

# Passively Recognising Human Activities through Lifelogging

---

## Abstract

Lifelogging is the process of automatically recording aspects of one's life in digital form. This includes visual lifelogging using wearable cameras such as the SenseCam and in recent years many interesting applications for this have emerged and are being actively researched. One of the most interesting of these, and possibly the most far-reaching, is using visual lifelogs as a memory prosthesis but there are also applications in job-specific activity recording, general lifestyle analysis and market analysis.

In this work we describe a technique which allowed us to develop automatic classifiers for visual lifelogs to infer different lifestyle traits or characteristics. Their accuracy was validated on a set of 95k manually annotated images and through one-on-one interviews with those who gathered the images. These automatic classifiers were then applied to a collection of over 3 million lifelog images collected by 33 individuals sporadically over a period of 3.5 years. From this collection we present a number of anecdotal observations to demonstrate the future potential of lifelogging to capture human behaviour. These anecdotes include: the eating habits of office workers; to the amount of time researchers spend outdoors through the year; to the observation that retired people in our study appear to spend quite a bit of time indoors eating with friends. We believe this work demonstrates the potential of lifelogging techniques to assist behavioural scientists in future.

*Keywords:* Lifelogging, SenseCam, algorithms, psychology, sociology

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION AND MAIN QUESTIONS

An embedded activity within our society is recording aspects of our lives and one of the most frequent examples of this is proactively taking pictures on special occasions like birthdays and weddings. This is a form of explicit but selective lifelogging. The field of lifelogging has been in existence since

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 the 1980's, with early pioneers such as Steve Mann and Kiyoharu Aizawa  
6 concentrating on making smaller and smaller devices with increasing battery  
7 capacity. However these devices were single prototypes and it has not been  
8 until the release of the SenseCam that researchers outside the hardware de-  
9 vices arena have been able to explore the software applications of lifelogging.  
10 It is likely that digital lifelogging on a less selective but more ubiquitous  
11 basis, is set to become a more commonplace activity [1, 2].

12  
13  
14 Large-scale lifelogs however, do come with a high management cost. New  
15 techniques to automatically segment large streams of lifelog data into mean-  
16 ingful events have been explored [2], where an event constitutes an activity  
17 such as *having lunch, talking to a neighbour or watching television*, etc.

18  
19 While there have been many developments in lifelogging technologies,  
20 with some exceptions [3, 4, 5] less work has been done on deriving actual  
21 meaningful information from lifelogs, knowing “*the what*” of given activities,  
22 and understanding how this can be re-applied in everyday life to inform  
23 our overall wellbeing. Such insights should allow us to derive new tools for  
24 lifelogs that not only support remembering [6, 7], but also advise us on future  
25 behaviours through analysis of the past. The research space here is complex  
26 and there are different lifestyle features that could be extracted from lifelogs,  
27 as well as different ways that we might interpret and map this logged data  
28 onto actual behaviours. There might even be different implications for how  
29 and what we consider to be a lifestyle feature.

30  
31  
32 In the exploratory study reported here we set out to develop an algorithm  
33 for deriving lifestyle patterns from a visual lifelog and to conduct a subjective  
34 investigation into how these automatically generated lifestyle interpretations  
35 map back onto the actual lifestyle of a group of 33 participants.

36  
37 The specific research questions we address are:

- 38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65
1. How can we automatically determine personal, individual traits which characterise a lifestyle, from vast streams of lifelog data ?
  2. What specific traits can we determine and can they be compared and contrasted across users or across time ?
  3. How do people perceive their own traits and how do these perceptions compare to the actual traits automatically inferred from lifelogs ?

## 2. RELATED WORK

The technologies to capture a visual narrative of one's life have so far been the primary focus of lifelogging research [8]. Privacy issues around

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 such surveillance or sousveillance (capturing data about oneself for use by  
6 oneself) [9] have also been explored by the experts in these fields [10, 7].  
7 Although increased storage capabilities and advances in sensor technologies  
8 have proliferated lifelogging practices, the real motivations and benefits of  
9 lifelogging are still unclear. In particular, there is little evidence of whether  
10 lifelogs of our past can usefully inform our future wellbeing.

11  
12 Steve Mann, now a researcher at the University of Toronto, spent much  
13 time, from the 1970's onwards, trying to capture much of what he saw  
14 through the design of head-mounted video cameras [11]. Much research in  
15 the past has concentrated on miniaturising visual lifelogging capture devices  
16 so as to encourage more users to become comfortable with this concept. Sev-  
17 eral research groups have had visual lifelogging devices that required users to  
18 wear a laptop carried on a bag around their backs [12, 13] and in some cases  
19 a head mounted camera [14]. Given the prevalence of mobile/cell phones,  
20 the WayMarkr project of New York University uses a mobile phone affixed  
21 to a strap so as to take pictures automatically [15]. The DietSense project  
22 in UCLA also makes use of a mobile/cell phone, hung via a lanyard around  
23 the neck in a SenseCam like fashion, to capture pictures automatically [16].  
24 However capturing a visual lifelog on cell phones is still not feasible due to  
25 considerable battery limitations. Microsoft Research in Cambridge, U.K.,  
26 has further advanced the field through the introduction of the SenseCam  
27 [17]. The SenseCam is small and light and from experience of wearing the  
28 device, after a short period of time, it becomes virtually unnoticed to the  
29 wearer. It holds advantages over video recorders as the device only takes im-  
30 ages on average 3 times per minute, thus allowing a person to quickly review  
31 all the images to gist what has happened in a given day, rather than the  
32 requirement of watching a video clip in real time. An even bigger advantage  
33 is the fact that storage requirements are reduced, and also privacy concerns  
34 are not as grave as the camera takes snapshots as opposed to continuous  
35 footage. The SenseCam is now used by not only lifelogging research groups,  
36 but also by research groups in other fields as it presently offers the most  
37 usable lifelogging solution.

