Activity-logging for self-coaching of knowledge workers
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ABSTRACT
With an increased societal focus on a sustainable economy and a healthy population, well-being of knowledge workers has become an important topic. This paper investigates techniques to support a knowledge worker to manage his well-being. A possible solution is to monitor the workers’ behaviour and use this information for giving feedback as soon as his well-being is threatened. Knowledge workers use a broad range of communication means to achieve their goals, like a computer and mobile phone. Our research aims at using features like mouse clicks, active applications or keypresses, because these are rather simple features to obtain instead of more invasive tools like a heart-rate monitor. This paper presents the first results of our research. First, logging of low-level features is developed. Based on these features the behaviour of different users is investigated. At first sight, this behaviour seems to be rather chaotic, but by taking into account different tasks, more structure is observed within the data. This paper shows that different behaviour is observed for different users and different tasks, while the same characteristics are observed when a user is performing the same task. This suggests that also anomalous behaviour might be recognized, which is an important result for developing self-coaching tools.

1. INTRODUCTION
In the modern knowledge economy, the demands for productivity of knowledge workers are steadily increasing. At the same time, information sources and communication means are more fragmented than ever. Real-time communication means, such as e-mail, (micro)blogging and other social media have generated an overflow of information, lacking a structure that is adapted to the user’s tasks. Networked information systems and portable devices make it possible to work anywhere, posing challenges to context aware net-centric organisation of documents, task lists etc. Finally, since the work-force in Western countries is ageing it is increasingly important to develop supportive techniques that help people having a reduced work capacity due to a medical condition to maintain a healthy work-style. The project User Centric Reasoning for Well-working (UCR4W) is investigating the key determinants for well-being at work. One of the guiding hypotheses of the project is that logging the activities of knowledge workers can be the basis for an effective computer based coach. The objective of the project is to develop user-centric sensing and reasoning techniques that help to improve well-being at home and at work. Technology should help people improve their sense of being and feeling in control, with a positive impact on work efficiency and effectiveness, work pleasure, mental and physical health status. An example of empowerment is to have relevant information from personal data collections available 'just-in-time'. We think that understanding the activities and tasks of individuals is a key condition to achieve this. In this paper we describe a study that is carried out as a precursor to the UCR4W project and present initial results of an experiment. The underlying idea of the study is that knowledge workers could possibly be helped to adapt their work style by providing them neutral feedback about their work style and activities. Section 2 discusses the background and assumptions of the study. Experimental results are presented in Section 3.

2. FEEDBACK FOR SELF-COACHING
The information overload and context switches of knowledge workers can be a threat for productivity and well-being at work. Let us consider the following scenario:

Scenario
Imagine a typical working day as a knowledge worker. You have different projects running and today your plan is to work on project A and B. For project A you do some internet search and start typing a document. While you are busy a colleague asks your help for project C. You interject.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.
Copyright 20XX ACM X-XXXX-XX-X/XX/XX ...$10.00.

1UCR4W is a 8 MEuro 4 year project co-funded through the Dutch national research programme COMMIT. Partners are: TNO, Novay, University of Twente, Radboud University Nijmegen, Philips research, Ericsson, Roessing R&D, Noldus Information Technology, Netherlands Centre for Social Innovation, Dutch Ministry of the Interior.
rupput your work to help her searching for some information. When a mail about project B arrives you decide to switch to this project as it is quite urgent to finish the required document. Suddenly you notice it is 5 o’clock and you did not finish your work on project A as planned. You might start wondering: How did I spend my time today?

**The relation between work-style and well-being at work**

Knowledge workers typically have various tasks and deadlines and they have to produce results. The possibility to easily switch tasks makes working very fragmented. The course of action is not always self planned but also determined by external causes, like phone calls, mails, information requests, other persons or appointments [3]. Knowledge workers typically have to self-manage their work and make a good planning in order to be able to accomplish all their tasks. All in all this way of working easily causes a feeling of stress and it is quite difficult to keep a good overview what it is one has done over the course of a day, weeks or even months. A study has shown that knowledge workers often spend effort in tracking their own tasks (13%). Automating this process would be of great benefit for the working process. A system that could monitor and provide overviews of performed activities could support the worker with his self-management, adapt his work-style [1] and in this way diminish cognitive load and stress. More awareness of ones own working process might also have beneficial effects on the on-task behavior and adherence to scheduled activities [9].

