual differences in PTM [11]; they found that PTM behaviors differed across individuals with respect to the relative strengths of individuals’ tendencies toward DIYing (using general-purpose tools to design one’s own PTM tool), make-doing (using whatever tools are available without personalizing them), and adopting (using a dedicated PTM tool). Although these studies provide insight into how people manage their tasks and how to support differences in PTM behaviors across individuals, they had little to no emphasis on understanding how PTM behaviors might change over time in order to inform design of tools that can support such changes. The goal of this paper is to fill this gap.

A number of empirical studies investigated how people use a single tool such as email for PTM [4,9,10,13,15,18,20]. These studies have identified a variety of problems of using email for PTM over time. A coder reliability of 0.8 (Cohen's kappa) was obtained. The two coders then discussed the disagreements, and the primary coder had 304 PTM behaviors over

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Interviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grad students</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Professor/post-doc</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative staff</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2/8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1/7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Software Developer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultant</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>1/25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>12/178</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

management strategies: folderless spring cleaners started using folders and became spring cleaners (pro-organizing), and frequent filers gave up filing and became spring cleaner (anti-organizing). Similarly, some no-filers in Whittaker and Sidner’s study [22] had been spring cleaners before giving up that strategy. Boardman and Sasse [6] conducted a longitudinal study to track the changes both in the personal information collections (files, emails, and bookmarks) and in the strategies used to manage them over the course of eight months. Their participants reported historical changes in their email strategies that involved both increase and decrease in organizing tendency. But the changes that they observed over the course of eight months were mostly in the form of subtle pro-organizing adjustments to an existing strategy than any major transitions such as the ones Bälter found (e.g., no-filer to spring cleaner). Our work builds on and expands this body of knowledge by investigating differences in PTM behaviors over time.

3 METHODOLOGY

We conducted an online survey to elicit a large number of changes that can occur in individuals’ PTM behaviors over time to inform the design of personalizable PTM tools that can support such changes. The survey was distributed to people with various occupations through snowball sampling: 178 participated in the survey (Table 1). Respondents were asked in an open-ended question to describe 1 to 5 changes they had made to the way they manage their tasks (Figure 1). A total of 328 changes were reported by 162 survey respondents, however 24 of the changes were not PTM related. Among the remaining 304 changes, 12 were not accompanied with a reason. Thus, we had 304 PTM changes and 292 reasons in our data. We used grounded theory to analyze the changes and their reasons. One coder open coded 10% of the data and discussed the codes with a second coder. After coming up with a list of codes that both coders agreed upon, another 10% of the data was coded by both coders and an inter-coder reliability of 0.8 (Cohen’s kappa) was obtained. The two coders then discussed the disagreements, and the primary coder
coded the rest of the data. The unit of analysis was a single change and its reason(s). Through merging the codes and affinity diagramming of the reasons, we identified different types of changes in PTM behaviors and the contributing factors to the changes.

About a year after the survey study, we conducted follow-up interviews with 12 of the survey respondents who had indicated interest to participate in a follow-up study. The goal of the interviews was two-fold: 1) to deepen our understanding of PTM changes they had reported in the survey, and 2) to hear what changes participants had made since their participation in the survey. Although we preferred the interviews to be at the participants’ workplace, 6/12 interviews were conducted by phone (5/12 participants preferred phone interviews and one participant required a phone interview as she was not local). The length of the interviews ranged from 6 to 52 minutes (median=16.5). Participants were reminded of and asked to elaborate on the changes in their PTM behaviors that they had reported in the survey. They were also asked if there have been any further changes in their PTM since completing the survey. All the interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. Thematic analysis was conducted on the changes collected in the follow-up interviews. Through an iterative process of developing themes, refining, and validating them in relation to the data from both the survey and interviews, we came up with several themes for PTM changes and factors contributing to them that we discuss below.

4 FINDINGS
We collected a large number of changes in PTM using our survey, and deepened our understanding of these changes and collected further changes after about a year through the follow-up interviews. In this section, we present our findings: categories of changes in PTM as well as the factors that have contributed to them.

4.1 Changes in PTM behaviors
The survey revealed 304 changes in PTM. 30/304 (10%) changes were related to transitioning from relying solely on one’s memory for remembering tasks to starting to use a PTM tool (a general-purpose tool or a dedicated PTM tool). We categorized the remaining changes into three groups: strategy changes (17%, 52/304) which did not involve the use of any tool, within-tool changes (20%, 62/304) which refer to changes made to a single tool, and tool-set changes (53%, 160/304) which were changes made to a tool-set—multiple tools in combination to satisfy their PTM needs.