38  
39 Recently, the focus of lifelogging research has shifted towards eliciting  
40 meaning from lifelogs e.g. specific behavioural patterns or lifestyles and in-  
41 vestigating how this new information could influence our wellbeing. This has  
42 been partially investigated by Lindley *et. al.* [5] in their study of SenseCam  
43 use for a week's duration in the family home. The study showed that after  
44 participants looked at their sedentary images, they were prompted to change  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 their lifestyle by, for example, cycling instead of driving, taking up exercise,  
6 and spending more time interacting with their children.

7 It is difficult to assess the effect that lifelogging devices have on lifestyle  
8 choices. To date, the majority of research has focused on short-term use,  
9 from a few hours use to a week [18, 6, 5]. However there are now several  
10 subjects who have been wearing a SenseCam constantly for months or even  
11 years, and one of our authors has been wearing it for over four years. It  
12 is **likely** that if lifelogging devices are to have any significant influence over  
13 lifestyle, it will happen during prolonged periods of use.

14 Segmenting lifelog data into meaningful events [2] to help make sense of  
15 large streams of visual information has also been adopted as one of the main  
16 approaches in memory archiving [19]. However, little effort has been made  
17 to understand lifelogs any further, in particular investigating what personal  
18 lifestyle traits could be embedded in one’s long-term lifelog. This raises the  
19 question of whether these types of features can be automatically identified  
20 and extracted and what this could tell us about our individual lifestyle traits.

21 One method recently identified as a potential solution in recognising  
22 lifestyle traits from lifelog data is that of semantic concept detection [20],  
23 an often-employed approach in video indexing [21], which aims to describe  
24 visual content with confidence values indicating the presence or absence of  
25 object or scene categories. Although it is hard to bridge the “semantic gap”  
26 between low-level features that one can extract from visual data and the high-  
27 level conceptual interpretation a user gives to this data, the video analysis  
28 field has made substantial progress by moving from specific single concept  
29 detection methods to generic approaches and by combining individual concepts  
30 into groups or hierarchies, forming ontologies. The goal of the work reported  
31 in this paper is in extending preliminary exploration into concept detection  
32 in the lifelogging domain which has been evaluated on just 5 users [20]. In  
33 the work here we propose an alternative technique for concept detection,  
34 then evaluate it on lifelog data from 33 subjects and then we show the kind  
35 of lifestyle inferences that can be made from this platform for interpreting  
36 lifestyle traits and characteristics.

### 3. METHOD

37 We begin by describing **the data collection tool and post-processing soft-**  
38 **ware analysis** automatic Trait Interpreter we developed for the study. Then  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 we describe details of the study, followed by the survey and interviews carried  
6 out.

### 7 8 *3.1. Lifelog collection tool* 9

10 The SenseCam is a small wearable device which incorporates a digital  
11 camera and multiple sensors including a 3-axis accelerometer to detect mo-  
12 tion, a thermometer to detect ambient temperature, a passive infra red sen-  
13 sor to detect the presence of a person in front of the wearer, and a light  
14 sensor [17]. It is worn via a lanyard suspended around the neck. **To ease**  
15 **privacy concerns it is worthwhile to note that audio is not recorded.** Unlike  
16 a conventional digital camera, SenseCam can facilitate passive image cap-  
17 ture, generating up to 5,000 images per day for an active user. This type  
18 of extensive visual lifelog can capture small details from our everyday ac-  
19 tivities that are often considered to be crucial in building memories of the  
20 past [22, 23, 6, 7, 24]. Figure 1 illustrates examples of everyday activities  
21 captured by SenseCam.  
22  
23  
24

### 25 26 *3.2. Trait Interpreter Tool* 27

28 Preliminary explorations of lifestyle recognition from lifelogs were based  
29 on concept detection techniques derived from those used successfully in auto-  
30 matic video indexing [25]. A characteristic of these techniques is that they  
31 are designed to extract low-level features from relevant image/video data  
32 and to carry out the classification of those features into relevant semantic  
33 concept categories. For publicly available image and video collections this  
34 approach is highly appropriate. However as is well documented in the lifelog  
35 community, users are naturally uneasy about sharing their personal image  
36 collections with others [10].  
37  
38

39 To address this we constructed a new model of classifying lifelog data  
40 for human behaviour understanding, based on using a software application  
41 to extract low-level features from a lifelog collection which runs on a user's  
42 own personal computer. The user then sends only the low-level feature data,  
43 which are some basic MPEG-7 [26] low-level features, to the cloud for anal-  
44 ysis. Using these features it is impossible to reconstruct what the original  
45 images look like, thus reassuring participants that content remains private  
46 and secure. We now describe how this approach is realised and evaluate its  
47 performance compared to the existing system which required all images to  
48 be sent to a central location.  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

### 3.2.1. Feature Extraction

Participants in our study used an open-source event-based lifelog browser [2] with images stored in a relational database on their local machine. A software application was sent to users which extracted two MPEG-7 features, namely ColorLayout and ScalableColor [26] from the images in their collections that they were comfortable in providing for analysis. Features were extracted from only the middle 35 images in each lifelog event, which have been shown to be sufficiently representative (i.e. 90%) of the event as a whole [3]. This meant that only **approximately** 35% of the users' collections were required for processing.