**Feedback based on action recognition**

As a first step to test the hypothesis that tracking activity and work-style can improve well-being at work a simple feedback tool is under development which can automatically infer and log the tasks a user is performing. The log information could be presented in the form of a daily or weekly overview, showing the amount of time spent on tasks and the number of interruptions or task switches. Such a tool requires the following steps: i) design of an activity ontology, ii) automatic logging of low level computer interaction data iii) developing an inference module that maps low level activity to the activity ontology level iv) developing an effective presentation mode for feedback purposes. In this paper we report work on the first three steps, the main contributions of our study are related to i) and iii). The first step necessary in this research is the creation of a taxonomy of tasks people could be performing. Several taxonomies of tasks have already been proposed in the literature. The taxonomies about internet use by Morrison, Pirolli and Card [7] identified a set of task types. The appropriateness of the identified set of task types was confirmed by several knowledge workers. From all task types, the tasks performed at the computer for this?’ and ‘Describe a typical working day’ were manually grouped into sets of similar answers to derive a set of typical task types. The appropriateness of the identified set of task types was confirmed by several knowledge workers. From all task types, the tasks performed at the computer were finally selected for automatic task recognition (see Table 1 for the tasks labels used).

**3. PILOT STUDY: WORK-LOGGING**

**3.1 Task analysis**

Following a user centred approach, a questionnaire was used to investigate the typical way of working of knowledge workers and their demands on software supporting them in their daily practices. From the responses by 47 knowledge workers at TNO we concluded that for a tool being usable for support, the captured activity data should be aggregated to a higher level in order to provide the user with valuable information. The recognition of the task a user is performing is a useful first step towards providing the user understandable feedback and insights about his working process. On the basis of the questionnaire a set of tasks that knowledge workers perform was identified. The answers to the questions ‘What tasks do you perform and how do you use your computer for this?’ and ‘Describe a typical working day’ were manually grouped into sets of similar answers to derive a set of typical task types. The appropriateness of the identified set of task types was confirmed by several knowledge workers. From all task types, the tasks performed at the computer were finally selected for automatic task recognition (see Table 1 for the tasks labels used).

**3.2 Data collection**

After identification of the software demands by the users, our next step consisted of investigating whether the computer could possibly fulfill these demands. In an experimental phase the computer activities of three knowledge workers were logged using uLog². An additional tool was created that reminded every 10 minutes to annotate his activity by selecting one of the labels from the task list (and indicating his level of wellworking). About two weeks of data collection resulted in a labelled raw data set. The labelled raw dataset was processed to extract several features, for example how often the user clicked or which application was mainly in focus within a five minute time frame (cf. Table 3 for a full list of extracted features; cf. Table 1 for the amount of data points per label). In total 20, 180, 66 labelled segments were recorded for the three users respectively.

²http://www.noldus.com
3.3 Analysis of the labelled data

First analysis showed that distinguishable patterns of computer activity arose per assigned task label. The most indicative feature seems to be the application that was mainly in focus, which is logical as specific tasks require specific applications, as for example ‘programming’ is done in a programming application. Also the distribution of all applications in the time frame seems to be useful. For both the tasks ‘write report’ and ‘search information’ Word has main focus, but someone ‘searching for information’ additionally uses an Internet browser and AcrobatReader (see Figure 1).

Besides the used applications the keyboard and mouse activity can be used to further distinguish tasks. Figure 2 shows the distribution of clicks and typed characters for the different task labels. Some features alone already have discriminative power (see Figure 3 for an indication of information gain ratio per feature), for example the amount of typed characters is about 0 for searching information, about 50 for mail writing and about 200 for report writing. Combining more features increases the discriminative power, for example tasks not discriminable by number of typed characters (for example writing mail and making an overview, both about 50 typed characters) could be recognized on basis of the number of clicks (about 40 vs. about 80).

