



¹Section for Computational Sensomotorics, HIH&CIN, Department of Cognitive Neurology, University Clinic Tübingen, ²IMPRS for Intelligent Systems, Tübingen, Germany, ³Research Group Neurophysiology, Dept. Neurowetenschappen, KU Leuven, 3000 Leuven, Belgium

Hertie-Institut für klinische Hirnforschung

Introduction

- Humans reliably attribute social interpretations to highly impoverished stimuli, such as interacting geometrical shapes, as shown in the classical experiments (Heider & Simmel, 1944).
- Perception of interaction has been explained by high-level cognitive processes, such as probabilistic reasoning (Baker et al., 2009)
- Perception of animacy from simple figures is dependent on a number of critical stimulus parameters (Tremoulet, Feldman, 2000, 2006; Henrik et al., 2014).
- The perception of basic interactive actions (e.g. 'chasing' or 'fighting') has been addressed in several studies (Gao & Scholl, 2013; Scholl & Tremoulet, 2000; McAleer & Pollick, 2000; Blythe et al. 1999); six types of interactive movements has been used repeatedly in these studies.
- Building on classical biologically-inspired models for action perception (Giese & Poggio, 2003), and a deep learning architecture (Simonyan & Zisserman, 2015) we propose a learning-based hierarchical NN model that analyses such stimuli directly from video sequences of the abstract and of the natural captured scenes.
- The model includes only simple physiologically plausible operations. The shaperecognition feed-forward pathway, modeled by a DeepNN (VGG16), followed by discriminative feature selection, an RBF NN and Neural Fields recognizing and tracking shape, orientation and position of moving agents.

Goal of the research

Investigation if and how basic aspects of social and animacy perception can be accomplished by simple and physiologically plausible neural mechanisms, exploiting a hierarchical (deep) model of the visual pathway.



12 different interaction categories (8 best recognized classes): Avoiding, Fithing, Chasing, Pushing, Dodging, Flirting, Walking (together), Tug of War

References

- Heider, F., Simmel, M.: An Experimental Study of Apparent Behavior. The American Journal of Psychology (1944).
- 2. Tremoulet, P.D., Feldman, J.: Perception of animacy from the motion of a single object. Perception 29, 943–951 (2000). 3. Tremoulet, P.D., Feldman, J.: The influence of spatial context and the role of intentionality in the interpretation of animacy from motion. Perception and
- psychophysics (2006) 4. Hernik, M., Fearon, P., & Csibra, G.: Action anticipation in human infants reveals assumptions about anteroposterior body structure and action. Proc. Biological Sciences (2014
- 5. Gao, T., Scholl, B. J.: Perceiving animacy and intentionality. In Rutherford, M.D. and Kuhlmeier, V.A., editors, Social Perception. The MIT Press (2013). 6. Scholl. B.J.. Tremoulet, P.D.: Perceptual causality and animacy. Trends in Cognitive Sciences, 4(8):299-309 (2000)
- 7. McAleer, P., Pollick, F.E.: Understanding intention from minimal displays of human activity. Behavior Research Methods, 40, 830-839 (2008). 8. Fajen, B.R., Warren, W.H.: Behavioral dynamics of steering, obstacle avoidance, and route selection. Journal of Experimental Psycholology: HPP (2003). 9. Giese, M.A., Poggio, T.: Neural mechanisms for the recognition of biological movements. Nat. Rev. Neurosci. 4, 179–192 (2003) 10. Blythe, P.W., Todd, P.M., & Miller, G.F.: How motion reveals intention: Categorizing social interactions. Simple heuristics that make us smart, 257-285

11. Baker, C.L., Saxe, R., Tenenbaum, J.B.: Action understanding as inverse planning. Cognition, R.L. and Higher Cognition, 113, 329–349 (2009). 12. Simonyan, K., Zisserman, A.: Very Deep Convolutional Networks for Large-Scale Image Recognition. ICLR. (2015).

13. Hovaidi-Ardestani, M., Saini, N., Martinez, A. & Giese, M.A.: Neural model for the visual recognition of animacy and social interaction. ICANN, Greece

14. Salatiello, A., Hovaidi-Ardestani, M. & Giese, M.A.: A Dynamical Generative Model of Social Interactions. Frontiers in Neurorobotics, 15, 62 (2021).

Neurophysiologically-inspired computational model of the visual recognition of social behavior and intent

Albert Mukovskiy¹, Mohammad Hovaidi-Ardestani¹, Alessandro Salatiello^{1,2}, Michael Stettler^{1,2}, Rufin Vogels³, Martin A. Giese¹



2015). This module is trained for the ImageNet visual features detection. *LDA***based weighted PCA** is used for the stimulus-vs-background feature selection of the outputs of VGG16. *RBF network* recognizes position and orientation of agents for specific keyframes. *Positive ICA based cross-contrasting* of two agents channels enhances the position discriminative estimation. *Neural Field/RNN* used for the stabilization of agent tracking in the video sequence, by suppression of wrong detections.

