

# Forecasting User Attention During Everyday Mobile Interactions Using Device-Integrated and Wearable Sensors

JULIAN STEIL, Max Planck Institute for Informatics, Saarland Informatics Campus, Germany

PHILIPP MÜLLER, Max Planck Institute for Informatics, Saarland Informatics Campus, Germany

YUSUKE SUGANO\*, Osaka University, Japan

ANDREAS BULLING, Max Planck Institute for Informatics, Saarland Informatics Campus, Germany

---

Users' visual attention is highly fragmented during mobile interactions but the erratic nature of these attention shifts currently limits attentive user interfaces to adapt after the fact, i.e. after shifts have already happened, thereby severely limiting the adaptation capabilities and user experience. To address these limitations, we study *attention forecasting* – the challenging task of predicting whether users' overt visual attention (gaze) will shift between a mobile device and environment in the near future or how long users' attention will stay in a given location. To facilitate the development and evaluation of methods for attention forecasting, we present a novel long-term dataset of everyday mobile phone interactions, continuously recorded from 20 participants engaged in common activities on a university campus over 4.5 hours each (more than 90 hours in total). As a first step towards a fully-fledged attention forecasting interface, we further propose a proof-of-concept method that uses device-integrated sensors and body-worn cameras to encode rich information on device usage and users' visual scene. We demonstrate the feasibility of forecasting bidirectional attention shifts between the device and the environment as well as for predicting the first and total attention span on the device and environment using our method. We further study the impact of different sensors and feature sets on performance and discuss the significant potential but also remaining challenges of forecasting user attention during mobile interactions.

CCS Concepts: • **Human-centered computing** → **Interactive systems and tools**; **Ubiquitous and mobile computing**;

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Egocentric Vision; Mobile Phone; Attention Shifts; Attention Span; Mobile Eye Tracking; Attentive User Interfaces

---

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Sustained visual attention – the ability to focus on a specific piece of information for a continuous amount of time without getting distracted – has constantly diminished over the years [48]. Such fragmentation can severely reduce user performance given that sustained attention is key to a variety of cognitive and perceptual processes, including memory [13], vigilance [47] and learning [12]. This trend is particularly prevalent for mobile interactions during which user attention was shown to be highly fragmented and to span only a few seconds in certain situations [39]. With sustained attention becoming an increasingly scarce and thus valuable resource [32], actively managing user attention has emerged as a key research challenge in human-computer interaction [6, 16]. However, the capabilities of current mobile attentive user interfaces to sense and adapt to user attention are still severely limited. Prior work mainly focused on estimating the point of gaze on the device screen using the integrated front-facing camera [23, 58, 62] or on using inertial sensors or application usage logs [10, 11, 15]

---

\*Work conducted while at the Max Planck Institute for Informatics

---

Authors' addresses: J. Steil, P. Müller and A. Bulling, Max Planck Institute for Informatics, Saarland Informatics Campus, Campus E1 4, 66123 Saarbrücken, Germany. email: {jsteil,pmueller,bulling}@mpi-inf.mpg.de; Y. Sugano, Graduate School of Information Science and Technology, Osaka University, 1-5 Yamadaoka, Suita-shi, 565-0871 Osaka, Japan. email: sugano@ist.osaka-u.ac.jp.

2017. This is the author's version of the work. It is posted here for your personal use. Not for redistribution. The definitive Version of Record was published in .




Fig. 1. We propose a method to forecast temporal allocation of overt visual attention (gaze) during everyday interactions with a mobile phone. Our method uses information on users’ visual scene as well as phone usage to predict attention shifts between mobile phone and environment and attention span on the mobile phone and on the environment.

to predict user engagement [34, 57] or boredom [43]. In contrast, attention shifts between the device and the environment have rarely been studied and only using simulated sensors [18, 35]. Even more importantly, all previous works only considered user attention after the fact, i.e. after an attention shift has taken place [21, 28, 33].

We envision a new generation of attentive user interfaces with the ability to pro-actively adapt to imminent shifts of user attention, i.e. *before* these shifts actually occur. Pro-active adaptation to user attention will open up a range of exciting new applications. For example, future attentive user interfaces could, if the current situation permits, engage users more should an imminent attention shift to the environment be predicted that would harm their productivity. Similar to automotive settings [54], users could also be alerted if a (potentially) dangerous situation is detected from a body-worn camera but a user might miss that situation due to a predicted, continuing attention to the mobile phone. Further, a predicted re-shift to the mobile phone could be used to reduce interaction delays by already re-starting the mobile phone and loading the previous screen content. Finally, pro-active adaptations could also have significant impact in interruptibility research. If attention is predicted to stay on the device for longer, a future interface could show important information that users should not miss or, inversely, alert them if attention to the environment is predicted to last too long to finish a mobile task, such as submitting a form or replying to a chat message, in time.

The core requirement to realise such pro-active applications is for user interfaces to be able to predict users’ future allocation of overt visual attention during everyday interactions with a mobile phone. We call this challenging new task *attention forecasting*.

To facilitate algorithm development and evaluation for attention forecasting, we collected a dataset of 20 participants freely roaming a local university campus over several hours while interacting with a mobile phone. Head-worn egocentric cameras recorded a high-resolution video and depth map of the visual scene in front of them. A head-mounted inertial measurement unit (IMU) measured users’ head movement while the phone-integrated IMU measured phone motion. To ease later ground truth annotation, we further logged application usage and users’ gaze behaviour using a state-of-the-art mobile eye tracker. Three annotators annotated the full dataset post-hoc with participants’ current environment, indoor or outdoor location, their mode of locomotion, and

whenever their attention shifted from the phone to the environment or back. The dataset including annotations will be made publicly available upon acceptance. We then developed a computational method for forecasting overt visual attention during everyday mobile interactions. Our method uses the phone-integrated and head-worn IMU as well as computer vision algorithms for object class detection, face detection, semantic scene segmentation, and depth reconstruction. We evaluate our method on the new dataset and demonstrate its effectiveness in predicting attention shifts between the phone and the environment as well as the first and total attention span on the phone.

The specific contributions of this work are three-fold. First, we propose *attention forecasting* as the challenging new task of predicting temporal allocation of users' overt visual attention during everyday mobile interactions. We propose a set of concrete prediction tasks that, if successful, facilitate pro-active adaptations to users' erratic attentive behaviour in future user interfaces. To facilitate algorithm development and evaluation, we further present a novel 20-participant dataset of mobile phone interactions embedded in everyday routine. Second, as a first step towards this vision, we present the first computational method to predict core characteristics of mobile attentive behaviour from device-integrated and wearable sensors. Third, we evaluate our method on the new dataset and demonstrate the feasibility of predicting attention shifts between device and environment, the first and total attention span on the device, as well as the primary attentional focus. We study the impact of different sensors and feature sets on performance, discuss the significant potential but also challenges of forecasting user attention during mobile interactions, and outline future applications for attention forecasting.

## 2 RELATED WORK

Our work is related to prior work on (1) user behaviour modelling on handheld devices, (2) gaze analysis in mobile settings, and (3) computational modelling of egocentric attention.

### 2.1 User Behaviour Modelling on Handheld Devices

With the widespread availability of sensor-rich handheld devices, sensing and modelling user behaviour, including gaze and attention, has gained significant popularity. Several recent works investigated the use of device-integrated sensors to predict users' interruptibility [2, 11, 15, 18, 56]. In particular, Obuchi et al. detected breaks in a user's physical activities using inertial sensors on the phone to push mobile notifications during these breaks [37]. Other works used phone-integrated sensors to predict other related concepts, such as user engagement [34, 57], boredom [43] or alertness [1]. Oulasvirta et al. investigated how different environments affect attention span while users waited for a web page to load on a mobile phone [39]. The work that comes closest to ours is a follow-up by the same authors in which they used a Wizard-of-Oz paradigm with simulated sensors to assess the feasibility of predicting time-sharing of attention between the phone and the environment [35]. Specifically, they studied prediction of the number of glances, the duration of the longest glance, and the total and average durations of the glances to the mobile phone.