A final useful feature that could indicate the task a user is performing is the amount of switching between different applications. Figure 3 plots the typical distribution for various users to show that there are clear individual differences.

3.4 Experiment: Automatic activity labelling

Some initial results about automatic activity labelling are available (see Table 2). We used Weka (see Hall et al. [5]) to train some classifiers and tested their performance by means of 10 fold cross validation. Labelling each activity simply as the majority class ‘write report/ paper’ with Weka’s ZeroR classifier yielded a baseline accuracy of 30.83% (F=0.145). Using Weka’s Naive Bayes classifier with just the feature mainApp to classify tasks resulted in an accuracy of 59.77% (F=0.468), so we can conclude that the application that was mainly in focus is a very strong feature. Adding the other features with mouse and keyboard information and indications about active applications and application switches (discretized with Weka’s preprocessing option) improved the classification accuracy to 70.30% (macro-averaged F=0.656; F values per task can be found in Table 1). Leaving out all features that address the use of specific applications, classification accuracy drops to 52%, with an average F=0.45, which stresses that application-dependent information is important as well for task identification.

4. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

The pilot experiment suggests that rather different behaviour is observed for different users, while they are performing the same task. This implies that self-coaching should be personalized tooling. Furthermore, it is concluded that task recognition is essential to monitor the well being of a knowledge worker, since low level information is not informative.

The dataset needs to be extended to several dozens of users, in order to draw more substantial conclusions. The data collection will probably be extended with a component that captures some semantic content that helps to model the interaction of well-being with an activity related to a particular project.

The next steps within the UCR4W project aim at the recognition of anomalous behaviour for each task that might signal a decreasing well-being of a worker. Furthermore, the project will evaluate the self-coaching tools together with end-users in order to improve its acceptance. Finally, proper privacy protection mechanisms and procedures will be an integral part of the project, because these tools are based on personal data.
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Figure 2: Distribution of #clicks and #characters per task

Table 3: Features extracted within 5 minute time-frames, sorted by information gain ratio ($GR$)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$GR$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mspaint</td>
<td>% time that mspaint had focus</td>
<td>0.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>user</td>
<td>the user who logged and labelled the data</td>
<td>0.765</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>programApp</td>
<td>% time that a programming application had focus (eclipse, cmd...)</td>
<td>0.677</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OUTLOOK</td>
<td>% time that OUTLOOK had focus</td>
<td>0.626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WINWORD</td>
<td>% time that WINWORD had focus</td>
<td>0.597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mainApp</td>
<td>application that was most of the time in focus</td>
<td>0.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AcroRd32</td>
<td>% time that AcroRd32 had focus</td>
<td>0.472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>spaces</td>
<td># spaces typed</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>characters</td>
<td># characters typed</td>
<td>0.364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backspaces</td>
<td># backspaces (inc. delete-key)</td>
<td>0.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>specialKeys</td>
<td># special keys typed</td>
<td>0.344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clicks</td>
<td># clicks within the timeframe</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>switches</td>
<td># switches between applications</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>internet</td>
<td>% time that an internet application had focus (explorer, firefox...) within the timeframe</td>
<td>0.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daytime</td>
<td>time of the day (as hour, i.e. 9-18)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>scrolls</td>
<td># scrolls</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nrApps</td>
<td># different applications used within the timeframe</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>time</td>
<td>% time this mainApp was in focus</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>editor</td>
<td>% time that an editing application had focus (notepad++, wordpad...)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POWERPNT</td>
<td>% time that POWERPNT had focus</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>explorer</td>
<td>% time that the explorer had focus</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EXCEL</td>
<td>% time that EXCEL had focus</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATLAB</td>
<td>% time that MATLAB had focus</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>label</td>
<td>task label for the activity given by the user</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3: Application usage and switching behavior per user