### 3.2.2. Lifestyle Trait Selection

There is a very large range of lifestyle traits that could be selected for analysis, and we used the 27 lifestyle traits outlined in Figure 1, which were previously used in the lifelogging field [20]. Indeed after further analysis of the rate of occurrence of these traits across a group of 5 users, we decided to omit 5 of them (*presentation, holdingPhone, reading, stairs, steeringWheel*). The reason for this is that these concepts occurred across very few of the participants, which meant that the example images were too skewed to too small a subset of participants resulting in a lack of sufficient heterogeneous training examples. For example only one user in our initial set of 5 users was involved in driving activity, therefore we had an insufficient distribution of *steeringWheel* traits across our participant, meaning that cross-fold validation in these instances is somewhat biased.

However more broadly it should be stressed that these 22 traits have been selected by computer scientists for the purposes of an exploratory study to investigate if our method has potential as a tool for behavioural scientists. The learning process for any newly selected traits is the same as for the 22 we use in this exploration. For example our method can be applied when more appropriate activities are selected for investigation in future, using the input of the behavioural sciences and epidemiology communities e.g. using techniques such as the Daily Reconstruction Method [27], ASAQ (Adolescent Sedentary Activity Questionnaire) [28], Canadian Occupation Therapists list [29], etc.

### 3.2.3. Lifestyle Trait Classification

In order to train our concept detectors, we used manually annotated images from five users. MPEG-7 features (ColorStructure and ScalableColor [26]) were extracted as image descriptors. We used the SVMlight




Figure 1: Example SenseCam images which represent the lifestyle activities that our trait interpreter tool automatically recognises.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 implementation of the Support Vector Machine [30] and optimised the pa-  
6 rameters using cross-fold validation. For speed of training, we split the users  
7 into just two folds. We used the RBF kernel with probabilistic output, and  
8 optimized parameters  $C$  and  $\gamma$  (gamma).  
9

#### 10 3.2.4. Evaluation of Proposed Technique

11 Building upon preliminary studies in the lifelogging domain related to this  
12 work [20], a training and test set of 87,850 images from 5 participants was  
13 used for evaluation. 9 annotators carried out a total of 152,538 judgments  
14 across the range of aforementioned lifestyle traits. Figure 2 summarises the  
15 accuracy of our technique across the 22 lifestyle traits, achieving an average  
16 F1-Measure of 65%. Encouragingly the performance of our lightweight classi-  
17 fier is comparable to that of the heavyweight video-analysis inspired lifestyle  
18 classification tools (avg. F1-Measure of 68%) applied in preliminary inves-  
19 tigation in this domain. It should also be noted that the performance of  
20 both approaches far exceeds that of random (avg. F1-Measure of 15%). We  
21 believe that the level of accuracy achieved by our technique in this medium-  
22 scale sized dataset is sufficiently mature to then be applied to a large-scale  
23 unannotated set of data.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29

## 30 4. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

### 31 4.1. Participants

32 A group of thirty three participants (9 female and 24 male, aged 22 - 60)  
33 who wore the SenseCam at some stage over the previous 3.5 years agreed to  
34 share image feature data derived automatically from the lifelog images, but  
35 not the actual images themselves, and four of these participants took part (2  
36 female and 2 male, aged 26 - 38) in a follow-up interview. Participants were  
37 volunteers from a wide variety of backgrounds: researchers, management  
38 and administrative staff, as well as other professionals. From this, and the  
39 lifelogging practices, we constructed 4 approximate groupings of participants:  
40 *Office Workers* (6x), *Researchers* (15x), *Retired* (4x) and *Regular lifeloggers*  
41 (8x). All participants wore SenseCam for short (min 1 day) or prolonged  
42 periods of time (max 3.5 years), with a median wear period of 8 days as shown  
43 in Table 1. Regular lifeloggers wore SenseCam on a re-occurring basis and  
44 primarily came from a research background. Other groups wore SenseCam  
45 on a once-off basis.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65






Figure 2: Lifestyle concept identification accuracy of our lightweight system (a ) compared with state of the art (68%) and random (15%) classification tools.

To investigate if cross-group comparisons could be made, these groups were selected by computer scientists. Naturally there are many cross-group intricacies missed out, such as the fact that certain groups were more inclined to wear the camera at different times. For example, the *Retired* group who wore the SenseCam for an average of four days relayed a preference for recording events outside of the home, whereas long-term SenseCam wearers such as the regular *Lifelogger* group of individuals appeared more inclined to record everything, from morning until night. These examples highlight the inevitable variation of image quantity and recorded activities between the participant groups we attempted to define, and provides opportunity for future improvement.

#### 4.2. Procedure

As this was an exploratory study, the participants were not given set guidelines as to where or how long they should wear the SenseCam. The participants were given instructions by the researchers on how to use the SenseCam. They were also given a single sheet as a reminder of its operation, which is displayed in Figure 3. In addition they were provided software to

Group (num people)	Median Days data	Median Events/Day	Median Images/Day	Avg Daily Duration
Office Workers (6)	7	19.5	1599	6h 55m
Researchers (15)	8	20	1640	7h 15m
Retired (4)	3.5	25.5	2091	10h 30m
Lifeloggers (8)	42	18.5	1517	10h 21m
Overall Averages	15.1	20.9	1712	8h 45m

Table 1: Information on data gathered by our participants, broken into general social groups

browse through their images [31]. Ethical approval was obtained from the Dublin City University Research Ethics Committee, the group charged with responsibility for monitoring and approving research projects from an ethical and privacy standpoint.

The study then consisted of two stages: 1) automated *lifestyle trait interpretation* and 2) subjective *lifestyle trait feedback*, each of which are described in detail below.

#### 4.2.1. Lifestyle Analysis Phase

In the *lifestyle trait interpretation* phase, we collected lifelog data from 33 participants. A total of 3,532,904 lifelog images were gathered which were then segmented into 43,072 events using an open-source event-based lifelog browser [31]. Participants then used a feature extraction software application which processed the lifelogs, and returned the low-level image output of a total of 1,314,376 images.