Our method is the first to predict attentive behaviour during everyday mobile interactions from real phone-integrated and body-worn sensors. Another distinction from prior work is that our data collection constrained participants as little as possible, and specifically did not impose a scripted sequence of activities or environments. To strike a balance between diversity and comparability, we only asked participants to not stay in any place on the university campus for longer than 30 minutes and to visit three given places at least once.

### 2.2 Gaze Analysis in Mobile Settings

Analysing gaze in mobile settings has only recently started to receive increasing interest, driven by technical advances in gaze estimation and mobile eye tracking. In an early work, Holland and Komogortsev proposed a learning-based method for gaze estimation on an unmodified tablet computer using the integrated front-facing camera [23]. More recently, Huang et al. presented a large-scale dataset and method for gaze estimation on tablets

and conducted extensive evaluations on the impact of various factors on gaze estimation performance, such as ethnic background, glasses, or posture while holding the device [24]. Wood and Bulling used a model-based approach for gaze estimation on an off-the-shelf tablet that achieved an average gaze estimation accuracy of  $6.88^\circ$  at 12 frames per second [62]. Jiang et al. proposed a method to estimate visual attention on objects of interest in the user’s environment by jointly exploiting the phone’s front and rear facing camera [26] while Paletta et al. investigated accurate gaze estimation on mobile phones using a computer vision method to detect the phone in an eye tracker’s scene video [40]. Foulsham et al. were among the first to demonstrate significant differences in gaze behaviour between laboratory and natural environments using mobile eye tracking [19]. More recent works focused primarily on mapping and visualising gaze in the surrounding environment. Takemura et al. used a simultaneous localisation and mapping method applied to the eye tracker’s scene camera to visualise 3D gaze of single and multiple users in the environment [53]. Peiffer et al. investigated the visualisation of 3D gaze using volume-based rendering [42] while Paletta et al. proposed methods to map fixations into a 3D environment model using local image descriptors [41]. In contrast, we aim to predict temporal allocation of overt visual attention without an eye tracker.

### 2.3 Computational Modelling of Egocentric Attention

An important type of computational model of visual attention are saliency models, which aim to predict which image regions most attract viewers’ attention [25]. While bottom-up saliency modelling, i.e. solely using image features, has been extensively studied in controlled laboratory settings [4], egocentric settings are characterised by a mix of bottom-up and top-down influences and are therefore less well explored. Yamada et al. were among the first to predict egocentric saliency using bottom-up image and egomotion information [64]. Zhong et al. used a novel optical flow model based on dynamic consistency of motion to build a uniform spatio-temporal saliency model for egocentric videos [67]. However, none of these works aimed to predict attention during mobile interactions. In addition, while we also use features extracted from egocentric video, we do not predict spatial attention distributions for the current video frame but use a short sequence of past frames (a few seconds) to predict shifts of visual attention in the near future.

## 3 FORECASTING USER ATTENTION DURING MOBILE INTERACTIONS

To be able to pro-actively adapt before users shift their attention and thus, in turn, to avoid any noticeable adaptation delay, attentive interfaces need to be able to predict users’ future attentive behaviour. We call this new prediction task *attention forecasting*. Attention forecasting is similar in spirit to the tasks of user intention prediction as investigated, for example, in web search and human-robot interaction [9, 45] as well as player goal or plan recognition studied in digital games [36]. In contrast to these lines of work, however, it specifically focuses on predicting fine-grained attentive behaviour and predictions at a moment-to-moment time scale. Attention forecasting is already highly challenging in stationary desktop interaction settings given the significant variability and strong task dependence of users’ attentive behaviour. Forecasting users’ attention is even more challenging during mobile interactions given the additional as well as the large number of potential visual attractors in the real-world environment. In this section we first propose a set of concrete prediction tasks within the attention forecasting paradigm and outline their potential use in future mobile attentive user interfaces. A more extensive consideration of how attention forecasting could be used in the future can be found in the discussion section. Afterwards, we propose a first proof-of-concept method that demonstrates the feasibility of predicting temporal attention allocation during everyday mobile interactions from real device-integrated and body-worn sensors.




Fig. 2. Overview of the different prediction tasks explored in this work: Prediction of attention shifts to the environment and (back) to the device, the duration of the first and total (first and all following) attention spans, as well as the primary attentional focus, i.e. whether attention is primarily on or off the device.

### 3.1 Prediction Tasks

To guide the development and evaluation of computational methods for attention forecasting during mobile interactions, we propose the following prediction tasks: Prediction of *Attention Shifts* and *Attention Span* as well as *Primary Attentional Focus*, which is a special case of *Attention Span* prediction. Figure 2 illustrates these three prediction tasks for a sample attention allocation of a user at the top. During the segments marked in black the user’s attention is on the mobile phone, while the gaps are time periods during which attention is in the environment. In the following, we detail each of these prediction tasks.

*Prediction of Attention Shifts.* The first prediction task deals with attention shifts from the mobile phone to the environment, and from the environment back to the phone (see Figure 2A). Attention shifts are a key characteristic of attentive behaviour and thus an important source of information for attentive user interfaces. The task involves taking a certain time window for feature extraction, training a prediction model with this data, and use that model to predict whether an attention shift will happen during a subsequent target time window. This task assumes the user interface to already have knowledge about whether a user’s attention is currently on the phone or not. Such knowledge can be obtained, for example, by using a method for mobile gaze estimation [63]. Prediction of attention shifts could be used in different ways by an attentive user interface. Similar to a number of recent works that used eye tracking or dedicated visualisation techniques [21, 28, 33], attention shift prediction could be used to pro-actively support users to reorient themselves on a mobile device to smoothly get back to their previous task. Similar to Obuchi et al. who used phone data, predicted attention shifts could also be used as breakpoints for push notifications [37]. These could, for example, be shown closely before or after an attention shift will take place. Finally, the prediction of these shifts could be leveraged to save energy by automatically turning off the screen when a shift to the environment is predicted to occur, and to automatically turn it on again when a shift to the device is predicted.

*Prediction of Attention Span.* Besides attention shifts, we propose to predict the attention span towards the mobile phone and the environment (see Figure 2B). A special subset of attention spans is the so-called first attention span – the duration of concentrated time spent on the mobile phone before getting distracted. The knowledge about how long a user will keep attention on an interface can be used for a variety of applications. It




Fig. 3. Overview of our method for attention forecasting during mobile interactions. Taking information on users’ visual scene, phone and head inertial data, as well as on mobile app usage as input (A), our method extracts rich semantic information about the user’s visual scene using state-of-the-art computer vision methods for object and face detection, semantic scene segmentation, and depth reconstruction (B). The method then extracts and temporally aggregates phone and visual features and takes eye tracking data into account to predict attention shifts and attention span (C).

can be used to highlight messages after the user has reached a point where he is not focusing on the current task but still keeping attention on the interface, or to manage user attention in such a way that the interface needs to change content or style of presentation to keep users’ attention beyond the predicted attention span. Especially the first attention span is valuable because important messages can be displayed with the knowledge that the user attention will be active within this time window. This task also involves extracting features and training a model but always from data at the beginning of an attention span. Predictions are then made for the remainder of that attention span. We propose two different prediction tasks related to attention span, namely prediction of the duration of the first and total (first and all following) attention spans to both the mobile phone and the environment. We frame these as regression tasks (see Figure 2).

*Prediction of the Primary Attentional Focus.* [38] showed that users’ visual attentive behaviour is highly fragmented during mobile interactions and dominated by short attention spans caused by distractions from users’ environment. Aggregating all of these many short attention spans, as a relaxed version of attention span prediction, we finally propose a binary classification task to predict whether users’ attention will be primarily on the mobile phone or off the phone for a particular time window in the future (see Figure 2C).

