Scene dynamism

Dynamic scene

scene

Static



Rehg, CVPR13 Prabhaker, ECCV12 Prabhakar, CVPR12 Patron-Perez, BMVC10



Lan, CVPR12Ding, ECCV10Ramanathan, CVPR13Choi, ECCV12, CVPR14Antic, ECCV14Direkoglu, ECCV12



Rodriguez, ICCVIIa, ICCVb Mehran, CVPR09 Alahi, CVPR14



Yang, CVPR12 Hoai, CVPR14



Fathi, CVPR12 Choi, ECCV14 Park, NIPS12, ICCV13

Cristani, BMVC11 Wang Park, CVPR15 Gallag Arev, SIGGRAPH14

I Wang, ECCV10 Gallagher, CVPR09

Dyadic interaction

Crowd interaction

Number of group members



Static scene

scene

Dynamic



Rodriguez, ICCVIIa, ICCVb Mehran, CVPR09 Alahi, CVPR14

Dyadic interaction

Crowd interaction

Number of group members





Pose as a skeleton



+ Almost complete representation.+ Provide fine details of the person.

Hard to estimate in complex scene.Large amount of variation.

Pose as a finite set of semantic classes

Standing Sitting Running Facing-Front Facing-Right

• • •

+ Compact representation.+ Higher accuracy.

- Require definition of classes.

- Less details.

Standing and Facing-forward







Exploiting Structures in Group Behavior



Proxemics in Personal Photos (Yang CVPR12)

Input: image Output: proxemics label and skeletons











Hand-Shoulder





Proxemics

Proxemics: the study of spatial arrangement of people as they interact

- anthropologist Edward T. Hall in 1963

Proxemics in Personal Photos



Proxemics in Personal Photos



Naïve Solution

	and the second	P
TRUM		
1	-	











Hand touch Hand



(a) Extreme Pose



(b) Occlusion



(c) Part Ambiguity



Joint Pose Estimation

	Connected	P
- TY		Ser





Hand touch Hand



Tree structure! Efficient Inference.

Proxemic Dependent Pose Models



Experimental Setup

- Proxemic Dataset
 - Available at:

http://www.ics.uci.edu/~yyang8/research/ proxemics/index.html

- 589 images, 1207 people, 1332 pairs.



Baselines



Baseline I: Sequential



HoG Template Baseline 2: Phrases

Quantitative Evaluation



Quantitative Evaluation

• Pose Accuracy:

- Sequential Estimation: 47.5%

- Joint Estimation: 73.6%

Qualitative Examples



Group Activity Recognition (Lan NIPS10)

Input: image and bounding boxes Output: group activity label







Collective Activities

Definition:

Activities that are defined or reinforced by the existence of a coherent behavior of a group of individuals in time and space.

Waiting



Queuing



Talking



Pose Representation for Groups



Pose to Group Behavior?















Dataset

- Collective Activity Dataset
 - Available at <u>http://wwweb.eecs.umich.edu/vision/activity-dataset.html</u>
 - 44 videos with multiple people
 - Crossing, Waiting, Queuing, Walking, Talking





Queuing

Walking

Talking

Choi et al, 2009

Qualitative Examples



Qualitative Examples



Limitations



No spatial relationship





Limitations



No spatial relationship

One group assumption



Group Discovery (Choi ECCV14)

Input: image and bounding boxes Output: clustered groups with activity label











Structured Groups



























Challenges



• Unknown number of groups.



Challenges



- Unknown number of groups.
- Large intra-class variation.

Interactions as Key Social Signal



Standing Facing-right

- Individual Pose
 - Weak social signal.

Interactions as Key Social Signal



- Individual Pose
 - Weak social signal.
- Pair Interaction
 - Strong social signal within a group.

Interactions as Key Social Signal



- Individual Pose
 - Weak social signal.
- Pair Interaction
 - Strong social signal within a group.
 - Repulsive signal in different groups.

Interactions as Key Social Signal

Intra-group Interactions

Inter-group Interactions



Attractive Potential for a Group



Repulsive Potential for a Group



Group Discovery Model



Nodes

- Individual likelihood to belong in a group C.

Edges

- Likelihood of interaction in a group C.

Solid lines

- Members belonging to the group.

Dashed lines

- Not belonging to the group.

Group Discovery Model



Nodes

- Individual likelihood to belong in a group C.

Edges

- Likelihood of interaction in a group C.

Solid lines

- Members belonging to the group.

Dashed lines

- Not belonging to the group.

Group Discovery Model



Nodes

- Individual likelihood to belong in a group C.

Edges

- Likelihood of interaction in a group C.

Solid lines

- Members belonging to the group.

Dashed lines

- Not belonging to the group.

Datasets

- Structured Group Dataset
 - Available at

http://cvgl.stanford.edu/projects/groupdiscovery/

- 588 images with 5,415 individuals and 1,719 groups.
- 7 structured groups:
 - Queue, Standing-Facing, Sitting-Object-Facing, Sitting-Ground-Facing, Standing-Side, Sitting-Object-Side, Sitting-Ground-Side.

Group Discovery Results





. 6







Learning the Models



Model weights can be learned in a Max-Margin framework using Structural SVM.

$$\min_{\mathbf{w}, \boldsymbol{\xi}} \quad \frac{1}{2} \|\mathbf{w}\|^2 + \frac{C}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i, \text{ s.t. } \forall i, \xi_i \ge 0 \\ \forall i, \forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{Y} \setminus \mathbf{y}_i : \langle \mathbf{w}, \delta \Psi_i(\mathbf{y}) \rangle \ge \Delta(\mathbf{y}_i, \mathbf{y}) - \xi_i$$

Tsochantaridis et al, 2004

Signals for Social Statics