The MPEG-7 ColorLayout and ScalableColor features were extracted at a speed of approximately 10 images per second across the participants’ machines. Thereafter the MPEG-7 features were input into our lifestyle trait interpreter tool to be classified into the relevant traits. This phase was completed at a speed of approximately 20 images per second on a single CPU. The trait classification outputs with an average confidence score of greater than zero over all (middle 35) representative images in each event were classified as positive examples of a given trait.

#### 4.2.2. Lifestyle Feedback Phase

After identifying personal traits, 4 participants who donated features from their lifelogs were interviewed. We conducted one-on-one interviews where

## Using SenseCam

**Turning on/off** – you can turn the SenseCam on or off by pressing the button in the top of the device for a few seconds. When it is turning on it will make a beep sound and an orange light will appear beside the button.

Turn the SenseCam off when you are not wearing it to save the battery. You will most likely only need to turn it off when you are going to bed or if you decide you do not want it to record anything for an extended period.

**Privacy button** – press this button to temporarily stop the device from taking pictures. It will reactivate automatically after 7 minutes.

**Activate button** – this button allows you to take a picture manually or to reactivate the device if you had previously pressed the privacy button.

**Status lights** – an orange flashing light will indicate every time an image is captured. A red light indicates that the privacy button has been pressed and the device is not taking any images at this time.

### Charging

You will be given a charger lead with a plug on one end and a small square plug on the other end. It is recommended that you charge SenseCam at night when you are sleeping so that the battery will be full for the next day.

To charge the SenseCam, put the small end of the plug into the SenseCam in the slot on its side (see picture) and plug the other end into your domestic plug socket.



Figure 3: Information sheet given to participants as a reminder on how to operate the SenseCam.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 we asked 4 participants to describe their personal behavioural traits and  
6 provide feedback on how well lifelogging devices fitted into their style of life  
7 and what they perceived their own personal lifestyle traits to be. Participants  
8 were asked about each of the following aspects:  
9

- 10 • Highlighting personal traits — what types of personal traits could lifelogging devices help highlight;
- 11 • Perceived trait frequency — perceived frequency of selected traits, specifically how frequently participants thought they undertook a given set of activities during their ordinary week;
- 12 • Fitting in with lifestyle — to what extent could SenseCam be used as a tool for collecting individual lifestyle characteristics.

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22 The interviews contained open-ended questions about what people perceived  
23 their dominant traits to be and how lifelog images helped them to highlight  
24 these traits. We present these as quotes through the article.  
25  
26

## 27 5. RESULTS

28  
29  
30 This section reports the findings of applying the trait interpreter tool on  
31 our group of participants. Obviously these findings will not tell significant  
32 insights into human behaviour as this is not a large scale randomised control  
33 trial. However these findings in our exploratory study are of interest as they  
34 demonstrate the future potential of using this automated behaviour capture  
35 tool. The following reports on findings from the *lifestyle trait analysis*.  
36  
37

### 38 5.1. Number of traits elicited

39  
40 Across the 1,013,878 minutes of total lifelog data collected by our 33  
41 participants, our tool determined that most time was spent indoors (mean of  
42 7h 15m per person per day of SenseCam wear time) with the least time being  
43 spent in the restroom (mean of just 13sec per person per day of SenseCam  
44 wear, probably indicating people generally switch the camera off for these  
45 activities). Figure 4 sums-up personal traits identified by our automated  
46 Trait Interpreter across all 33 lifelogs.  
47  
48

49 Under the conditions of our study, and given the output of our trait  
50 interpreter tool, the largest part of the time, 83%, was spent *indoors*. People  
51 also spent a lot of time, 39%, socializing with other people, as inferred by  
52  
53

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

co-occurrences of the (*people* 39%) and (*face* 20%) traits. Personal computer based activities (*screen* 9% & *hands* 25%) were also prevalent traits captured by our Trait Interpreter.

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65




Figure 4: Time spent on each of the 22 automatically identified activities across entire set of lifelog data gathered by 33 participants

Trait 1	Trait 2	W	Trait 1	Trait 2	W
Face	people	0.79	hands	people	0.55
Buildings	sky	0.77	tree	veg	0.54
Sky	tree	0.74	grass	tree	0.53
Buildings	tree	0.66	hands	screen	0.53
hands	indoor	0.65	face	hands	0.5
indoor	people	0.65	indoor	screen	0.49
buildings	outdoor	0.62	outdoor	tree	0.48
grass	veg	0.58	grass	sky	0.48
outdoor	sky	0.57	office	screen	0.47
face	indoor	0.56	sky	veg	0.44

Table 2: Top 20 most strongly co-occurring lifestyle traits in our study

Before carrying out further analysis on the outputs of our lifestyle analysis, we decided to carry out a “common sense” logic approach on some of the concepts. Firstly there was a strong negative correlation between the *indoor* and *outdoor* lifestyle traits, which follows logical expected outcomes (see Figure 5). Also consider the co-occurrence of different traits outlined in Table 2, where the co-occurrence factor is  $W = c_{ij} / \sqrt{(s_i s_j)}$ , which normalises co-occurrence by the likelihood of individual concepts. Again quite logically we can see that when the trait *face* is present, the trait *people* is also highly likely to be present, and also with other instances such as *sky:tree*, *grass:veg*, *hands:screen*, etc.