### 3.2 Proposed Method

To explore the feasibility of these prediction tasks, and establish a baseline performance on each of them, we developed a first method for attention forecasting. Previous work has shown that information available on a mobile device itself, such as inertial data, GPS location, or application usage, can be used for detecting engagement or predicting interruptibility during mobile interactions [1, 34, 37, 43]. It is therefore conceivable that such information may also be useful to predict attention shifts to the mobile phone. However, other characteristics, such as shifts to the environment, are likely to require information on the user’s current environment. This suggests to combine the mobile phone with wearable sensors, in particular egocentric cameras worn on the user’s head. Egocentric cameras represent a rich source of visual information on the user’s environment as demonstrated by the rapidly growing literature on egocentric vision [3]. Combined with the fact that an ever-increasing number

Sensor	Features
RGB camera	number of detected faces and pixel counts of object classes like person, car, and monitor from the semantic segmentation, and binary occurrence indicator, numbers of detected instances of each object class from object detection, 1-hot encoded scene classes, mean, min, max, standard deviation and entropy of saliency and objectness of the scene images
Depth camera	mean, min, max, standard deviation and entropy of the depth map from the stereo camera
Head IMU	mean, min, max, standard deviation, norm and slope of accelerometer and gyroscope
Phone	mean, min, max, standard deviation, norm and slope of accelerometer, gyroscope and orientation sensor values 1/0 features indicating touch events, screen on/off, and activity of each of the installed applications
Eye tracker	fixation positions (x, y); objectness, saliency and depth values at gaze position

Table 1. Overview of the different sensors and corresponding features explored in this work.

of egocentric cameras are used in daily life (e.g. sports cameras, cameras readily integrated in HMDs, life-logging cameras, etc.), this makes them not only a promising but also practical sensing modality for attention forecasting.

Figure 3 provides an overview of our method for attention forecasting. Inputs to our method are egocentric, phone, and eye tracking data. Our method first extracts information from the egocentric scene and depth videos using computer vision algorithms for object and face detection, semantic scene segmentation labels, scene category, and reconstructed depth data as well as head motion. In addition, our method extracts features from the mobile phone, including the history of application usage and accelerometer, gyroscope, and magnetometer measurements as well as gaze data. Our method finally uses these features in a machine learning framework for attention forecasting, specifically attention shifts between the mobile phone and the environment as well as the first and replacedtotalfollowing attention spans on the phone.

### 3.3 Feature Extraction

We extract features from the head-mounted egocentric RGB and depth cameras, head IMU, mobile device (phone), and eye tracker (see Table 1 for a complete list of features used in this work). These features include, numerical features such as pixel counts of semantic segmentations, gaze positions, entropy of objectness maps, mean depth map values, as well as binary encodings like occurrence of a touch event or whether an application on the phone is active. To aggregate features over a feature window, we compute the mean, maximum, minimum, standard deviation and slope for numerical features, and the mean and the slope for binary features.

For evaluation purposes, and with potential future applications in mind, we group these features into four feature groups (c.f. Figure 3): *Egocentric* (including RGB, depth, and head inertial features), *Phone-Only* (including only phone features), *Proposed* (all features from *Egocentric* and *Phone-Only*), as well as *Proposed + Gaze* (including fixation characteristics).

*Egocentric*. This feature group covers the egocentric RGB and depth camera, as well as a head inertial sensor. The depth and inertial sensors we used just for the sake of reliable feature extraction, although they can also be estimated from the egocentric camera itself [14, 31]. As described above, we extract the most information from the egocentric scene video because scene information can include triggers which lead to changes of attentive behaviour. We obtain a coarse description of the scene by applying the scene recognition method of Wang et al. [60] to the video frames. This method utilizes a convolutional neural network to extract scene descriptions like "office" or "library". As objects are potential targets for capturing attention, we obtain a more fine-grained

description of the scene by applying the semantic scene segmentation approach of Zheng et al. [66]. Semantic scene segmentation labels each pixel in a scene image as belonging to a certain object class or to background. To this end, their method combines a deep neural network with a probabilistic graphical model, trained to obtain pixel-wise segmentations of 20 different object classes including persons, monitors and cars. By encoding the occurrence of objects and also counting the number of pixels belonging to each object class, we obtain information about which objects take up the largest portion of the cameras field of view. Another important aspect of objects in a scene is the count of their instantiations. For example gazing upon a dining hall can lead to a large number of "person" pixels as does standing directly in front of another person. By simply counting the number of "person" pixels these two cases cannot be distinguished. Thus, we employ the object class detection method by Ren et al. [50] to obtain an estimate of the count of instances for each object class. In addition to people detections, we hypothesized that faces can help in predicting attention shifts, as they are well known to strongly draw attention of an observer [49] and their presence is also indicative of social situations [22], constituting a highly distracting factor in the scene. To this end, we apply a face detection approach [29] and count the number of detected faces in the scene image. Moreover, we extracted depth information to obtain physical structure of the scene and mapped the depth map to the scene video via camera calibration. With the calculation of saliency and objectness maps we collect ancillary knowledge about the scene complexity. As head poses can serve as a useful prior for gaze estimation [59], we additionally extract inertial features from the head-mounted camera.

*Phone-Only.* This feature group covers inertial data, which consists of accelerometer, gyroscope and orientation information, as well as phone usage data, which consists of single app usage information, whether touch events took place or the screen is on or off. For that purpose we installed additional applications on the phone which were running in the background to log the movement of the phone and users' phone usage.

*Gaze.* Besides the usage of gaze point extraction for ground truth annotation, we additionally take eye tracking features into account. Prior works on eye-based activity recognition have demonstrated that gaze behaviour is characteristic for different activities [7, 8, 51]. It is therefore conceivable that gaze features may help to improve the performance of our method for attention forecasting. Specifically, we calculate mean, min, max, standard deviation, norm and slope of the fixation positions  $(x, y)$  as well as objectness, saliency and depth values at users' gaze position.

## 4 DATA COLLECTION

Given the lack of a suitable dataset for algorithm development and evaluation, we conducted our own data collection. Our goal was to record natural attentive behaviour during everyday interactions with a mobile phone. The authors of [39] leveraged the, at the time, long page loading times during mobile web search to analyse shifts of attention. We followed a similar approach but adapted the recording procedure in several important ways to increase the naturalness of participants' interactive behaviour and the realism of the prediction task. First, as page loading times have significantly decreased over the last 10 years, we instead opted to engage participants in chat sessions during which they had to perform web search tasks as in [39] and then had to wait for the next chat message to arrive.

To counter side effects due to learning and anticipation, we varied the waiting time between chat messages and search tasks. Second, we did not perform a fully scripted recording, i.e. participants were not asked to follow a fixed route or perform particular activities in certain locations in the city, they were not accompanied by an experimenter, and the recording was not limited to about one hour. Instead, we observed participants passively over several hours while they interacted with the phone during their normal activities on a university campus. For our study we recruited twenty participants (six females) aged between 22 and 31 years using university mailing lists and study board postings. Participants were students with different backgrounds and subjects. All had normal or corrected-to-normal vision.






Fig. 4. (a) Recording system consisting of a PUPIL head-mounted eye tracker, an egocentric depth camera, a mobile phone, and a recording laptop carried in a backpack. To robustly detect the phone in the egocentric video, four visual markers were attached to its four corners. (b) Participants were engaged in 12 chat blocks (CB) that were randomly distributed over their recording, which lasted in total about 4.5 hours. In each block, participants had to answer six questions, some of which required a short online search (Q1–Q6, working time), followed by waiting for the next question (waiting time).

#### 4.1 Apparatus

The recording system consisted of a PUPIL head-mounted eye tracker [27] with an additional stereo camera, a mobile phone, and a recording laptop carried in a backpack (see Figure 4a). The eye tracker featured one eye camera with a resolution of  $640 \times 480$  pixels recording a video of the right eye from close proximity with 30 frames per second, and a scene camera with a resolution of  $1280 \times 720$  pixels recording at 24 frames per second. The original lens of the scene camera was replaced with a fisheye lens with a  $175^\circ$  field of view. The eye tracker was connected to the laptop via USB. In addition, we mounted a DUO3D MLX stereo camera to the eye tracker headset. The stereo camera recorded a depth video with a resolution of  $752 \times 480$  pixels at 30 frames per second as well as head movements using its integrated accelerometer and gyroscope. Intrinsic parameters of the scene camera were calibrated beforehand using the fisheye distortion model from OpenCV. The extrinsic parameters between the scene camera and the stereo camera were also calibrated. The laptop ran the recording software and stored the timestamped egocentric, stereo, and eye videos. We stress that an eye tracker is not required for our proposed method – gaze data was only used to obtain ground truth gaze information. However, we also investigate the possibility to additionally use gaze information to forecast future attentive behaviour in the *Proposed + Gaze* sensor modality.