Strategy changes (17%, 52/304) did not directly involve use of a tool and were in the form of revising, adopting, or abandoning a PTM strategy such as breaking down tasks into smaller tasks, talking about to-dos with others, or associating objects to tasks as a remembering strategy. An example of a strategy change was: “[...] I made certain days of the week to be used for [a] specific job; thus I am spending less time on switching context from one job to another.” [P26]. Although strategy changes might not directly affect tool use, PTM tools can still support them for example by encouraging positive strategy changes and supporting the potential resulting changes in tool use.

Within-tool changes (20%, 62/304) were changes made to a single tool. The examples include starting to use reminders, highlight/color-code tasks, use a different view of a task list (e.g., changing monthly view to weekly view), create/remove task categories, and prioritize tasks by changing the order of tasks on a list. The range of within-tool changes seemed to be relatively limited which may have been either due to the lack of flexibility of the PTM tools used or the small number of respondents who were willing to make changes to their tools.

Tool-set changes (53%, 160/304) were changes made to a tool-set or to the relative usage of the tools in a tool-set. The examples include adding and removing a tool to and from one’s PTM tool-set, as well as making greater use of one of the tools and less of other tools in one’s PTM tool-set. The latter change, which we observed mostly in the follow-up interviews, appeared to be associated with the cyclic nature of some changing needs that will be discussed in the next section, and the relative affordances of the tools in supporting them. In 52/160 (33%) of tool-set changes,
media changed as well. The most common changes in media were paper to digital (63%, 33/52) and digital to paper (23%, 12/52), Figure 2. 12/178 of the survey respondents reported having tried dedicated PTM tools, but abandoned them. For example, a university professor who had tried several dedicated tools (Google Tasks, Remember The Milk, and Outlook) said: “I’ve often tried these, but find paper and pencil better for task lists” [P129].

In the next section, we explore what contributed to these changes in PTM.

4.2 Contributing factors to PTM Changes

Understanding what contributes to changes in PTM behaviors can inform the design of personalizable PTM tools. Based on the survey study and the follow-up interviews and data analyses described in Section 3, we identified three groups of factors that contribute to changes in PTM behaviors: (1) changing needs, (2) dissatisfaction caused by unmet needs, and (3) opportunities revealing unnoticed needs. Some PTM changes were described as the result of changing needs, more specifically as the result of changes in factors that affect PTM needs such as job and busyness. The majority of PTM changes, however, were the result of dissatisfaction caused by unmet needs. Such dissatisfaction was often framed as missing support of a practice or tool for a PTM need. Lastly, there were cases, where an opportunity brought an unnoticed or infrequent need to a user’s attention. In several cases, it was a combination of the above three reasons that contributed to a change. Below, we describe each in more detail (see Table 2 for examples for each of the contributing factors).

4.2.1 Changing needs

Changes in factors such as busyness, job, family structure (e.g., getting married or having kids), tools used, and type of tasks managed were mentioned as reasons behind 95/304 of the PTM changes reported in the survey. Table 2 displays the number of PTM changes that were influenced by changes in each factor; some changes were influenced by changes in more than a single factor (e.g., some changes in job or family structure were accompanied with changes in busyness). Changes in job appeared to lead to PTM changes by increasing one’s busyness, imposing use of a specific tool, or changing the nature of tasks that need to be managed (e.g., having longer-term tasks to manage). Changes in family structure appeared to lead to PTM changes either by increasing busyness or creating new needs such as creating shared awareness of tasks. In general, changes in the factors affecting PTM needs/behaviors appeared to contribute to changes in PTM in two ways: 1) by directly imposing a change to an individual’s PTM system (e.g., being required to use Outlook in a new job), or 2) by changing PTM needs, in response to which individuals adapt their PTM behaviors. See Table 2 for quotes from respondents.

4.2.2 Dissatisfaction caused by unmet needs

In the majority of changes (74%, 226/304), respondents cited the support (or lack thereof) of their tools or practices for a PTM need as reasons for making changes to their PTM behaviors— adopting or abandoning PTM tools or practices. We divided this group of reasons into 14 subcategories based on the PTM needs that were cited either as being supported by a new tool/practice or not supported by a previous tool/practice. Each subcategory