### 5.2. Do traits differ among defined groups ?

As described in the participants section (Section 4.1) and in Table 1, we identified 4 participant groupings: *office workers*, *researchers*, *retired* (people from non-computing background), and *lifeloggers* (avid enthusiasts, all researchers by profession, who wear the SenseCam for long periods of time). We then compared the relative number of occurrence of traits between these different groups. As Figure 6 illustrates, the *retired* group of participants appeared to spend more time *meeting* with friends and relatives. A possible explanation for this may be that they are not as engaged with technology given they spend less time in front of a personal computer *screen*. An interesting trait related to the *lifeloggers* group is that they appear to wear the device for a wider range of activities, thus traits such as *inside Vehicle* occur much more frequently when compared to other groups. The *office workers*




Figure 5: Correlation of time spent *outdoors* versus *indoors* by our participants, illustrating a spectrum along which a user can evaluate his/her lifestyle.






Figure 6: Time that 4 groups of participants in our study spent on 4 selected lifestyle categories. The x-axis ( $y=0$ ) represents the mean rate of occurrence of lifestyle traits and the y-axis measures the number of standard deviations away from this mean.

in our study exhibited more *face*-to-face interaction than the other social groups, while the *researchers* grouping demonstrated the least proportion of social contacts among the groupings defined in our study.

### 5.3. Did some groups miss their lunch ?

We now demonstrate the potential of our tool in eliciting a detailed daily breakdown of engagement in a given activity, and how this may be used in future human behaviour validation studies. For the purposes of this demonstration we consider the eating patterns of the different groups of participants (results illustrated in Figure 7). We observed that *office workers* appeared to have a regular set pattern of eating between 11am and 2pm, while had an evening meal between 7pm and 8pm, before supper at 10pm. The *retired* groups of users appear to have regular lunch at 1pm, and then evening dinner between 7pm and 9pm. But the *researchers* and *lifeloggers* have less set patterns of meal times, which may suggest further implication on their work-life balance and wellbeing. Again this requires further validation in large scale field trials, but could be a powerful means of contextualising traditional methods used.




Figure 7: Participant eating patterns during a typical day as measured by our trait interpreter tool in this exploratory study.

#### 5.4. Is there potential to compare lifestyle trait profiles ?

Since it is possible to represent each user as a vector with 22 associated lifestyle feature dimensions (with each dimension representing the fraction of time that the participant was engaged in a given activity), we can exploit these vectors to group together participants by lifestyle similarity. Figure 8 shows a plot of the first 2 PCA components<sup>1</sup> for each participant, as the first 2 components contained over 80% of the variance. A majority of the 33 participants appeared to cluster closely into the groups we pre-defined. A possible interpretation that would require further study is that if one is a *researcher* or a regular *lifelogger*, they tend to spend a lot of time with like-minded people and over time adapt to some group lifestyle traits. Another possible observation is that, *retired* and *office workers* tend to retain more individually pronounced traits, which may explain the individual points being positioned further away from the cluster centroid in Figure 8.

<sup>1</sup>First 2 PCA components were selected from a 22-element vector representing each participant, with each element representing the % time spent on a given activity




Figure 8: Clustering of participant groups in our study by lifestyle traits using PCA analysis.

### 5.5. Periods where more time is spent indoors

Within the group of *lifeloggers* we further investigated the average amount of time spent *outdoors*. The reason for selecting this grouping was that they had captured the most data over longer periods of time (median of 42 days gathered as noted in Table 1). Figure 9 suggests that more time may be spent *outdoors* in the Summer months when there is more daylight, than during the Winter months.

### 5.6. Lifestyle Trait Interpreter Reliability

To qualitatively investigate the reliability of the output generated by our Trait Interpreter tool we carried out follow-up interviews with 4 (2 female, 2 male, mean age = 30) of the participants who donated their lifelog image features. The interviews were broken down into 3 sections or phases. In the first phase, users were asked to select from a list, the 10 most frequent traits that they believed to be captured by their own lifelog images. Then, during the second phase, participants were shown a breakdown of the time they spent on these pre-defined 22 traits that our algorithm had identified and they could also contrast this information with traits from the other 32 participants. Finally, they were then asked to comment on this automated interpretation of their lifestyle.




Figure 9: Time spent outdoors by the participants we placed in the *lifeloggers* group, calculated over a period of 3.5 years.

The traits that participants perceived as being the 10 most frequent traits (see Figure 10) were compared to the 10 most frequent traits identified by the Trait Interpreter tool. The accuracy between participants identifying own traits and those generated by the Trait Interpreter was encouraging (see Table 3) in our study. We now comment on some anecdotal observations.

Participant comments highlighted an overwhelming interest in being able to see automatically generated interpretations of their own personal traits that they could easily identify. After viewing the automated trait identification output, to our surprise, participant 3 said that she felt that the Trait

Participant	Crossover between self report and our lifestyle trait tool
1	70%
2	70%
3	50%
4	57%

Table 3: Accuracy between self-identified and automatically identified personal traits.




Figure 10: Perceived frequency of time spent on lifestyle activities by 4 participants in interviews.

Interpreter ranking was actually more accurate than her own ranking. They were all genuinely surprised how much time they actually spent indoors: *“I should meet more people or go out more, I am too much indoors. I can see the overall imbalance and maybe I’ll try to change it”* and *“I don’t see much of nature. Grass is practically not there”*. Other traits around eating habits specifically showing lack of time spent having meals, brought out some weight concerns for one of the participants: *“I should spend a bit more time eating, I’m very thin. I’m only 55 kilos”*.

The interviewed participants agreed that the presentation of such detailed automatically-generated summaries of their own lifestyle traits could spark motivation for a change in their behaviour. Further application of such visualization could lead to investigating how personal traits change over time and across seasons e.g. Summer versus Winter. Participants were also interested in being able to compare their own traits and frequencies of occurrence to those of their friends and peers.