Given the necessity to root the phone to record touch events and application usage, similar to [39] we opted to provide a mobile phone on which all necessary data collection software was pre-installed and validated to run robustly. For participants to "feel at home" on the phone, they were encouraged to install any additional software they desired and to fully customise the phone to their needs prior to the recording. As in [10, 30], we collected information on application usage. An overview of the applications used by participants is shown in Figure 5. Although additional social apps (e.g. Facebook) were not used often, visual inspection of the recorded egocentric videos showed that the effective usage time was significantly higher, as they were used inside the browser. Another observation we gathered from the egocentric videos was that participants often entered personal passwords while being filmed. Thus, we can assume that participants adopted the study phone for their private purposes and felt "at home" on it, and thus also did not care too much about privacy. To robustly detect the phone




Fig. 5. Aggregated data from all participants of mobile phone application usage.

in the egocentric video and thus help with the ground-truth annotation, we attached visual markers to all four corners of the phone (see Figure 4a). We used WhatsApp to converse with the participants and to log accurate timestamps for these conversations. We used the Log Everything logging software to log phone inertial data and touch events [61], as well as the Trust Event-Logger to log the current active application as well as whether the mobile phone screen was turned on or off.

#### 4.2 Procedure

After arriving in the lab, participants were first informed about the purpose of the study and asked to sign a consent form. We did not reveal which parts of the recording would be analysed later to not influence their behaviour. Participants could then familiarise themselves with the recording system and customise the mobile phone, e.g. install their favourite apps, log in to social media platforms, etc. Afterwards, we calibrated the eye tracker using the calibration procedure implemented in the PUPIL software. The calibration involved participants standing still and following a physical marker moved in front of them to cover their whole field of view.

To obtain some data from similar places on the university campus, we asked participants to visit three places at least once (a canteen, a library, and a cafe) and to not stay in any self-chosen place for more than 30 minutes. Participants were further asked to stop the recording after about one and a half hours so we could change the laptop's battery pack and recalibrate the eye tracker. Otherwise, participants were free to roam the campus, meet people, eat, or work as they normally would during a day at the university. We encouraged them to log in to Facebook, check emails, play games, and use all pre-installed applications on the phone or install new ones. Participants were also encouraged to use their own laptop, desktop computer, or music player if desired.

As illustrated in Figure 4b, 12 chat blocks (CB) were distributed randomly over the whole recording. Each block consisted of a conversation via WhatsApp during which the experimental assistant asked the participant six random questions (Q1–Q6) out of a pool of 72 questions. Some questions could be answered with a quick online search, such as “How many states are members of the European Union?” or “How long is the Golden Gate Bridge?” Similar to Oulasvirta et al. [39] we also asked simple demographic questions like “What is the colour of your eyes?” or “What is your profession?” that could be answered without an online search. After each answer (A1–A6), participants had to wait for the next question. This waiting time was varied randomly between 10, 15, 20, 30, and 45 seconds by the experimental assistant. This was to avoid learning effects and to create a similar



Fig. 6. Sample attention allocation patterns in different environments. The grey boxes represent waiting time segments, within which the black bars indicate attention to the mobile phone. The gaps in between indicate attention to the environment. The red bars indicate the first attention span and all bars together are the total attention span on the phone.

situation as in [39]. This question-answering procedure was repeated until the sixth answer had been received, thus splitting each chat block into six working time segments (yellow) and five waiting time segments (red) (c.f. Figure 4b). At the end of the recording, participants returned to the lab and completed a questionnaire about demographics and their mobile phone usage behaviour. In total, we recorded 1440 working and 1200 waiting segments over all participants. Statistics about our dataset are listed in Table 2.

### 4.3 Data Preprocessing

Fixations were detected from the raw gaze data using a dispersion-based algorithm with a duration threshold of 150ms and an angular threshold of  $1^\circ$  [27]. These data we use later in a sensor modality we investigate. The 3D position of the mobile phone in the scene camera was estimated using the attached markers (see Figure 4a). Marker positions were detected by the PUPIL capture software [20], and the position of the mobile phone surface was logged if at least two markers were visible in the scene camera. However, we only used the mobile phone detection as an aid for the ground truth annotation.

### 4.4 Data Annotation

To train our classifier we need precise annotations of when an attention shifts takes place and how long an attention span lasts. Findlay and Gilchrist showed that in real-world settings, covert attention rarely deviates from the gaze location [17]. Thus, we leveraged gaze as a reliable indicator of user’s current attentional focus. Concretely, annotations were performed using videos extracted from the monocular egocentric video for the working/waiting time segments overlaid with gaze data provided by the eye tracker. Three annotators were asked to annotate each chat block with information on participants’ current environment (office, corridor, library, street, canteen, cafe), whether they were indoors or outdoors, their mode of locomotion (sitting, standing or walking), as well as when their attention shifted from the mobile phone to the environment or back. Figure 6 shows sample gaze deployment patterns of three participants in different environments during the waiting time segments.

	mean	std	total
<b>Working segments per question (sec)</b>			
Working time	40.29	11.27	--
Time on phone	29.96	7.31	--
<b>Waiting segments per question (sec)</b>			
Waiting time	25.28	7.45	--
Time on phone	11.02	4.26	--
<b>Attention shifts (quantity)</b>			
Shifts to environment	248.85	107.22	4,957
Shifts to phone	259.90	106.88	5,178
<b>Fixation time on/off screen (hh:mm)</b>			
On	00:46	00:12	15:24
Off	00:13	00:05	04:36
<b>environments (hh:mm)</b>			
Cafe	00:11	00:06	03:55
Corridor	00:12	00:12	04:08
Library	00:11	00:07	03:51
Canteen	00:08	00:06	02:50
Office	00:23	00:12	07:37
Street	00:04	00:06	01:20
<b>Indoor/Outdoor (hh:mm)</b>			
Indoor	01:06	00:17	22:08
Outdoor	00:06	00:08	01:56
<b>Modes of locomotion (hh:mm)</b>			
Sit	01:02	00:14	20:49
Stand	00:05	00:05	01:44
Walk	00:04	00:04	01:31

Table 2. Statistics of the ground truth annotated chat block sequences with mean, standard deviation (std) and total time.

## 5 EXPERIMENTS

We conducted a series of experiments to evaluate the performance of our method for the different prediction tasks described before: Attention shifts between the mobile phone and the environment, attention span on the mobile phone and environment, as well as primary attentional focus. We evaluated our method for different time segments, i.e. while *working* to answer a question and while *waiting* for the next question, as well as for four different sensor combinations: *Proposed*, *Egocentric*, *Phone-Only*, and *Proposed + Gaze*. We further studied different feature subsets to facilitate more detailed analyses. Therefore, we split the *Egocentric* features in its eight feature subsets: Head IMU, Face, Saliency, (Semantic) Scene Segmentation, Object Detection, and Depth. Our *Proposed* feature set consists of the combination of the *Phone-Only* feature subsets (Phone IMU and App Usage) and the *Egocentric* features. The eye tracking features are summarised in the *Gaze* subset.

We trained a random forest algorithm [5] using these features. We used a leave-one-person-out evaluation scheme, i.e., the data of n-1 participants was used for training and the data of the remaining participant was used for testing. This procedure was repeated for all participants and the final performance averaged over all iterations. All hyperparameters (number of features, maximum depth and minimum samples at leaf nodes) were optimized via cross-validation on the training set. For all experiments we extracted features from a one-second window (feature window) and aimed to predict for a subsequent target window. The choice of the one-second feature window was informed by preliminary experiments in which it showed superior performance compared

to longer time windows. As target window sizes, we focus on one and five seconds. This is because different applications might benefit from different time horizons for the prediction of attention shifts.

