Man-Machine Communication: of technological dreams and human realism

Lambert Schomaker presentation held at IBM Watson Center May 26th 2004





Artificial Intelligence / RuG

Overview

- Background
- Pattern recognition x User Interfacing
- Characteristics of human cognition
- Lines of research
- Conclusions





Speaker background

- physiological psychology, cognitive science, pattern recognition, member IEEE, IAPR
- handwriting process modeling (simulation)
- on-line handwriting recognition
- European projects (IMU,MIAMI,Papyrus)
- Company projects: Olivetti, Tulip computers, Hewlett Packard, Philips, Document Access
- on: handwriting recognition, multimodality and multimediality, information retrieval
- since 2001 full prof & director of AI institute Groningen



Al institute Groningen University

- 20 staff, 250 students
- BSc/AI, MSc/AI, MSc/human-machine communication
- part of: Behavioral & Cognitive Neuroscience institute
- Rated 2nd in The Netherlands





Research Programmes

- Cognitive Modeling (Taatgen, van Rijn)
- Multi-agent systems (Verbrugge)
- Auditory cognition (Andringa)
- Autonomous Perceptive Systems (Schomaker, de Boer)
- Language & Speech (Hendriks, Wiersinga)





Example research line: Social Cognitive Robotics

- Aim: investigate social interactions with robots
 - Focus on the basics
- Themes:
 - Distinction conspecific/other
 - Distinction self/other (mirror experiment)
 - Individual recognition
 - Basic communication/cooperation
- Ideas:
 - Use visual features and motion classification
 - Inspiration from a.o. primate research
- Platform:
 - Sony Aibo









Example research line: Auditory Cognition

Audio classification on the basis

of a model of the cochlea



 Applications: security (shouting detection), traffic classification, environmental measurements







Copyright © 2004 L. Schomaker

The tale of the stubborn pattern recognizers





8

Copyright © 2004 L. Schomaker

The tale of the stubborn pattern recognizers

- Wouldn't it be great if we could talk to computers?
- Wouldn't it be great if computers could read our writings?
- Wouldn't it be great if computers would see our world?

•(etc.)





Observations

- From 1984 to 2004, CPU power increased from 6 MHz to 3 GHz, an improvement factor of 500
- Spoken-word recognition error rate went from 25% to 1% (10⁴-word lexica), an improvement of factor 25
- Handwritten-word recognition error rate went from 35% to 5% (10⁴-word lexica), an improvement of factor 7

Hirsch, Hellwig, Dobler (2001), Eurospeech'01 (Ericsson R&D)





Observations

- From 1984 to 2004, CPU power increased from 6 MHz to 3 GHz, an improvement factor of 500
- Spoken-word recognition error rate went from 25% to 1% (10⁴-word lexica), an improvement of factor 25
- Handwritten-word recognition error rate went from 35% to 5% (10⁴-word lexica), an improvement of factor 7

→ We must be doing something wrong ... (?)





Observations

- From 1984 to 2004, CPU power increased from 6 MHz to 3 GHz, an improvement factor of 500
- Spoken-word recognition error rate went from 25% to 1% (10⁴-word lexica), an improvement of factor 25
- Handwritten-word recognition error rate went from 35% to 5% (10⁴-word lexica), an improvement of factor 7

→ We have ill-posed goals ...(?)





Four eye openers

- 1. Rudnicky & Hauptman (1989)
- 2. Frankish, Hull & Morgan (1995)
- 3. Goldberg & Richardson (1993)
- 4. Lopresti (1994) & others





Eye opener 1: User's Cost Evaluation & pattern recognition

- Rudnicky & Hauptman (1989): there is a cost associated with user actions, speech, pen or typing
- Cost: #actions to reach goal (example: entering numbers)
- Use explicit Markov modeling to analyze and predict user behavior
- Time (#actions) relates to inverse of transition probability matrix





Eye opener 1: User's Cost Evaluation & pattern recognition

Rudnicky & Hauptman: ...There is a keyboard/microphone break-even point which is a function of recognizer performance and string length

with current HWR / ASR word-recognition performances, the keyboard can be expected to win often



. . .