## 6. FUTURE WORK

We believe that this article provides the first investigation into the elicitation of various human behaviour activities from visual lifelogs. To reach this stage, much effort has been required to find willing participants to gather data. Also, advances have been required in managing the data through de-

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 tecting distinct events or activities [31]. Building upon the visual processing  
6 work of the TRECVID video community [32], we have been able to apply  
7 the automatic detection of 22 concepts to visual lifelog data. We feel that  
8 the approach we've taken in this work has been successfully "sanity-checked"  
9 through the anecdotal observations reported in this article. However there is  
10 naturally a number of future milestones that need to be achieved for lifelog-  
11 ging review technologies to truly be more acceptable to behavioural scientists  
12 and also the wider population. We now highlight these challenges:  
13  
14

- 15  
16 • Identifying a set of base concepts to generalise across lifestyle activi-  
17 ties - While the techniques and processes mentioned for the activities  
18 covered in this article, can be re-applied to find new activity types in  
19 future, we recognise that a more appropriate set of activities should  
20 be selected. The lifelogging community should actively seek the input  
21 of the behavioural sciences and epidemiology communities e.g. using  
22 techniques such as the Daily Reconstruction Method [27], ASAQ (Ado-  
23 lescent Sedentary Activity Questionnaire) [28], Canadian Occupation  
24 Therapists list [29], etc. From this a set of base concepts or classes  
25 can be identified to provide the technology with a set of activities to  
26 automatically identify.  
27  
28
- 29  
30 • Evaluation across a more diverse set of users - As noted by Froehlich,  
31 Findlater, and Landay the computing community is quite weak in re-  
32 cruiting large populations of representative users for experiments, es-  
33 pecially when compared to the behavioural sciences community [33].  
34 However they also note that the computing community has a strength  
35 in offering possible solutions or interventions. This article mirrors the  
36 general trend, in that this study "sanity-checks" our generic framework,  
37 but that our selection of user groups is far from ideal. Over a period of  
38 3.5 years, most of our recruited participants were generally from tech-  
39 nology backgrounds (apart from a a number of retired citizens) and  
40 only wore the camera for short and varying periods of time. However  
41 as the technology becomes more accepted [8] it is now becoming more  
42 realistic to recruit a large number of diverse users to investigate how  
43 successfully technology can identify their lifestyle traits. Again inter-  
44 action with the behavioural sciences community is key.  
45  
46
- 47  
48 • Multi-modal concept detection - In addition to visual images, other  
49 types of lifelog information exists such as accelerometer [17], GPS [34],  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Bluetooth [35], etc. The fusion of these sources of information should  
6 be investigated to evaluate their use in improving the performance of  
7 automatic lifestyle activity recognition.  
8  
9

## 10 7. CONCLUSION

11  
12 This study extends the notion of lifelogging by starting to better capture  
13 human behaviour. Previous work has viewed lifelogs as archives [19] often  
14 organised into events [2] or as a data source for triggering recall [6, 7]. Instead  
15 in this study, we evaluate a new technique for automatically eliciting personal  
16 traits from visual lifelogs. We trained classifiers which were able to identify 22  
17 different lifestyle traits ranging from detecting whether someone was meeting  
18 friends or having lunch. We applied those chosen classifier models to 3+  
19 million lifelog images collected by 33 participants at some point during a  
20 period of 3.5 years. More specifically, this work shows that lifelogs have the  
21 potential to inform our future wellbeing through automated analysis of past  
22 traits. A subset of questioned participants noted that automatically elicited  
23 traits appeared correct and in anecdotal cases there was tendency to trust  
24 the automatic traits more than self perceptions.  
25  
26

27  
28 There are important design implications that follow from this work. While  
29 it is important to collect rich recordings about our past, it is also critical to  
30 consider what traits people might want to track and examine to help inform  
31 future wellbeing. We have noted that in future, close collaboration with other  
32 disciplines will be necessary to advance this work. It is also crucial to consider  
33 how to present this data. Since intention to share, motivates lifelogging, *who*  
34 to share it with and *how* is an interesting research question. Facebook and  
35 other social networking sites could support trait sharing amongst different  
36 social groups. Our results on a sample of 33 participants suggest that some  
37 social groups tend to adopt similar traits.  
38  
39

40  
41 Critics of lifelogging [24] argue that lifelogging simply accumulates huge  
42 collections of mundane data. But our study shows that providing automated  
43 and meaningful extractions of traits can address this criticism. This work  
44 represents a milestone towards a more structured behavioural sciences style  
45 experiment, and after addressing some of the future work challenges men-  
46 tioned in Section 6, we envisage a number of useful applications such as:  
47  
48

- 49 • Assessing one’s own health and wellbeing e.g. how active we are, what  
50 foods we have been eating ?  
51  
52  
53

- Automatically creating labelled personal diaries of past activities and interests;
- Improving personal efficiency through understanding how much time was spent on specific tasks without having to actively log anything e.g. [36];
- Helping to determine the traits, correlates, and interventions that influence population health e.g. [37];
- Providing quantitative lifestyle improvement metrics as a consideration factor in determining the success of treatments in clinical trials.

These are just some of the possibilities that have now opened up following this exploration study into new automated lifestyle trait detection technique. Our hope is that future work will continue to systematically examine the ways in which lifelog data helps understand personal traits and inform future personal wellbeing. There are still challenges in further miniaturising lifelog capture devices, and also many retrieval challenges associated with lifelogging. However in essence we believe that this novel platform of automated lifestyle trait analysis represents the wider emergence of lifelogging to support researchers in passively measuring human activities.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This material is based upon work supported by Science Foundation Ireland under Grant No. 07/CE/I1147. This work is also supported by the Irish Health Research Board under grant number MCPD/2010/12. We thank our volunteers for sharing their data and providing feedback on their experiences.

## References

- [1] G. Bell, J. Gemmell, A digital life, *Scientific American*.
- [2] A. R. Doherty, A. F. Smeaton, Automatically segmenting lifelog data into events, in: *WIAMIS: 9th International Workshop on Image Analysis for Multimedia Interactive Services*, IEEE Computer Society, Washington, DC, USA, 2008, pp. 20–23.



- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5 [3] A. R. Doherty, C. Ó Conaire, M. Blighe, A. F. Smeaton, N. E. O'Connor,  
6 Combining image descriptors to effectively retrieve events from visual  
7 lifelogs, in: MIR '08: Proceeding of the 1st ACM international confer-  
8 ence on Multimedia Information Retrieval, ACM, New York, NY, USA,  
9 2008, pp. 10–17. doi:http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1460096.1460100.  
10  
11  
12 [4] R. Harper, D. Randall, N. Smyth, C. Evans, L. Heledd, R. Moore,  
13 Thanks for the memory, in: HCI 2007 - Proceedings of the 21st BCS  
14 HCI Group Conference, 2007.  
15  
16  
17 [5] S. E. Lindley, D. Randall, W. Sharrock, M. Glancy, N. Smyth,  
18 R. Harper, Narrative, memory and practice: tensions and choices in  
19 the use of a digital artefact, in: BCS-HCI '09: Proceedings of the  
20 23rd British HCI Group Annual Conference on People and Computers,  
21 British Computer Society, Swinton, UK, UK, 2009, pp. 1–9.  
22  
23  
24 [6] V. Kalnikaite, A. Sellen, S. Whittaker, D. Kirk, Now let me see where  
25 I was: understanding how lifelogs mediate memory, in: CHI '10: Pro-  
26 ceedings of the 28th international conference on Human factors in com-  
27 puting systems, ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2010, pp. 2045–2054.  
28 doi:http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1753326.1753638.  
29  
30  
31 [7] A. J. Sellen, A. Fogg, M. Aitken, S. Hodges, C. Rother,  
32 K. Wood, Do life-logging technologies support memory for the  
33 past?: an experimental study using sensecam, in: CHI '07: Pro-  
34 ceedings of the SIGCHI conference on Human factors in com-  
35 puting systems, ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2007, pp. 81–90.  
36 doi:http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1240624.1240636.  
37  
38  
39 [8] G. Bell, J. Gemmell (Eds.), Total Recall: How the E-Memory Revolution  
40 Will Change Everything, Penguin Books, 2009.  
41  
42  
43 [9] A. L. Allen, Dredging-up the past: Lifelogging, memory and surveil-  
44 lance, *New Yorker* (2007) 38–44.  
45  
46  
47 [10] D. H. Nguyen, G. Marcu, G. R. Hayes, K. N. Truong, J. Scott,  
48 M. Langheinrich, C. Roduner, Encountering sensecam: per-  
49 sonal recording technologies in everyday life, in: UbiComp '09:  
50 Proceedings of the 11th international conference on Ubiquitous  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 computing, ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2009, pp. 165–174.  
6 doi:<http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1620545.1620571>.

- 7  
8 [11] S. Mann, Wearable computing: a first step toward personal imaging,  
9 Computer 30 (1997) 25–32.
- 10  
11 [12] D. Tancharoen, T. Yamasaki, K. Aizawa, Practical life log video indexing  
12 based on content and context, in: Multimedia Content Analysis, Man-  
13 agement, and Retrieval In Proceedings of SPIE-IST Electronic Imaging,  
14 2006.
- 15  
16 [13] W.-H. Lin, A. Hauptmann, Structuring continuous video recordings of  
17 everyday life using time-constrained clustering, in: Multimedia Content  
18 Analysis, Management, and Retrieval SPIE-IST Electronic Imaging, Vol.  
19 6073, 2006, pp. 111–119.
- 20  
21 [14] S. Tano, T. Takayama, M. Iwata, T. Hashiyama, Multimedia informal  
22 communication by wearable computer based on real-world context and  
23 graffiti, in: ICME IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and  
24 Expo, 2006, pp. 649–652.
- 25  
26 [15] M. Bukhin, M. DelGaudio, Waymarkr: acquiring perspective  
27 through continuous documentation, in: MUM '06: Proceed-  
28 ings of the 5th international conference on Mobile and ubiqui-  
29 tous multimedia, ACM Press, New York, NY, USA, 2006, p. 9.  
30 doi:<http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1186655.1186664>.
- 31  
32 [16] S. Reddy, A. Parker, J. Hyman, J. Burke, D. Estrin, M. Hansen, Image  
33 browsing, processing, and clustering for participatory sensing: lessons  
34 from a dietsense prototype, in: EmNets '07: Proceedings of the 4th  
35 workshop on Embedded networked sensors, ACM, New York, NY, USA,  
36 2007, pp. 13–17. doi:<http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1278972.1278975>.
- 37  
38 [17] S. Hodges, L. Williams, E. Berry, S. Izadi, J. Srinivasan, A. Butler,  
39 G. Smyth, N. Kapur, K. Wood, Sensecam: A retrospective memory aid,  
40 in: UbiComp: 8th International Conference on Ubiquitous Computing,  
41 Vol. 4602 of LNCS, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006, pp. 177–193.
- 42  
43 [18] N. Caprani, A. R. Doherty, H. Lee, A. F. Smeaton, N. E. O'Connor,  
44 C. Gurrin, Designing a touch-screen SenseCam browser to support an  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 aging population, in: CHI EA '10: Proceedings of the 28th of the in-  
6 ternational conference extended abstracts on Human factors in com-  
7 puting systems, ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2010, pp. 4291–4296.  
8 doi:<http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1753846.1754141>.  
9