We used a leave-one-person-out evaluation scheme in which the data from  $n-1$  participants was used for training and the data of the  $n$ -th participant for testing. We used a random subset of the samples to achieve a 50/50 distribution of positive and negative samples and thus avoid class imbalance. Performance was calculated using the weighted F1 score for the potentially imbalanced test data. This procedure was repeated for all participants and the resulting F1 scores averaged over all iterations. The  $F_1 = 2 * \frac{precision * recall}{precision + recall}$ , which is the harmonic mean of precision  $\frac{TP}{TP+FP}$  and recall  $\frac{TP}{TP+FN}$ , where TP, FP, and FN represent frame-based true positive, false positive, and false negative counts, respectively. The F1 score of 0.5 defines the chance-level for the following experiments. For a more in-depth analysis we also calculated full confusion matrices.

### 5.1 Prediction of Attention Shifts

We first compared the performance of different feature sets for both attention shift prediction tasks. We suspect this is because reactions to distractions in the environment typically happen quickly, weakening the dependence of attention shifts on prior states of the environment.

Figure 7 shows the prediction performance of our method depending on used feature sets for both *working* and *waiting* time segments. As can be seen from the figure, performance for predicting shifts to the environment is above the chance level (F1 score 0.5) for all feature sets for the one-second (see Figure 7a) and five-second (see Figure 7b) target window (TW). This shows the effectiveness of our method for this challenging task. However, we can see differences in the prediction performance between the working and waiting time segments and feature sets. As expected, the *Egocentric* sensor modality (one-second TW: F1 0.80, five-second TW: F1 0.72) performs competitively against the *Proposed* feature combination (one-second TW: F1 0.77, five-second TW: F1 0.70) during working but also during waiting time segments. During working segments performance is generally higher than during waiting segment besides for the phone-only feature combination. A possible explanation for this is that during working time, the task defines a certain phone interaction pattern (e.g. app usage, phone movement) with minor variability, whereas during waiting time the phone interaction can be chosen more freely (e.g. surfing the internet, using Facebook, playing games, chatting,...) and can induce different tendencies to switch one’s attention to the environment. As can be seen from Figure 7c, the proposed feature combination head IMU, semantic scene, and depth features achieve an F1 score notable above chance level. Especially during working time detected faces from the scene camera are a helpful feature for the prediction of attention shifts to the environment. The egocentric features, which are part of our proposed feature set, are the dominating ones for this task because shifts to the environment are mainly driven by attractors in our field of view. However, having access to the smartphone state can also help the classifier. The confusion matrices for predicting shifts to the environment show that the classifier achieves a good performance mainly on the negative training examples (i.e. no shift happening).

The results are different from those for predicting shifts to the mobile phone (see Figure 8). Using mobile phone features alone we already achieve a similar performance as with our proposed feature set with F1 scores of 0.53 for the one-second and 0.58 for the five-second target window during waiting, and F1 scores of 0.47 and 0.7 for the two target window sizes during working time segments. The competitive performance of phone features for the attention shift forecasting is caused by participants’ natural phone usage behaviour, which is characterised by picking up and moving the phone or turning on its screen. Participants often held their phones in their hands out of the view of the camera, so there was a movement of the phone followed by the shift to the phone and a touch sequence to unlock the phone. Figure 8c confirms that both actions are registered by the phone sensors and logging apps with F1 scores higher than 0.6 (phone IMU and application usage). Features from the egocentric camera only result in chance-level performance, which indicates that the visual environment of




Fig. 7. Performance for predicting shifts to the environment during working and waiting time segments for the different feature sets for a) one-second and b) five-second target window with the corresponding confusion matrices for our proposed feature set, and c) a more detailed feature analysis of b).

the participant does not play a role in determining whether the attention will go back to the screen. This is in line with our reasoning given above, indicating that poorly observable top-down factors influence shifts to the phone as compared to better observable properties of the visual environment that might capture attention in a way more influenced by bottom-up processes. In contrast to the prediction of shifts to the environment, most errors occur for the negative examples, as indicated by the confusion matrices.




Fig. 8. Performance for predicting shifts to the mobile phone during working and waiting time segments for the different feature sets for a) one-second and b) five-second target window with the corresponding confusion matrices for our proposed feature set, and c) a more detailed feature analysis of b).

To further elucidate how the performance of our proposed feature set varies across the current environment of the user, we evaluate our feature set in six environments each (see Figure 9) during working and waiting time segments for the one-second target window. For the environments corridor and library our proposed feature set even exceeds an F1 score of 0.75, whereas for the street environment it is below 0.6 (see Figure 9a) and during waiting time even below 0.4 (see Figure 9b). In contrast, for shifts to the mobile phone in Figure 9c our proposed feature set performs the best in the street environment with an F1 score higher than 0.7 during working time




Fig. 9. Performance for predicting shifts to the environment(a,b) and shifts to the mobile phone (a,b) for different real-world environments of our proposed feature set during (a,c) working and (b,d) waiting time segments.

segments. A reason for this good performance during working is already provided in Figure 8c, where especially phone IMU features, like accelerometer and gyroscope data, which are quite informative during walking on the street, push the F1 score.

## 5.2 Prediction of Attention Span

We then evaluated the performance for predicting the duration of the first attention span (FAS) as well as the length of all (total) attention spans (AS) to the mobile phone and to the environment. For this experiment we also used one-second feature windows, during which attention was on the phone or to the environment, respectively. For FAS prediction we only used feature windows from the very beginning of every waiting or working segment as well as for the following attention spans of the AS prediction. The performance was measured as the time difference between our predictions and the ground truth in seconds. Thus, a perfect result would be close to zero. As a baseline we used the mean of complete attention span lengths on the training set.

In Figures 10a and 10b we can see that, at least for first attention span prediction, our results are around our self-defined baseline during working and waiting time segments and even higher for the case of predicting general attention spans. These results already show the difficulty of this prediction task. The absolute values for attention span prediction during working time segments are even higher than during waiting time segments for






Fig. 10. Performance for predicting the first and total attention spans on the phone (a,b) and on the environment (c,d) during (a, c) working and (b, d) waiting time segments for the different feature sets. The mean attention span length on the training set for the first and total attention spans are indicated by the red and blue dashed lines, respectively.

both, attention to the mobile phone and attention to the environment. A reason for this difference are very long attention spans during working time, where participants kept engaged with the mobile phone, which are very difficult to predict.

The results in Figure 10 indicate that predicting the (first) attention span as a regression problem is a very challenging task, with our method performing at baseline level. The results for attention span prediction to the environment shown in Figure 10c suggest that during working time segments performance is diminished in comparison to the attention span towards the mobile phone in Figure 10a. The most likely reason for this performance difference is participants' behaviour. Although participants received a question to answer, they got distracted from their environment and stopped working. Therefore, the attention span to the environment can be long (>5 minutes) especially for the first attention span, which makes the prediction more difficult than for shifts to the environment.

During waiting time segments (see Figure 10d) the lower absolute error is additionally supported by the controlled waiting time of attention span samples. However, there are less samples for training and testing than during the attention span prediction on the mobile phone because most participants are able to keep their attention to the phone. The prediction of attention spans towards the mobile phone or towards the environments are challenging but open the door for very helpful applications.




Fig. 11. Performance for primary attentional focus on mobile phone during working and waiting time segments for the different feature sets for a) one-second and b) five-second target window with the corresponding confusion matrices for our proposed feature set, and c) a more detailed feature analysis of b).

### 5.3 Prediction of the Primary Attentional Focus

Finally, we explored the problem of predicting whether the primary focus of the users' attention will be on the phone or on the environment. Knowledge that users' primary attention will stay on the mobile phone for a given amount of time could be used to show messages or news or even to select users' next task that is feasible to be completed in the considered temporal horizon. More precisely, we aim at predicting whether the time spent in fixations on the phone is larger than the time spent in fixations off the phone in the next one and five seconds. It

provides a good indication of where the user’s main focus of attention will be in the near future. This is a slightly easier task than the ones studied before given that it is not that sensitive to a large number of short attention shifts to the environment or the phone. We again investigate the difference of predictions during working and waiting time, as well as the influence of different feature sets towards the prediction performance.