Eye opener 2:

User perception of classifier performance

- Frankish, Hull & Morgan (1995): user acceptance of a pen-based interface is strongly influenced by Pen-UI design.
- Users worked on a dbase application and were asked about the quality of the handwriting recognizer
- A good PUI can make mediocre recognizers look useful
- A bad PUI can make a reasonably good recognizers look "stupid"





Eye opener 3: If the cpu can't do it, use the brain

- Goldberg & Richardson (1993): if pattern recognition does not work, let the users adapt their writing style
- Stylized "unistroke", easy on the classifier
- Users like the predictability
- (speed is slower than cursive script)





Eye opener 4: Who needs pattern recognition?

- Scribble communication (human-to-human) and personal note taking do not require full-blown pattern recognition
- HP research and Lopresti (1994): leave ink "as is"
- Use an Information-Retrieval paradigm for note search: 100% recognition is not needed at all
- Also → IBM Crosspad concepts, such as lifelong note taking with a single device





Insights at NICI's on-line HWR group (1)

- Nobody wants to write an isolated word and wait more than a second for a possibly misrecognized machine-font version of it
- In writing, users want to fluently produce larger, meaningful text chunks or
- store exact crisp facts: phone numbers, email addresses, URLs
- the user motivation for post-hoc annotation is likely to be limited



Insights at NICI's on-line HWR group (1)

- Nobody wants to write an isolated word and wait more than a second for a possibly misrecognized machine-font version of it
- In writing, users want to fluently produce larger, meaningful text chunks or
- store exact crisp facts: phone numbers, email addresses, URLs





Insights at NICI's on-line HWR group (2)

- omni-writer (free-style) handwriting recognition in an open application is a dream
- while user-adaptation approaches for single-writer recognition require user motivation, knowledge and competence
- ... unsupervised adaptation is yet another dream





Insights at NICI's on-line HWR group (3)

- Language & dialog modeling is very helpful
- ...but costly in design
- models are never complete
- which will hold a fortiori for multimodal dialog models



Performance in Reading Systems (% correct) (4)

Input	Machine	Human
isolated digits	> 99%	> 99% but fatiguable
isolated letters	> 90%	> 95%
cursive words in sentence	> 65% (?) (may be higher when using language model)	> 85%
cursive words, isolated	> 65% (fixed lexicon, limited size)	~ 77% (huge lexicon)
sloppy cursive words, unknown context	<< 20%	~ 54%

Is on-line handwriting recognition a bad idea?

- (maybe)
- Pen-based note taking may be useful
- Pen-based tablet PCs may be very useful
- Counter measures:
 - better classifiers
 - better hardware (tablet resolution, noise)
 - better dialog modeling
 - better feedback
 - better error-correction scenarios
- Multimodality in the UI?





Multimodality hypothesis

the simultaneous or alternating use of different input devices will increase the user-to-system bandwidth





Multimodality

- pen and keyboard
- pen and speech
- hand gesture and speech
- visual and audio speech
- mouse and keyboard
- pen, speech and keyboard
- joystick +force feedback, tactile feedback
- etc.





Multimodality

...but: multimodality must be learned, just like driving a car

multimodality works well in analog control (F16 fighter planes),

multimodality in symbolic communication is difficult!





the simultaneous or alternating use of different human sensory systems will increase system-to-user bandwidth





Multimediality

but: badly organized multimediality reduces system-touser bandwidth.

Examples:

- Text+speech explanations in museal kiosks
- "Flashy" web sites
- Mc Gurk effect





McGurk effect



- an example of multimodal fusion
- an example of unpredictable effects of
- inappropriate multimedia combination





Back to the drawing board

We need to reconsider goals

towards a Moore's Law of User-System Bandwidth !!





31

Copyright © 2004 L. Schomaker

towards a Moore's Law of User-System Bandwidth

- We need more knowledge on fundamental characteristics of human perception, cognition (language) and motor control
- Sources: neuroscience, cognitive science





Human-world interaction







33

Copyright © 2004 L. Schomaker

Integrated perception-action







34

Copyright © 2004 L. Schomaker

Human-computer communication





bcn

36



Copyright © 2004 L. Schomaker

RuG
Bandwidth







37

Copyright © 2004 L. Schomaker

Bandwidth







38

Copyright © 2004 L. Schomaker

- There is a distinction between the physical signal bits (light intensity, sound-wave pressure, muscle force)
- and intended symbolic bits (language, reasoning)
- between them sits noise and a lot of unknowns





- 10⁷ bit/s is peak rate (e.g. modeling tennis player movements)
- it includes all muscles
- of which the end effector system for a given UI task is just a subset
- per muscle, the bandwidth is limited and there is motor noise (van Galen & Schomaker)





 $\Delta \mathbf{f}$

Power-spectral density of pen-tip movements



Power spectrum of handwriting, one writer



Force = G(#units active , firing rate)

coarse control fine control

(Fig: after neuromuscular research center)



(Fig: after neuromuscular research center)



(Fig: after neuromuscular research center)

Where to get your bits?