Table 2. Examples and frequency of factors that had contributed to changes in our respondents’ PTM behaviors (N=304).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(95) Changing needs</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in job (new job, entering grad school)</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>“the tool we use at work” [P177], ‘’movement from undergrad to grad school meant less day to day homework, more long-term assignments/goals” [P85]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in busyness</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>“I got too busy for this to be a reliable system” [P111], “more on the brain” [P132], “I was much busier all of a sudden” [P46], “On days when I have many tasks” [P142], “when the task list got bigger” [P154]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in type of tasks managed</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>“movement from undergrad to grad school meant less day to day homework, more long-term assignments/goals” [P85], “tasks that are due a later time” [P176], “started a new project which required different types of appointments” [P168], “for research collaborations” [P112]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in family structure (having kids, getting married)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>“multiple children so this helps at a glance” [P140], “Kids started to have more activities” [P147]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in tools used</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>“I now work from a desktop, instead of a laptop” [P110], “changed my group membership and that is the default approach” [P13], “Started using 2 computers […] Different OS so not able to synchronize” [P53]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(16) Opportunities revealing unnoticed needs</strong></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Buying or availability of a new device (e.g., a phone, laptop) “got a Blackberry smartphone” [P161], “New work station […] with 3 white boards” [P110]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suggestions from others</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>“attended a time management workshop that made me realize that I was having trouble distinguishing between high urgency-low priority tasks and low urgency-high priority tasks” [P137]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need</td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for supporting prospective memory</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>“Don't trust my own memory to keep tabs on everything” [P70], “otherwise I would forget” [P76], “I liked seeing the visual reminder (daily)” [P119], “provides reminders” [P145]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for ease, continuity, and reliability of access to tasks</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>“I schedule a lot of things through email, and don't always have my paper planner nearby” [P45], “it was always available at home or work” [P156], “I would forget it [paper calendar] at home” [P125], “Lost/forgotten paper lists” [P127]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General need for better management or keeping track of tasks</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>“having more time to organize” [P135], “the faster the action is taken the less tasks you have to remember and manage” [P173], “keeping track of tasks that are due a later time” [P176], “I feel that it takes me too long to get back to people” [P172]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for decreasing overhead of task management</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>“found keyed-entry to be a little tedious” [P73], “I find I have a hard time making a habit of processing the things I have captured” [P81], “my paper planner was an extra weight to my bag” [P48]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for appropriate view of tasks</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>“a concise reference point where I can get an immediate snap shot of what I need to do” [P92], “needed a planner that included monthly overviews and week-by-week sections” [P42], “made it difficult to know what to work on next” [P74], “Gives me a better overview; helps me look ahead and plan” [P87]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for getting a sense of satisfaction</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>“gives me a sense of accomplishment” [P163], “helps improve the overall flow of the week and keeps me feeling on top of and in control of my life” [P106], “helps me feel as if I'm making progress” [P60]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for keeping tasks in one/multiple place(s)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>“Need to consolidate calendar using Outlook” [P15], “more efficient to centralize reminders in a calendar, beyond just meetings and appointments” [P161], “recording deadlines and making plans for action in multiple formats allowed me to benefit from an increase in perspective” [P55]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for creating shared awareness or for collaborative management of tasks</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>“So that all in household can see and time conflicts can be avoided” [P146], “need for shared visibility of my schedule” [P112], “Easy to share to-do list with others as it is not limited to the applications that others use” [P36]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for scalable PTM (larger quantity and/or diversity of tasks)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>“my paper planner is just not large enough to handle all the different categories of tasks” [P9], “use to have a master list of tasks, split between school related and non-school related. These big buckets no longer suffice because they were too general and I had too much going on” [P71]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for prioritization</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>“Very confusing to have two task lists. Was not able to prioritize” [P157], “Needed ability to sort tasks by due date and priority” [P51]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for better multitasking</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>“I am spending less time on switching context from one job to another” [P35], “too many items to attend to that competed with focus, which caused too much stress and anxiety” [P100], “I was having trouble focusing on just one task when every time I looked at my task list I saw dozens (hundreds?) of tasks” [P162], “multitasking is not my forte” [P12]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for better task breakdown, often to avoid procrastination</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>“helps keep me from procrastinating” [P123], “Never had time for bigger tasks because there were too many small tasks to deal with” [P157]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for allocating time to tasks</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>“found I ran out of time if I didn't put it in as an event” [P34], “long list of &quot;to dos&quot; not done each day so I set aside time to address the items” [P84]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need for uncluttering physical/virtual workspace</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>“To (try to) keep my desk top somewhat clean, I make &quot;To Do&quot; lists, then I can put some stuff away” [P57], “it is less cluttered than post-its” [P129]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

represents a PTM need: supporting prospective memory; ease, continuity, and reliability of access to tasks; decreasing overhead of task management; appropriate view of tasks; getting a sense of satisfaction; keeping tasks in one/multiple place(s); creating shared awareness or for collaborative management of tasks; scalable PTM (larger quantity and/or diversity of tasks); prioritization; better multitasking; better task breakdown, often to avoid procrastination; allocating time to tasks; uncluttering physical/virtual workspace; and better management or keeping track of tasks (see Table 2 for numbers and example quotes). In
PTM behaviors rather than forcing users to switch tools by failing instead be personalizable enough to accommodate changes in associated with such changes, we think that PTM tools should new tool and transferring data to the new tool. To reduce costs to be adapted. Below, we review what contributed to the changes in PTM behaviors and suggest ways in which personalizable PTM tools could better support those changes.