As can be seen from Figure 11, for this prediction task, our method reaches an F1 score of more than 0.7 for both target window sizes as well as working and waiting time segments, which indicates that the problem is simpler than the ones investigated above. It can also be seen that combining features is helpful in all cases. Figure 11c shows that especially head IMU, depth, and face features from the egocentric feature subsets as well as the phone IMU and app usage features contribute to the good performance of our method. During waiting time segments, phone-only features show competitive performance to our proposed features. As it can be seen from Figure 11c, especially users’ app usage patterns on the mobile phone contribute to the performance. The proposed feature combination can even be improved when taking gaze information into account reaching an F1 performance larger than 0.8 during working and 0.75 during waiting time segments. Thus, for this kind of prediction task a full eye tracking system is a meaningful setup. The increasing availability of mobile eye tracking including on smartglasses as well as eye tracking using the cameras readily integrated in laptop, tablets, and public displays [52, 62, 65] makes gaze another interesting source of information on users’ future attentive behaviour. The corresponding confusion matrices show, that our approach performs clearly above chance on all ground truth classes.

## 6 DISCUSSION

The experiments demonstrated that our method can predict several key aspects of attentive behaviour during everyday mobile interactions, using a combination of egocentric and phone-integrated sensors stably over all prediction tasks and in comparison with the investigated sensor combinations. Specifically, we showed that we can predict shifts between the phone and environment as well as primary attentional focus above chance level. Although the results do not reach an F1 score of 1.0, these results are promising for future mobile attentive user interfaces, particularly given the large variability in natural user behaviour and the large number of possible visual attractors in users’ environment and thus the difficulty of these prediction tasks.

*Complexity.* Prior work which focuses on laboratory conditions does not take the complexity of daily life situations into account. Our method is the first to predict attentive behaviour during everyday mobile interactions from real phone-integrated and body-worn sensors. Another distinction from prior work is that our data collection constrained participants as little as possible, and specifically did not impose a scripted sequence of activities or environments [39]. Based on the presented prediction tasks in Section 3, there are numerous applications for attentive user interfaces. Similar to Obuchi et al. [37], predicted attention shifts could be exploited for detecting breakpoints in users’ attentive behaviour to show notifications shortly before an attention shift takes place. Without the possibility to predict future attention shifts, a notification could only be displayed once the user’s attention is in the environment (assuming the user’s attention was on the phone before). This would lead to a larger effort, as the user has to switch his attention back to the device to process the notification. The prediction of attention shifts could even be leveraged to save energy of the current device while automatically turning off the screen when a shift to the environment is predicted before users’ attention leave the device screen, and automatically turning on when a shift to the device is predicted. The knowledge of how long users will keep their attention on an interface is very valuable information. It can be used to highlight messages or show news after the user reached a point where he is not focused on the current task but still keeping attention on the interface, or to manage user attention in such a way that the interface needs to change content or style of presentation to keep the user’s attention beyond the predicted attention span. For a large number of applications it is also not important that users keep their attention continuously on the phone, just that they do so for long enough. This




Fig. 12. Potential applications of attention forecasting (attention shifts and attention spans) in future attentive user interfaces.

information we are able to extract with the primary attentional focus prediction. We will discuss and recap the findings of our experiment section and point out limitations and promising future work approaches.

*Attention Shift Prediction.* For predicting shifts to the environment, egocentric features contribute most to the performance, indicated by F1 scores of above 0.6 (see Figure 7c). From the detailed feature analysis it can be seen that especially face features, but also head IMU, semantic scene and depth features contribute positively to the prediction of shifts to environment. In contrast, phone-only features show the best performance for predicting attention shifts back to the mobile phone as shown in Figure 8c. The chance-level performance for the egocentric features in Figure 8 suggest that shifts to the mobile phone were less influenced by the environment. This is as expected given that such shifts are typically triggered by events on the mobile phone, such as an incoming chat message or notification. The analysis of predicting attention shifts for different environments shows a robust performance with our proposed feature set in each environment as well as task dependent performance peaks in the corridor environment for shifts to the environment and on the street for shift back to the mobile phone (see Figures 9a and 9c).

*Attention Span Prediction.* We further investigated the task of predicting the duration of the first and total attention span on the phone. As can be seen from Figure 10, this task is also highly challenging. We achieved an absolute error of about seven seconds for the first attention span, and about nine seconds for the total attention span on the mobile phone during waiting, but 20 seconds during working segments. Attention span prediction on the environment is even more difficult during working time segments and similar in terms of performance during waiting time segments.

*Prediction of Primary Attentional Focus.* Performance for predicting the primary attentional focus was even higher with an F1 score of over 0.8 (see Figure 11). Our method again achieved the best performance but was closely followed by the phone-integrated sensors. This result suggests that information readily available on the phone is most informative for predicting on-phone attention, and performance can be improved further by contextualising attentive behaviour using information about the visual scene.

*Potential Applications.* Automatic forecasting of user attention opens up a range of exciting new applications that could have paradigm-changing impact on our everyday interactions with mobile devices. Starting with attention span prediction, there is a variety of supportive functions which are highly desirable and have the potential to ease our lives. Predicted attention shifts to a mobile device (see Figure 12a) could, for example, be used to reduce the interaction delay. The device could start automatically and load the previous screen content for a smooth transition and help to reorient. Attention forecasting also has applications for the detection of imminently hazardous situations. Especially during car driving scenarios or walking on the street we want to avoid attention shifts to the mobile device. With an attention forecasting application we would be able to detect dangerous situations in the camera view and give an alert to the user to avoid such attention shifts.

For attention shifts to the environment (see Figure 12b) attention forecasting could be used to pro-actively support the users and automatically pause a video already before the attention drifts away so that the user is not missing a second. However, attentive user interfaces are also faced with situation where predicted attention shifts to the environment should be prevented. Especially within face-to-face conversations in the real world or during a Skype meeting attentive user interfaces could help us to keep our focus giving an alert avoiding unkind behaviour. Alternatively, if a user really wants to finish a task, the attentive user interface could support him to keep the attention on the device by changing content or style of content presentation. Besides applications of attention shift forecasting, attention span prediction further extends application opportunities. If a longer attention span to a mobile device is predicted and the user's current activity on the mobile device is not focused this could be used to show missed messages or notifications (see Figure 12c). Moreover, the user interface could suggest the next task to be performed by the user in the predicted attention span. Similar to avoiding attention shifts in dangerous situations, attentive user interfaces could break longer predicted attention spans to a mobile device or interface when potential threads are detected via a scene camera. These kinds of lifesaving applications are only possible with attention forecasting as proposed in this paper.

Even longer forecast attention spans on the environment could be further used to ease our lives (see Figure 12d). Slowing updates or calculations during mobile device interaction can be avoided and shifted to time spans where we spend our attention on the environment. However, when the predicted attention span on the environment is too long, attentive user interfaces could warn the user so that the current task can be finished in time. Although it is still a long way towards a perfect attention forecasting, attention shift and attention span predictions could help to ease our lives, improve our working performance and even protect us from dangerous situations.

*Limitations and Future Work.* Automatic prediction of attention shifts and attention span has significant potential to become a key component in future mobile attentive user interfaces. Despite our encouraging results, our method still has several limitations. First, in this work we only considered visual triggers, but attention shifts to the environment can also be triggered by auditory stimuli. We opted for a visual-only approach, assuming that participants behave differently if they are aware of their voice and discussions being recorded continuously. While participants forget that they are wearing head-mounted devices, such as eye trackers [46], it will be important to see whether this is also true for body-worn microphones. If yes, this could lead to interesting follow-up research to analyse both visual and auditory information for predicting mobile attentive behaviour. Second, we only considered prediction of temporal characteristics of attention, namely timing of attention shifts and attention span. In addition, future mobile attentive user interfaces could also predict "where" user attention will shift to. Third, while all our predictions were clearly above chance level, performance has to further increase to make attention forecasting using wearable sensors practically useful. In order to improve the performance, additional sensors like heart rate, galvanic skin response (GSR) or brain activity could be used. Also the method itself could be improved. Instead of per pixel object segmentations, we could also use spatio-temporal CNN features extracted from each frame that showed superior performance for other egocentric vision tasks [44, 55].

