Perception and Categorization of Computer Animated Walking Figures

Department of Computer Science and the Media And Graphics Interdisciplinary Centre Jason Harrison, Brian D. Fisher, and Kellogg S. Booth University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia Canada

Computer graphics has long benefited from an understanding of human vision. Basic perceptual phenomena such as trichtomacy, opponent colors, and color JNDs have enabled the design of graphics hardware and software. More complex stimuli such as human movements are a well understood also important for graphics but are not so

For example, Bruderlin's (1995) walk generator uses twenty-nine parameters to create "human like" walking motions by simulating the joint angle rotations of thirty-six joints (eighty-three rotational angles).





Questions Motivating Our Research:

How should the parameters be adjusted to make the walk

Can we find a concise set of descriptive terms to define a "Linguistic Motion Space" which can be used to describe the human motions? appear faster? Younger? Bouncier? Graceful?

What are the psychophysics of human motion? Which parameters are most perceptually salient

Do experts and novices differ in their ability to reliably distinguish and describe motions?

We are investigating the mapping between the parameters used by a computer to generate animated movements (different gaits of a walking figure), participants' descriptions of movements, and their judgments of the similarity of the movements.

Stimuli

We utilize a conceptual framework relating three motion

spaces: a mechanical motion which computer animation programs operate in, a psychological motion space which human encode and organize motions according to their features, and a linguistic motion space that humans use to describe movements using words.





The psychological motion space is defined by the participants' judgments of the similarity of pairs of gaits



The linguistic motion space is defined by the participants descriptions of each gait on eight scales labeled with

6 participants: 26 gaits, randomly paired

5 social dancers (3 females, 2 males) 1 non-dancer (male)

President at 1



Experiment Two: 9 gaits, paired according to schema 30 participants:

8 dancers (7 females, 1 male)

17 runners (9 females, 8 males)

5 neither (1 female, 4 males)

Comparisons (Session One) Parameters Motion Similarities Motion Scaling of Similarities Principal Components Analysis of Ratings Multidimensional Responses (Experiment Two) Analyses Correlation Parameters Trials Ratings (and differences of ratings Interpolated Gaits (Experiment Two) (Session Two) Ratings Motion

Experiment One examined the classification of gatts within the structure of paits of opposite movement description terms. We found that the focus of attention varied among participants, but that similar stimulus characteristics were salient in determining the classification of gaits:

We tested for correlations (Pearson's 1) between the mechanical motion space (pranneters), the psychological motion space (miniatriy judgments) and the inguestic motion space (descriptions). We present the ranges of participants' strongest correlations for each of these relationships:

 flexible-stiff: upper torso and pelvis rotation fast-slow: step length and knee swing smooth-bouncy: bounciness

Mechanica

Mechanical versus sychological

Psychological versus Linguistic

versus Linguisti

young-old: arm, elbow, and knee swing

energetic-tired: arm, elbow and knee swing; average torso tilt and knee bend throughout stride

and hip swing tic: elbow rotation, torso sway, bouncines

normal-strange: torso sway, bounciness and hip swing

fourth components capturing individual biases participants with the first two principal components common to a majority of participants and the third and

altering parameter values associated with the relative weights given to common perceptual cutes without the need to add new cutes or substantially modify the nature of the cutes themselves.

Observed inter-participant differences suggest that amination systems should be customizable not only for the user's preferences, but for their perceptual abilities and movement categories as well. If our findings are correct, we can predict that this customization might be achieved by

light	energetic	young	smooth	flexible	fast	1st PC of 5 1 (#2, #3, #4,
heavy	tired	old	bouncy	stiff	slow	participants #5, #6)
light	energetic	young	smooth	flexible	fast	2nd PC of . (#1, #2, #3
heavy	tire	ok	bouncy	stif	slow	5 participan , #4, #6(3rd

References

Experiment Two explored the metric properties of motion similarity judgments by asking participants to make comparisons between a limited range of movements that were unikely to span boundares between multiple linguistic descriptors, but which were perceptually distinct

normal

strange

normal

strange

Jason Harrison. Measuring and Comparing Human Walking Motions for Computer Animation. PhD thesis, University of British Columbia, Department of Computer Science, December 2001. Available from

http://www.cs.ubc.ca/~harrison/Thesis/Doctoral/

Armin Bruderlin. Procedural Motion Control Techniques for Interactive Animation of Human Figures. PhD thesis, Simon Fraser University, School of Computing Science, March 1995.

gracemu

Metric Properties:

1. Only self distance is 0D(A,B) > D(A,A) = 0

2. Distances are symmetric D(A,B) = D(B,A)

D

Acknowledgements

Kellogg S. Booth: ksbooth@cs.ubc.ca Brian D. Fisher: fisher@cs.ubc.ca Jason Harrison: harrison@cs.ubc.ca

Contacts

3. Triangle inequality $D(A,B) + D(B,C) \ge D(A,C)$

We gratefully acknowledge the support of the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada "Interactive Computer Graphics" research grant to Kellogg S. Booth.

across participants. Symmetry was the most robust: We conclude that similarity judgments do not have all of the metric properties but that their evaluation was similar

Self distance often greater than zero non-self distance often near zero D(A,A) > ε, D(A,B) < ε

Distances are usually symmetric D(A,B) ≈ D(B,A)

Triangle inequality does not hold D(A,B) + D(B,C) < D(A,C)

NSERC CRSNG

UBC