4.2.3 Opportunities revealing unnoticed needs Buying or the availability of a device or an application and adopting suggestions by others for enhancing one’s PTM system were mentioned as reasons for 16/304 (5%) PTM changes. We refer to these types of contributing factors as opportunities; see Table 2 for example quotes. In 4 of such reasons, respondents also mentioned a PTM need that was better supported by their new tool/practice. However, it appeared that in those cases, the opportunities revealed some PTM needs that were not apparent beforehand. For example, a new smart phone (opportunity) revealed the need to access calendar while on the go for a portfolio manager: “switched from a paper planner to an electronic calendar for my personal tasks. [because] I got a Blackberry smartphone -- an easy way to have my calendar with me at all times” [P157]. This suggests that one way to make users aware of their needs is to provide them with some opportunities that they could take, which we elaborate in the next section.

5 DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS FOR DESIGN OF PERSONALIZABLE PTM TOOLS

We characterized the changes in PTM behaviors over time based on whether a change is made to a strategy, a tool, or a tool-set. Within-tool changes and tool-set changes, in many cases, reflected the inherent adaptability and non-adaptability of tools respectively. Within-tool changes often were possible because of some level of adaptability of a tool. Non-adaptability of a current PTM tool, on the other hand, led to tool-set changes when a new functionality was needed but not offered by the tool. Tool-set changes which involve adding and removing a tool from one’s tool-set might be costly considering the time spent on finding a new tool and transferring data to the new tool. To reduce costs associated with such changes, we think that PTM tools should instead be personalizable enough to accommodate changes in PTM behaviors rather than forcing users to switch tools by failing to be adapted. Below, we review what contributed to the changes in PTM behaviors and suggest ways in which personalizable PTM tools could better support those changes.

Implication-1: Enable documenting and reporting unmet PTM needs. We found that in 74% of the reported changes, respondents cited unmet needs and the dissatisfaction caused by those (see Table 2) as reasons for changes in their PTM. Although different subsets of these unmet needs are supported by many e-PTM tools, any individual e-PTM tool rarely supports the full set of a user’s changing needs unless it is fully personalizable—that is capable of expanding its functionality by allowing users to build and add new features. Further, as the number of possible changes in a personalizable tool grows, it might become more difficult for users to even know whether a personalization is possible or how to invoke their desired change. To address this potential challenge in personalizable PTM tools, we suggest that they allow users to report their unmet needs so that others—either other users or the tool developers—could help them find how to make their desired changes. Examples of unmet needs—taken from our data—that could be reported by clicking on a button that says “I need to...” include: “I need to have an overview of all my tasks at a glance, since my task list is getting larger” referring to the lack of an appropriate view for large number of tasks, and “I need to see my tasks on a calendar so I know when I’m focusing on what”.

Providing an easy-to-use mechanism for reporting unmet needs could help in several ways: 1) if the reported need is supported without requiring new development, it can be responded to either by a community of users who might have experienced the same need and thus have found ways to meet that need or by the tool’s support team to guide the user in how to make the change needed; 2) the reported need will act as a feature request which makes developers aware of users’ unsupported needs so they can build the needed functionality into the system—or as a separate add-on/plugin; and 3) reported needs can also be used in personalization research to better understand how users express their needs which could inform the design of end-user programming languages or personalization facilities that match users’ way of expressing their needs. The goal of end-user programming languages and personalization facilities is to empower individuals to build their desired functionality when not supported by their tools.

Implication-2: Encourage reflection on and evaluation of PTM behaviors. We found that the dissatisfaction that led to PTM changes sometimes involved user evaluation and reflection on their PTM practices. Therefore, we think that encouraging people to reflect on and evaluate their PTM behaviors is beneficial since that might cause them to make positive changes to their PTM. In order to encourage people to reflect and make needed changes to their PTM behaviors, we suggest that PTM tools should be made reflective [17] to make people aware of their PTM behaviors and thus make people more likely to personalize their tools such that they better fit their needs. This can be done in a similar approach to that of the quantified-self applications that track and show individuals’ data to users to induce reflection and encourage behavior change [16]. For example, a PTM system could present information such as number of tasks recorded in the past week, number of overdue tasks since last month, number of times that a task has been postponed, number of accomplished tasks, how long
each task has been on the list, and how they are spending their
time by tracking users’ tasks.