- 10  
11 [19] J. Gemmell, Z. Wang, Clean living: Eliminating near-duplicates in life-  
12 time personal storage, Tech. rep., Microsoft Research Report no. MSR-  
13 TR-2006-30 (2006).  
14  
15 [20] D. Byrne, A. R. Doherty, C. G. M. Snoek, G. J. Jones, A. F. Smeaton,  
16 Everyday Concept Detection in Visual Lifelogs: Validation, Relation-  
17 ships and Trends, *Multimedia Tools and Applications* 49 (1) (2009)  
18 119–144.  
19  
20 [21] A. Hauptmann, R. Yan, W.-H. Lin, How many high-level concepts  
21 will fill the semantic gap in news video retrieval?, in: CIVR '07:  
22 Proceedings of the 6th ACM international conference on Image and  
23 video retrieval, ACM, New York, NY, USA, 2007, pp. 627–634.  
24 doi:<http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1282280.1282369>.  
25  
26 [22] M. A. Conway, C. P. Pearce, The construction of autobiographical mem-  
27 ories in the self memory system, *Psychological Review* (2000) 261–288.  
28  
29 [23] M. A. Conway, Episodic memory, *Neuropsychologia* 47 (2009) 2305–  
30 2313.  
31  
32 [24] A. J. Sellen, S. Whittaker, Beyond total capture: a construc-  
33 tive critique of lifelogging, *Comm. ACM* 53 (5) (2010) 70–77.  
34 doi:<http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1735223.1735243>.  
35  
36 [25] C. G. M. Snoek, I. Everts, J. C. V. Gemert, J. M. Geusebroek, B. Hu-  
37 urnink, D. C. Koelma, M. V. Liempt, O. D. Rooij, A. W. M. Smeulders,  
38 J. R. R. Uijlings, M. Worring, The MediaMill TRECVID 2007 Semantic  
39 Video Search Engine, in: TRECVID 2007 - Text REtrieval Conference  
40 TRECVID Workshop, 2007.  
41  
42 [26] P. Salembier, T. Sikora, Introduction to MPEG-7: Multimedia Content  
43 Description Interface, John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, NY, USA,  
44 2002.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5 [27] D. Kahneman, A. B. Krueger, D. A. Schkade, N. Schwarz, A. A. Stone,  
6 A survey method for characterizing daily life experience: The day re-  
7 construction method, *Science* 306 (2004) 1776–1780.  
8  
9 [28] L. L. Hardy, M. L. Booth, A. D. Okely, The reliability of the Adoles-  
10 cent Sedentary Activity Questionnaire (ASAQ), *Journal of Preventive*  
11 *Medicine* 45 (1) (2007) 71–74.  
12  
13 [29] M. Law, S. Baptiste, M. McColl, A. Opzoomer, H. Polatajko, N. Pollock,  
14 The Canadian Occupational Performance Measure: an outcome measure  
15 for occupational therapy, *Can J Occup Ther* 57 (2) (1990) 82–7.  
16  
17 [30] T. Joachims, Making large-scale SVM learning practical, in:  
18 B. Schölkopf, C. Burges, A. Smola (Eds.), *Advances in Kernel Methods*  
19 *- Support Vector Learning*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1999, Ch. 11,  
20 pp. 169–184.  
21  
22 [31] A. R. Doherty, C. J. Moulin, A. F. Smeaton, Automatically  
23 Assisting Human Memory: A SenseCam Browser, *Memory* (in  
24 press)doi:<http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1735223.1735243>.  
25  
26 [32] A. F. Smeaton, P. Over, W. Kraaij, Evaluation campaigns and  
27 TRECVID, in: *MIR '06: Proceedings of the 8th ACM In-*  
28 *ternational Workshop on Multimedia Information Retrieval*,  
29 ACM Press, New York, NY, USA, 2006, pp. 321–330.  
30 doi:<http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1178677.1178722>.  
31  
32 [33] J. Froehlich, L. Findlater, J. Landay, The design of eco-feedback tech-  
33 nology, in: *CHI '10: Proceedings of the 28th international conference*  
34 *on Human factors in computing systems*, ACM, New York, NY, USA,  
35 2010, pp. 1999–2008. doi:<http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/1753326.1753629>.  
36  
37 [34] Z. Qiu, C. Gurrin, A. R. Doherty, A. F. Smeaton, Term weighting ap-  
38 proaches for mining significant locations from personal location logs, in:  
39 *CIT 2010 - 10th IEEE International Conference on Computer and In-*  
40 *formation Technology*, 2010.  
41 URL <http://doras.dcu.ie/15399/>  
42  
43 [35] D. Byrne, B. Lavelle, A. R. Doherty, G. J. Jones, A. F. Smeaton., Using  
44 Bluetooth and GPS Metadata to Measure Event Similarity in Sense-  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65

1  
2  
3  
4  
5 Cam Images, in: IMAI'07 - 5th International Conference on Intelligent  
6 Multimedia and Ambient Intelligence, 2007, pp. 1454–1460.  
7

8 [36] S. Kumpulainen, K. Järvelin, S. Serola, A. R. Doherty, A. F. Smeaton,  
9 D. Byrne, G. J. Jones, Data collection methods for task-based informa-  
10 tion access in molecular medicine, in: International Workshop on Mo-  
11 bilizing Health Information to Support Healthcare-related Knowledge  
12 Work, 2009, pp. 1–10.

13 URL <http://doras.dcu.ie/2382/>  
14  
15

16 [37] P. Kelly, C. Foster, A new technology for measuring our journeys: Re-  
17 sults from a pilot study, in: 2010 Annual Conference of the International  
18 Society of Behavioral Nutrition and Physical Acitivity, 2010.  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53

**ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

This material is based upon work supported by Science Foundation Ireland under Grant No. 07/CE/11147. This work is also supported by the Irish Health Research Board under grant number MCPD/2010/12. We thank our volunteers for sharing their data and providing feedback on their experiences.