## 7 CONCLUSION

In this work we explored *attention forecasting* – the task of predicting future allocation of users’ overt visual attention during interactions with a mobile phone. We proposed three prediction tasks with direct relevance for future mobile attentive user interfaces as well as a first computational method to predict key characteristics of attentive behaviour from phone-integrated and wearable sensors. We evaluated our method on a novel 20-participant dataset and demonstrated its effectiveness in predicting attention shifts between the mobile phone and the environment as well as attention spans on the mobile phone and on the environment. Our results demonstrate both the feasibility but also significant challenge of attention forecasting and point towards a new class of user interfaces that pro-actively support, guide or even optimise for users’ ever-changing attentive behaviour.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We would like to thank all participants for their help with the data collection as well as Preeti Dolakasharia, Nahid Akhtar and Muhammad Muaz Usmani for their help with the annotation. This work was funded, in part, by the Cluster of Excellence on Multimodal Computing and Interaction (MMCI) at Saarland University, as well as a JST CREST research grant (grant number JPMJCR14E1).

## REFERENCES

- [1] Saeed Abdullah, Elizabeth L Murnane, Mark Matthews, Matthew Kay, Julie A Kientz, Geri Gay, and Tanzeem Choudhury. 2016. Cognitive rhythms: unobtrusive and continuous sensing of alertness using a mobile phone. In *Proc. UbiComp*. 178–189.
- [2] Christoph Anderson, Clara Heißler, Sandra Ohly, and Klaus David. 2016. Assessment of social roles for interruption management: a new concept in the field of interruptibility. In *Adj. Proc. UbiComp*. 1530–1535. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2968219.2968544>
- [3] Alejandro Betancourt, Pietro Morerio, Carlo S Regazzoni, and Matthias Rauterberg. 2015. The evolution of first person vision methods: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology* 25, 5 (2015), 744–760.
- [4] Ali Borji and Laurent Itti. 2013. State-of-the-art in visual attention modeling. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 35, 1 (2013), 185–207.
- [5] Leo Breiman. 2001. Random forests. *Machine Learning* 45, 1 (2001), 5–32. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324>
- [6] Andreas Bulling. 2016. Pervasive Attentive User Interfaces. *IEEE Computer* 49, 1 (2016), 94–98. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/MC.2016.32>
- [7] Andreas Bulling, Jamie A. Ward, Hans Gellersen, and Gerhard Tröster. 2011. Eye Movement Analysis for Activity Recognition Using Electrooculography. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 33, 4 (April 2011), 741–753.
- [8] Andreas Bulling, Christian Weichel, and Hans Gellersen. 2013. EyeContext: Recognition of High-level Contextual Cues from Human Visual Behaviour. In *Proc. ACM SIGCHI*. 305–308. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2470654.2470697>
- [9] Zhicong Cheng, Bin Gao, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2010. Actively predicting diverse search intent from user browsing behaviors. In *Proc. WWW*. 221–230.
- [10] Driss Choujaa and Naranker Dulay. 2010. Predicting human behaviour from selected mobile phone data points. In *Proc. UbiComp*. 105–108. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/1864349.1864368>
- [11] Minsoo Choy, Daehoon Kim, Jae-Gil Lee, Heeyoung Kim, and Hiroshi Motoda. 2016. Looking back on the current day: interruptibility prediction using daily behavioral features. In *Proc. UbiComp*. 1004–1015.
- [12] Nelson Cowan. 1998. *Attention and memory: An integrated framework*. Oxford University Press.
- [13] Edward Cutrell, Mary Czerwinski, and Eric Horvitz. 2001. Notification, disruption, and memory: Effects of messaging interruptions on memory and performance. (2001).
- [14] David Eigen, Christian Puhersch, and Rob Fergus. 2014. Depth map prediction from a single image using a multi-scale deep network. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 2366–2374.
- [15] Anja Exler, Marcel Braith, Andrea Schankin, and Michael Beigl. 2016. Preliminary investigations about interruptibility of smartphone users at specific place types. In *Adj. Proc. UbiComp*. 1590–1595. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2968219.2968554>
- [16] Alois Ferscha. 2014. Attention, Please! *IEEE Pervasive Computing* 13, 1 (2014), 48–54. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/MPRV.2014.3>
- [17] John M Findlay and Iain D Gilchrist. 2003. *Active vision: The psychology of looking and seeing*. Number 37. Oxford University Press.
- [18] James Fogarty, Scott E Hudson, Christopher G Atkeson, Daniel Avrahami, Jodi Forlizzi, Sara Kiesler, Johnny C Lee, and Jie Yang. 2005. Predicting human interruptibility with sensors. *ACM Transactions on Computer-Human Interaction* 12, 1 (2005), 119–146.
- [19] Tom Foulsham, Esther Walker, and Alan Kingstone. 2011. The where, what and when of gaze allocation in the lab and the natural environment. *Vision research* 51, 17 (2011), 1920–1931.