In addition, presenting changes in such information can make
users aware of changes in their behaviors, and hence make them
more likely to reflect. For example, visualizing trends such as an
increase in the number of appointments or tasks, which could
mean increased busyness, could lead to the use of different views
that better support monitoring of a larger number of tasks.

Examining what elements of PTM information could encourage
reflection and their variation across individuals is an important
avenue for future research.

Implication-3: Personalizable PTM tools should support sharing
of PTM changes or personalizations. We found that friends’
recommendations—which we categorized under opportunities—
contributed to changes in PTM behaviors by creating awareness
of the benefit of a new practice/tool or the limitation of a previous
tool/practice. Based on this, we think that if personalizable PTM
tools expose users to personalization or changes that other users
have made to the tool, other users will be able to improve their
own PTM practice by learning from others’ behaviors. One way
of exposing users to personalizations made by others is to link
each interface component to a list of relevant user-generated
personalizations that users can browse through and perhaps vote
on (e.g., “like it”). Exposing users to others’ personalization
seems similar to, but perhaps more complex than feature
recommendations [14]; performing an advanced personalization
such as creating a new view for tasks, or creating a new
functionality that would change some aspects of tasks (e.g., due
dates) when triggered may not be as predictable/straightforward as
using a feature, thus depending on the personalization mechanism
used, sharing a personalization might require capturing the steps
involved in performing the personalization and presenting the
steps to the users in way that is easy to understand and reuse.
In addition, recommending a personalization to users may require
understanding the motivation behind it, which needs to be sourced
from the original user who performed the personalization.

An example of a personalization that could be shared—taken from
our data—is a desired feature that allows the user to define quiet
hours such that she will not receive any reminders during those
hours. If a user added this to her personalizable PTM tool, she
could then also share this feature with others—together with her
motivation of not getting distracted by reminders when focusing
on a single task—using a sharing mechanism provided within the
personalizable tool itself. This feature can then be linked to a
relevant interface component such as reminders’ settings to
enhance discoverability. Designing sharing mechanisms for
personalization and mechanisms for informing users about
potentially beneficial personalization are interesting avenues for
research in personalization.

We did not discuss potential benefits—or lack thereof—of changes in PTM behaviors in this paper, because we did not ask
our participants whether the changes they made in their PTM

proven to be beneficial or not. However, the reported reasons
appeared to imply that the participants expected to see some
benefits as a result of making a change, and that the benefits
seemed to outweigh the potential cost of making that change.

6 LIMITATIONS

Asking people to recall changes in their PTM using a survey
questionnaire has limitations. A different approach would have
been a longitudinal investigation where participants are asked to
record changes in their PTM as they occur over a period of one
year for example and they are interviewed in monthly intervals.
However, such longitudinal approach is likely to suffer from
Hawthorne effect—some behavior changes would likely be a
result of participating in the study. This effect is especially
interfering when studying changes in behavior. The survey
approach did not suffer from the Hawthorne effect in that it
captured changes that did not occur due to participating in the
study. However, the retrospective nature of the survey may have
elicited more major changes (tool-set changes) than minor
changes (within-tool changes), since major changes are likely
easier to remember. Our follow-up interviews were conducted to
partially compensate for this limitation—a subset of participants
were asked about their PTM behaviors a year after they reported
their behaviors in the survey and we compared their behaviors
objectively. However, half of the follow-up interviews (6/12)
were conducted by phone because of participant preference.
Phone interviews have their own limitations since we were not
able to pick up on potential changes they had made to their PTM
without their conscious awareness and the phone interviews were
notably shorter than the in-person ones (12.6 vs 24.5 min).

7 CONCLUSION

We characterized three different types of changes that occurred in
individuals’ PTM behaviors over time: strategy changes, within-
tool changes, and tool-set changes. What contributed to these
changes were: changing needs, dissatisfaction caused by unmet
needs, and opportunities revealing unnoticed needs.

To support changes in PTM behaviors over time, we suggest that
PTM tools: enable users to document and report their unmet
needs, encourage reflection on and evaluation of PTM behaviors,
and support sharing of PTM behaviors. We have provided
concrete design possibilities on how to achieve each of these and
offered suggestions for future PTM research.
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