Adapted from Penfield & Rasmussen

Rule of thumb: 1 neuron, 1 bit/s

Where to get your bits?

- Large motor areas devoted to mouth and tongue
- Large motor areas devoted to fine control of the fingers
- There is intrinsic feedback (propriocepsis) to improve S/N ratio!





Where to get your bits?

- Tantalizing: keyboard and pen, speech indeed seem to be the way to go:
- these motor-cortex areas are largest
- ... neural implants?





@ 2001 Ted Goff tedgoff@tedgoff.com http://www.tedgoff.com

"It comes with a special tool for pushing buttons on the keyboard."



- Aim at PR applications where the user is motivated and/or expert
- Writer identification
- Cognitive Modeling (ACT*R) for user agents
- Keyboard-based innovations
- Active vision for camera-based reading





Active Vision







Copyright © 2004 L. Schomaker





retina: x,y → log(r), phi

bcn

electro prowsed, more ormat. Electronic ja considerably over the pa aging copyright restr d of hardcopy journal e journals are now publishers will



equal-density in V1 cortical projection 54



AI





Lesson from the biological system

- save computation on the image
- ...by opportunistic sampling
- selective attention instead of cumbersome full-page segmentation
- dynamic error correction (back tracking)





Active Vision

- will be used in a project on robotic reading systems
- robot trying to find its way in man-made environment without electronic navigation (beacons, gps)
- PhD student Marius Bulacu





Keyboard methods (student work)

- cell-phone text messaging is popular in Europe
- text entry is expensive:
 a: press 1x b: 2x c: 3x
- idea: letter/ngram frequency-dependent ordering
 - cf: Dvorak, Velotype





Letter	<u>Frequentie</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
SPACE	2784494	22.48
е	1407151	11.36
n	769818	6.22
а	717151	5.79
t	537183	4.34
i	523371	4.23
0	478815	3.87
d	436487	3.52
r	420218	3.39
1	285381	2.30
g	281465	2.27
s	269930	2.18
h	261449	2.11
k	239107	1.93





SMS text entering (Schaap & Geerdink)



- find the writer identity on the basis of an unknown handwritten sample and a reference set
- applications:
 - automated forensic-writer search
 - mail-address filtering
 - user (style) identification in HWR





algebra

algelra

olgelra

algelra

algebra

Algebra

alçıbra

Aljebra

algebra

algebra

algebra

algebra

2 leg bra

algebra

alge bra

algebra

algebra

algebra

algebra

algebra

algebra

algebra

algebra

algebra





allographic variation

В ALPHA





neuro-biomechanical variability

sequence variability

Edge-angular features



PDF of edge angles (cf Maarse et al., Crettez)

DAT ZE IN DEW YOU NADAT ZE IN NEW BYS, ZÜBICH EN OS PARYSS, ZÜRICH EN YGEN ZO UIT DE U VIOGEN ZE UIT DE DON WEU VI BS JEDAN OGEN ZO UIT 0.160.16writer 1 - paragraph A writer 2 - paragraph A writer 2 - paragraph B writer 1 - paragraph B 0.14 0.140.12 0.120.10.10.080.080.06 0.060.04 0.040.02 0.020 0 0.150.10.05 0 0.05 0.10.150.150.10.050 0.05 0.10.15

PDF of edge angles (cf Maarse et al., Crettez)



PDF of hinge angles (Bulacu & Schomaker, '03)



One writer, mixed and lower-case text

Brush feature (Schomaker & Bulacu, '03)



Brush feature (Schomaker & Bulacu, '03)



Run length, ink (Lb)

Brush feature (Schomaker & Bulacu, '03)







f1 autocorrelation of horizontal raster

f2 Vertical run-length PDF of ink

f3 Horizontal run-length PDF of white

f4 Brush (ink density at stroke endings)

f5 Single edge-angle PDF

f6 Hinge edge-angle PDF

f7 Horizontal co-occurrence edge-angle PDF

(f8 non-writing characteristics: age group, handedness etc.)