- [20] S. Garrido-Jurado, R. Muñoz-Salinas, F.J. Madrid-Cuevas, and M.J. Marin-Jimenez. 2014. Automatic generation and detection of highly reliable fiducial markers under occlusion. *Pattern Recognition* 47, 6 (2014), 2280 – 2292. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.patcog.2014.01.005>
- [21] Carl Gutwin, Scott Bateman, Gaurav Arora, and Ashley Coveney. 2017. Looking Away and Catching Up: Dealing with Brief Attentional Disconnection in Synchronous Groupware. In *Proceedings of the 2017 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work and Social Computing*. ACM, 2221–2235.
- [22] James V Haxby, Elizabeth A Hoffman, and M Ida Gobbini. 2002. Human neural systems for face recognition and social communication. *Biological Psychiatry* 51, 1 (2002), 59–67. DOI : [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3223\(01\)01330-0](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0006-3223(01)01330-0)
- [23] Corey Holland and Oleg Komogortsev. 2012. Eye tracking on unmodified common tablets: challenges and solutions. In *Proc. ETRA*. 277–280. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2168556.2168615>
- [24] Qiong Huang, Ashok Veeraraghavan, and Ashutosh Sabharwal. 2015. TabletGaze: unconstrained appearance-based gaze estimation in mobile tablets. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.01244* (2015).
- [25] Laurent Itti and Christof Koch. 2000. A saliency-based search mechanism for overt and covert shifts of visual attention. *Vision research* 40, 10 (2000), 1489–1506.
- [26] Zhiping Jiang, Jinsong Han, Chen Qian, Wei Xi, Kun Zhao, Han Ding, Shaojie Tang, Jizhong Zhao, and Panlong Yang. 2016. VADS: Visual attention detection with a smartphone. In *Proc. INFOCOM*. 1–9. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/INFOCOM.2016.7524398>
- [27] Moritz Kassner, William Patera, and Andreas Bulling. 2014. Pupil: an open source platform for pervasive eye tracking and mobile gaze-based interaction. In *Adj. Proc. UbiComp*. 1151–1160. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2638728.2641695>
- [28] Dagmar Kern, Paul Marshall, and Albrecht Schmidt. 2010. Gazemarks: gaze-based visual placeholders to ease attention switching. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*. ACM, 2093–2102.
- [29] Davis E. King. 2009. Dlib-ml: A Machine Learning Toolkit. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 10 (2009), 1755–1758.
- [30] Nicholas D Lane, Emiliano Miluzzo, Hong Lu, Daniel Peebles, Tanzeem Choudhury, and Andrew T Campbell. 2010. A survey of mobile phone sensing. *IEEE Communications Magazine* 48, 9 (2010), 140–150. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/MCOM.2010.5560598>
- [31] Fayao Liu, Chunhua Shen, and Guosheng Lin. 2015. Deep convolutional neural fields for depth estimation from a single image. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 5162–5170.
- [32] Paul P. Maglio, Rob Barrett, Christopher S. Campbell, and Ted Selker. 2000. SUITOR: An attentive information system. In *Proc. IUI*. 169–176. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/325737.325821>
- [33] Alexander Mariakakis, Mayank Goel, Md Tanvir Islam Aumi, Shwetak N Patel, and Jacob O Wobbrock. 2015. SwitchBack: Using Focus and Saccade Tracking to Guide Users’ Attention for Mobile Task Resumption. In *Proc. ACM SIGCHI*. 2953–2962.
- [34] Akhil Mathur, Nicholas D Lane, and Fahim Kawsar. 2016. Engagement-aware computing: modelling user engagement from mobile contexts. In *Proc. UbiComp*. 622–633. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2971648.2971760>
- [35] Miikka Miettinen and Antti Oulasvirta. 2007. Predicting time-sharing in mobile interaction. *User Modeling and User-Adapted Interaction* 17, 5 (2007), 475–510.
- [36] Wookhee Min, Bradford W Mott, Jonathan P Rowe, Barry Liu, and James C Lester. 2016. Player Goal Recognition in Open-World Digital Games with Long Short-Term Memory Networks.. In *Proc. IJCAI*. 2590–2596.
- [37] Mikio Obuchi, Wataru Sasaki, Tadashi Okoshi, Jin Nakazawa, and Hideyuki Tokuda. 2016. Investigating interruptibility at activity breakpoints using smartphone activity recognition API. In *Adj. Proc. UbiComp*. 1602–1607.
- [38] Antti Oulasvirta. 2005. The fragmentation of attention in mobile interaction, and what to do with it. *interactions* 12, 6 (2005), 16–18.
- [39] Antti Oulasvirta, Sakari Tamminen, Virpi Roto, and Jaana Kuorelahti. 2005. Interaction in 4-second bursts: the fragmented nature of attentional resources in mobile HCI. In *Proc. CHI*. 919–928. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/1054972.1055101>
- [40] Lucas Paletta, Helmut Neuschmied, Michael Schwarz, Gerald Lodron, Martin Pszeida, Stefan Ladstätter, and Patrick Luley. 2014. Smartphone eye tracking toolbox: accurate gaze recovery on mobile displays. In *Proc. ETRA*. 367–68.
- [41] Lucas Paletta, Katrin Santner, Gerald Fritz, Heinz Mayer, and Johann Schrammel. 2013. 3D attention: measurement of visual saliency using eye tracking glasses. In *Ext. Abstr. CHI*. 199–204. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2468356.2468393>
- [42] Thies Pfeiffer. 2012. Measuring and visualizing attention in space with 3d attention volumes. In *Proc. ETRA*. 29–36. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2168556.2168560>
- [43] Martin Pielot, Tilman Dingler, Jose San Pedro, and Nuria Oliver. 2015. When attention is not scarce-detecting boredom from mobile phone usage. In *Proc. UbiComp*. 825–836. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2750858.2804252>
- [44] Yair Poleg, Ariel Ephrat, Shmuel Peleg, and Chetan Arora. 2016. Compact cnn for indexing egocentric videos. In *Applications of Computer Vision (WACV), 2016 IEEE Winter Conference on. IEEE*, 1–9.
- [45] Harish Chaandar Ravichandar and Ashwin P Dani. 2017. Human Intention Inference Using Expectation-Maximization Algorithm With Online Model Learning. *IEEE Trans. Autom. Sci. Eng.* 14, 2 (2017), 855–868.
- [46] Evan F Risko and Alan Kingstone. 2011. Eyes Wide Shut: Implied Social Presence, Eye Tracking and Attention. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics* 73, 2 (2011), 291–296. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/s13414-010-0042-1>
- [47] Monica Rosenberg, Sarah Noonan, Joseph DeGutis, and Michael Esterman. 2013. Sustaining visual attention in the face of distraction: A novel gradual-onset continuous performance task. *Attention, Perception, & Psychophysics* 75, 3 (2013), 426–439. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.3758/s13414-013-0042-1>

- [48] Joshua S Rubinstein, David E Meyer, and Jeffrey E Evans. 2001. Executive control of cognitive processes in task switching. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Human Perception and Performance* 27, 4 (2001), 763. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0096-1523.27.4.763>
- [49] Shiori Sato and Jun I Kawahara. 2015. Attentional capture by completely task-irrelevant faces. *Psychological Research* 79, 4 (2015), 523–533. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s00426-014-0599-8>
- [50] Ross Girshick Jian Sun Shaoqing Ren, Kaiming He. 2015. Faster R-CNN: Towards Real-Time Object Detection with Region Proposal Networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.01497* (2015).
- [51] Julian Steil and Andreas Bulling. 2015. Discovery of Everyday Human Activities From Long-term Visual Behaviour Using Topic Models. In *Proc. ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing (UbiComp)*. 75–85.
- [52] Yusuke Sugano, Xucong Zhang, and Andreas Bulling. 2016. Aggregaze: Collective estimation of audience attention on public displays. In *Proceedings of the 29th Annual Symposium on User Interface Software and Technology*. ACM, 821–831.
- [53] Kentaro Takemura, Yuji Kohashi, Tsuyoshi Suenaga, Jun Takamatsu, and Tsukasa Ogasawara. 2010. Estimating 3D point-of-regard and visualizing gaze trajectories under natural head movements. In *Proc. ETRA*. 157–160. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/1743666.1743705>
- [54] Marcus Tonnis and Gudrun Klinker. 2006. Effective control of a car driver’s attention for visual and acoustic guidance towards the direction of imminent dangers. In *Proceedings of the 5th IEEE and ACM International Symposium on Mixed and Augmented Reality*. IEEE Computer Society, 13–22.
- [55] Du Tran, Lubomir Bourdev, Rob Fergus, Lorenzo Torresani, and Manohar Paluri. 2015. Learning spatiotemporal features with 3d convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*. 4489–4497.
- [56] Liam D Turner, Stuart M Allen, and Roger M Whitaker. 2015. Interruptibility prediction for ubiquitous systems: conventions and new directions from a growing field. In *Proc. UbiComp*. 801–812. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2750858.2807514>
- [57] Gašper Urh and Veljko Pejović. 2016. TaskyApp: inferring task engagement via smartphone sensing. In *Adj. Proc. UbiComp*. 1548–1553. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2968219.2968547>
- [58] Vytautas Vaitukaitis and Andreas Bulling. 2012. Eye Gesture Recognition on Portable Devices. In *Proc. International Workshop on Pervasive Eye Tracking and Mobile Gaze-Based Interaction (PETMEI)*. 711–714. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2370216.2370370>
- [59] Roberto Valenti, Nicu Sebe, and Theo Gevers. 2012. Combining head pose and eye location information for gaze estimation. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 21, 2 (2012), 802–815.
- [60] Limin Wang, Sheng Guo, Weilin Huang, and Yu Qiao. 2015. Places205-vggnet models for scene recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1508.01667* (2015).
- [61] Dominik Weber and Sven Mayer. 2014. LogEverything. <https://github.com/hcilab-org/LogEverything/>. (2014).
- [62] Erroll Wood and Andreas Bulling. 2014. Eyetab: Model-based gaze estimation on unmodified tablet computers. In *Proc. ETRA*. 207–210. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2578153.2578185>
- [63] Erroll Wood and Andreas Bulling. 2014. EyeTab: Model-based gaze estimation on unmodified tablet computers. In *Proc. International Symposium on Eye Tracking Research and Applications (ETRA)*. 207–210.
- [64] Kentaro Yamada, Yusuke Sugano, Takahiro Okabe, Yoichi Sato, Akihiro Sugimoto, and Kazuo Hiraki. 2011. Attention prediction in egocentric video using motion and visual saliency. In *Pacific-Rim Symposium on Image and Video Technology*. Springer, 277–288.
- [65] Xucong Zhang, Yusuke Sugano, Mario Fritz, and Andreas Bulling. 2015. Appearance-Based Gaze Estimation in the Wild. In *Proc. of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR 2015)* (2015-03-02). 4511–4520. DOI : <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2015.7299081>
- [66] Shuai Zheng, Sadeep Jayasumana, Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Vibhav Vineet, Zhizhong Su, Dalong Du, Chang Huang, and Philip HS Torr. 2015. Conditional random fields as recurrent neural networks. In *Proc. ICCV*. 1529–1537.
- [67] Sheng-hua Zhong, Yan Liu, To-Yee Ng, and Yang Liu. 2016. Perception-oriented video saliency detection via spatio-temporal attention analysis. *Neurocomputing* 207 (2016), 178–188.