- Hierarchical neural network with two pathways analyzing form and motion features.
- Mid-level features extracted by first 5 layers of VGG16, followed by discriminative feature selection, RBF mapping and 2-channels crosscontrasting, followed by the robust 2D tracking of position by Neural Field.
- Two top levels compute perceived animacy and classify perceived interaction.
- The choice of features for agency judgements was driven by results in the psychophysical literature: absolute velocity and acceleration of agents, relative distance, velocity, and acceleration (cf. McAleer & Pollick, 2008).
- Testing multiple types of classifiers at the top level.

Psychophysical Experiment

- Fee labelling task: participants assigned descriptions to each test video freely. Classification task: (new) subjects classified using the most frequently chosen
- labels from free labelling task.
- Semantic similarity task: (New) participants rated (Likert scale) the pairwise similarity of the category labels.







- Reliable classification, way above chance level.
- MDS results indicate that misclassified labels are semantically similar.
- Classes of semantically similar actions can be distinguished from videos.



Activity of the neurons in the RBF networks that detect the two agents (without enhanced feature selection).

Activity of the corresponding neurons in the neural field (without preceding cross-contrasting, see next section).

Tracking in the natural environments

Scenes used for the extension of the model to real videos including natural backgrounds.



The examples of feature selection and cross-contrasting are shown below for the first snapshot of the scene above.

Discriminative feature selection: as input it takes the local populations of feature detectors of the last layer of VGG16. Feature selection is based on a combination of LDA (separating agent features from the background) and an appropriate rescaling of features in PCA space.

Cross-contrasting: In order to separate the patterns generated by the two interacting agents we exploited a simplified form of positive ICA, resulting in clearly separated activity patterns for the individual agents.



1a & **1b**: the output of RBF, without discriminative feature selection. 2a & 2b: the output of RBF, with LDA-based feature selection. **3a** & **3b**: 2-channel cross-contrasting of the RBF network outputs (2a, 2b). 4a & 4b: NFs activation

Results on abstract stimuli Perception of animacy from the motion of a single object (Tremoulet, Feldman 2000) Experiment Model Velocity Change

Direction Deviation

Consistent with the psychophysical res neuron' increases with size of velocity and

Reproduction of increased animacy body axis, as opposed to a moving circle (v if motion is aligned with body axis.

Social interaction classification

- 6 social interactions regularly used in psychophysics.
- Highest confusion rates between 'flirting' and 'chasing'; sometimes also 'playing' and 'guarding'.
- Minimum achieved accuracy: 94 %; best classification result with linear support vector machine: 99 %.
- All original videos from McAleer and Pollick (2008) were classified correctly, even though they were not part of the training set.

Accuracy: different classifiers Classifier Accuracy 99.0% Linear SVM Gaussian kernel SVM 96.3% 94.7% LDA

KNN	94.7%
Nonlinear LDA	94.3%
Neural Network	94.0%

Conclusions

- ✓ New psychophysically validated simulator generates 12 reliably distinguishable categories of social interactions.
- ✓ Simple physiologically plausible neural model reproduces several important characteristics of human agency perception and of social interaction recognition from abstract displays.
- \checkmark Model suitable also for the recognition of articulating bodies and the real animals in a rich natural backgrounds.
- \checkmark Model makes precise predictions about the behavior of neurons involved in interaction perception, which can be verified in electrophysiological experiments.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by: ERC 2019-SyG-RELEVANCE-856495; HFSP RGP0036/2016; BMBF FKZ 01GQ1704; DFG GZ: KA 1258/15-1; SSTeP-KiZ BMG: ZMWI1-2520DAT700, and NVIDIA Corporation.

esults, activity of the output 'agency direction changes of the agent. perception for stimuli that have a which does not have a body axis),	2	C	0	-0-	0	•••
⁰ 0 10 20 40 80 Direction Deviation ⁸⁰ sults, activity of the output 'agency direction changes of the agent. perception for stimuli that have a which does not have a body axis),			-	Recta	ngle 🗲	- Circle
esults, activity of the output 'agency I direction changes of the agent. perception for stimuli that have a which does not have a body axis),	0	0	10 Directi	20 on Dev	40 iation	80
perception for stimuli that have a which does not have a body axis),	sult dir	ts, ac [.] ectio	tivity of n chan	f the o ges of	utput ' the ag	'agency ent.
	per whi	ceptio ch do	on for s es not	timuli have a	that has body	ave a axis),



CIN Werner Reichardt

Centre for Integrativ