Ordered-Borda combination results



Split-line hinge edge-angle PDF



Connected-Component Contours (CO³)



Kohonen SOFM (33x33) of CO³s

111 15555 /////**//**\$\$\$\$ LELEEEE EEFLFFFBLLKKL 11111493355 561*75R*RKK<u>K</u>RI(**|||///**)JJ33 tt**e**t*cc*€cf6 REKRRKRALLI <u>ee</u>(((())) **ec**cccc GERRRRAAAA CCCCCLL RERRRAAAAA GGCELL Q R R R A A A A A A A P P D I 2 ERRAAAAAAAA×>×** GGCLLIL GOOLLL GRRRAAAAAAHNKKKD Prv GGGLLLI 000 ~ ~ ~ ^ ^ A A A M N N N N N N N U U U GGULLSI + GOLLLII GGLCECKA **>>** 4 CCFRRAA **BOR ----**SSMMNNNNNNNNUUUD LEEKRRAQ LEKERRAHOOON ---- MMNNNNNNNWWWDD ECCRRRKR ECSFRRR rrsFrrsssDOOD---WWWHHNNNVZWUUKKUUK DDJDDARAAMMNNNNUUUUUUUU D=5600RPMMMNNK2UVUUUUU LI 239 JORP 7~ MHNNKLUVVVVV 55 555512228330R07~110Hk 79 VVVVUU 355**552**22777000R~n**n**nnyyy*yvv*vvuoo

Fragmented CO³ Kohonen SOFMs























7x7

15x15





20x20

8x8

30x30

9x9



40x40

10x10

12x12



50x50



% correctly identified writers at top of hit list



FCO³ test on independent ImUnipen data (40x40 net)



Feature vector combination, Hinge and FCO³

- Adjoined PDFs: Hinge and FCO³
- 150 writers, 300 samples, leave one out, 1NN Hamming
- mixed lower case

Top1	97.00	(% writers correctly identified in top-n list)
2	98.00	
3	98.33	
4	99.00	
5	99.00	
6	99.33	
7	99.33	
8	99.33	
9	99.33	
10	99.67	





The archives of the Cabinet of the Queen at the Dutch National Archive: a challenge for script recognition!







Digitization of the cultural heritage

- scans of handwritten documents
- manually and superficially annotated at the document or page level (not words, characters)





Digitization of the cultural heritage

- scans of handwritten documents
- manually and superficially annotated at the document or page level (not words, characters)
- "OCR" of handwriting to generate a "transcription"?





- "OCR" of handwriting to generate a "transcription"?
- not possible
- what IS possible in PR?





- "OCR" of handwriting to generate a "transcription"?
- not possible
- → what IS possible in PR?
- Word spotting





Handwritten historical documents

- In general, very difficult: documents written by many writers → too much style variation
- Cabinet of the queen:
 one archivist, writing hand-written indices and summaries for years





A pilot collection

- 48 scanned pages (larger than A4)
- from book: left page vs right page layout
- very strict constraints
 - layout
 - items: imprint, header, footer
 - dates
 - text blocks





1346 1903 " Kon: Nol. Mil. Invalidentuis ant 10 43 Rappet Ridy fand 19 an hier ing van helver Rag betreffende het hon kal Mit Invalde den of monteek over hel 4 kwaitant 1902 Noteficatie April 16 23 Ropp RAy April 1. 59, alokoven non hell har 203 Luli 15 b5 Kapph KDroful: 1.28, althour ner helt the ups. Oeth 12 y Rappt 11 6 Volt B. 46, altroe new het 3 hallers uli 20 53 Rappi RA 14 Jule h. 30, tot hepshikbaan Stelling van een bekag van 1600 .- ter he Shipbing olar hosten ups heris verting, voeting Verpletaing one in her hor : hol effit how Lidenhilis op Monbeek van in West. Indie gebrand hebbende Militairen. Beshirt fias Cett 29 21 Noppl 10 20 Oct h 62, on masplegingon Tweer in hat mickenon vous hat hom hal Mil In. Walidenhuis the Monheck bewaand worden de in lost more verouerde, lelais afte Staan a ande hich the arnhem govormale Commotie tother oprichten wan cange donkhoeken voor wijlen don Seichenand be poraal M. vounder Heyden, hen einde oroundah gedonkheekan, dah geplaatit ial Worden aan den aldass hieun vangelegten Kourd un des Heydonweg, op den hoogeneam den Borkenheunel, och met do kayayour dianstan van den overledene oversenhomen ligenaardig karaktes to geven. - Mial misfice

April 16 23 Roppi RAy April h 53, alohoven machellikes 403 Luli 15 15 Kapph Kilioful: 1. 18, aliboven voer helliku 1903. Oeth 12 y Rapph KA 6 Velt B. 4h, allow now het 3 hur 1913 uli 20 53 Rappi Rid 14 Juli h 30, tot hepshikhaan Stelling van een bedag van 1000 .- ter he Shighing olar posters upon heris acting, vacame Verpleging ong in her Kon: hol Mil mun lidentifis op Bronbeek van in West. Indie gebrend hebbende Militaisen. ___ Medhit fial Oeth 29 21 Routh 20 Octh h lin um achtegingon Tweerin het medenon vous het hom holdel in. Walidentruis the Monkeek bewaard worden de in Post - more verouerde, l'élais afte Staan a ande hich the Winhem govolmade Commotie tother oprichten wan earge donkhocken voor wijlen den Suchenand be 010 140 1 1

The easy part, imprints: already difficult





The transcription

Novb 16 42 Rappt. MD 11 Novb nº 108 tot het toekennen eener jaarlijksche vergoeding voor bureaukosten aan den Secretaris van de Commissie ingesteld tot herziening van het reglement nopens de burgerlijke werklieden bij de Inrichtingen der Artillerie, enz.

Besluit fiat





Summarizing

- Pattern recognition problems are very interesting, scientifically
- In the user interface, their applicability is limited for standard & generalized input
- Customized applications are always possible, but they will be constrained





Summarizing (2)

- There is a need for fundamental cognitive research in the area of human-machine communication...
- ...in order to pave the way for innovative interaction and communication patterns.
- Hand, mouth and tongue are still the most likely candidates for user-interaction concepts without surgery





Summarizing (3)

- As regards PR & UI:
- we concentrate on what works
- with lowered ambition levels





Recent papers

- L. Schomaker, M. Bulacu & M. van Erp (2003). Sparse-parametric writer identification using heterogeneous feature groups. ICIP'2003: IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (Vol. I), pp. (I) 545-548.
- M. Bulacu, L. Schomaker & L. Vuurpijl (2003). Writer identification using edge-based directional features. ICDAR'2003: International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition, pp. 937-941.
- M. Bulacu & L. Schomaker (2003). Writer Style from Oriented Edge Fragments. In: N. Petkov & M.A. Westenberg (Eds.), LNCS 2756 - Computer Analysis of Images and Patterns, pp. 460-469.
- L. Schomaker & M. Bulacu (2004). Automatic writer identification using connectedcomponent contours and edge-based features of upper-case Western script. IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence, Vol 26(6), June 2004, pp.xx-xxx.
- K. Franke, L. Schomaker, C. Veenhuis, C. Taubenheim, I. Guyon, L. Vuurpijl, M. van Erp, and G. Zwarts (2003). WANDA: A generic framework applied in forensic handwriting analysis and writer identification, Design and Application of Hybrid Intelligent Systems (HIS'03), pages 927-938. Amsterdam: IOS Press.





Selected papers

- Plamondon, R., Lopresti, D.P., Schomaker, L.R.B. and Srihari, R. (1999). On-line handwriting recognition. In: J.G. Webster (Ed.). Wiley Encyclopedia of Electrical & Electronics Engineering, 123-146, New York: Wiley, ISBN 0-471-13946-7.
- Schomaker, L., Vuurpijl, L. & de Leau, E. (1999). New use for the pen: outline-based image queries. Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Document Analysis and Recognition (ICDAR '99). Piscataway (NJ): IEEE. pp. 293-296.
- Schomaker, L.R.B. (1998). From handwriting analysis to pen-computer applications. IEE Electronics Communication Engineering Journal, 10(3), pp. 93-102.
- Schomaker, L.R.B., & Van Galen, G.P. (1996). Computer models of handwriting. In: Dijkstra & De Smedt (Eds.), Computational Psycholinguistics: Al and connectionist models of human language processing (pp. 386-420). London: Taylor & Francis.
- Schomaker, L.R.B, Muench, S. & Hartung, K. (Eds). (1995). A Taxonomy of Multimodal Interaction in the Human Information Processing System. Report of the Esprit Project 8579 MIAMI (187 p.), Nijmegen: NICI.
- Schomaker, L.R.B. (1993). Using Stroke- or Character-based Self-organizing Maps in the Recognition of On-line, Connected Cursive Script. Pattern Recognition, 26(3), 443-450.



