
SMELL AND EMOTION: RECOGNISING EMOTIONS IN SMELL-RELATED ARTWORKS

Vishal Patoliya, Mathias Zinnen, Andreas Maier, Vincent Christlein
Pattern Recognition Lab
Friedrich-Alexander-Universität
Erlangen, Germany

1 Introduction

Traditionally, emotions have played only a marginal role in historical research and heritage discourse. During the twentieth century, various disciplinary turns and paradigm shifts, specifically the emergence of sensory studies [1] and the history of emotions [2], have broadened the perspective of humanities-based research beyond the scope of classical historiography. Similarly, the gradual extension of the concept of cultural heritage towards intangible heritage, particularly and towards multi-sensory approaches, expands our understanding of what dimensions of culture are considered valuable to safeguard for future generations [3]. Recent approaches in computational humanities embrace this broader perspective and incorporate the recognition of abstract and subjective concepts [4], sound [5], or smells [6]. Emotions have successfully been recognised in historical texts [7, 8] and natural images [9, 10]. Unfortunately, neural networks trained on photographic emotion recognition datasets are subject to a performance drop when applied to artworks due to the domain gap between artistic and photographic representations [11]. While the WikiArt emotions [12] and the more recent ArtEMis [13] datasets compile emotional responses to artworks by multiple viewers, automatic recognition of emotions of the persons depicted in artworks has not yet been targeted in literature. This work explores whether person-level emotion recognition in smell-related artworks is technically feasible. By focusing our study on smell-related artworks, we aim to set the stage for future research that links the extracted emotions to previously identified olfactory references [14, 15]. With this research, we seek to contribute to the emergence of a broadened view in computational humanities, including the analysis of multiple senses, emotions, and everyday history.

2 Method

2.1 Baseline Dataset

Our approach involves training an emotion recognition network on the EMOTION recognition in Context (EMOTIC) dataset [16] and applying it to a set of smell-related artworks. These artworks were previously used for the detection of olfactory objects [14] and gestures [17] in the context of the Odeuropa¹ project.

The EMOTIC dataset consists of 23,571 unconstrained, natural photos with 34,320 individuals identified primarily on their perceived emotions. The dataset has images from Google, COCO [18] and Ade20k [19] depicting diverse contexts. The annotations were collected using Amazon Mechanical Turk (AMT) and agreement levels among different annotators were used in the labelling process [10]. Overall, Persons are labelled with their location in the image, 26 discrete emotion categories and three continuous variables (Valence, Arousal, and Dominance). We labelled a subset of the Odeuropa images for quantitative evaluation using the EMOTIC labelling scheme. We will refer to this test set consisting of 100 images with one annotated person each as ODOR-emotions.

¹<https://www.odeuropa.eu>



Figure 1: Example of a style transfer using internal-external learning [21]: Image (a) is the normal photographic image from the EMOTIC dataset where the style transfer will be applied. Image (b) is the artwork image from WikiArt used to get style features. Finally, Image (c) is the output image where the main body or object content is from Image (a) and the colouring effect is from Image (b).

2.2 Stylized Dataset Creation

We additionally created a stylized version of the EMOTIC dataset (EMOTIC-s) to overcome the domain gap between photographic and artistic imagery and approximate the distribution of our artistic target domain. To this end, we apply internal-external learning [20] to the EMOTIC dataset with random artworks from the WikiArt² dataset defining the target styles (see fig. 1). The WikiArt dataset features images of diverse genres, such as abstract, Shan Shui, landscape, and Veduta.

2.3 Network Architecture

We adopt the network architecture from Kosti et al. [10]. Their convolutional neural network (CNN) model combines person-specific (body bounding box) and scene context information (entire image). The model’s workflow is illustrated in fig. 2, comprising three modules: body feature extraction, image (context) feature extraction, and a fusion network.




Figure 2: Model architecture for Emotion Recognition in Context which uses two different branches to extract body and context features separately. In the fusion network, both features are merged for the final prediction (Discrete and Continuous dimensions). Figure taken from [10] with permission from the authors.

Individual-centric attributes, such as body posture, facial expressions, and other non-verbal indicators, are the primary focus of the body feature extraction module. It processes characteristics connected to the person’s body by analyzing their visible appearance. The algorithm uses a CNN model that has been previously trained on ImageNet [22], adjusting it to extract relevant features from each image’s body bounding box. The Scene Context Feature Extraction module is tasked with understanding the broader scene-context features. The entire image is utilized as input to generate scene-related features. It employs a CNN model pre-trained on the Places dataset [23] to extract features that capture the situational context of each image. The extracted features from both modules are combined in a fusion network to perform a detailed regression of discrete emotion categories and continuous dimensions. This network is important for interpreting emotions in artworks because it combines scene-contextual and individual-centric information to evaluate the emotional state shown in the image.

²<https://www.wikiart.org/>

To derive features from the data, ResNet-18 [24], ResNet-50 [24] and DenseNet161 [25] neural network encoder architectures are utilized in the body and context modules and performance is evaluated for each architecture. As suggested by Kosti et al. [10], a weighted combination of two separate losses has been considered, where one loss corresponds to learning the discrete categories and the other one considers the continuous dimensions. For the discrete categories, a weighted Euclidean loss is used, and for the continuous dimensions, a smooth ℓ^1 loss is used.

3 Experiments & Results

3.1 Baseline Performance

We retrain the architecture with ResNet-18 and ResNet-50 backbones from [10], keeping data splits, image sizes, hyperparameters and augmentations. We do not reproduce the configuration with a DenseNet161 due to its weaker performance reported in [10].³ Kosti et al. [10] evaluate the discrete prediction of the predominant emotion, and a continuous regression of the three dimensions of valence (V), arousal (A), and dominance (D). Similarly, we evaluate our retrained models and report the average precision for the discrete emotion prediction (AP_{EMOTIC}) and the regression error, averaged over all three dimensions (VAD_{EMOTIC}) in table 1. The numbers are very close to what Kosti et al. [10] originally reported, showcasing the reproducibility of their study. ResNet-50 stands out as the superior model when EMOTIC and ODOR-e datasets are taken into consideration. However, if we apply the models on our test set consisting of historical artworks, we see a drop in classification performance (measured by AP_{ODOR-e}) and an increase in regression error (measured by VAD_{ODOR-e}). Examples of misclassifications in the ODOR-e dataset were shown in fig. 3.



Figure 3: Example of misclassifications from ODOR-e dataset where Ground Truth (GT) emotion and predicted emotion (Pred) are completely different. Image credits (left to right): *Merry man holding a pewter jug and a pipe*. Circle of Frans Hals. 1638–1640. RKDImages(302304), *Portrait of Arnold Aletrino*. Jan Veth. 1885. RKDImages(20797).

Table 1: Comparison of average precision for predominant emotion prediction (AP) and mean error in valence arousal dominance dimensions (VAD) of models trained on the EMOTIC. Both models exhibit a decrease in classification performance and an increase in regression error for the continuous dimensions when evaluating on artworks compared to the evaluation on the EMOTIC test set.

| Model | $AP_{EMOTIC} \uparrow$ | $AP_{ODOR-e} \uparrow$ | $VAD_{EMOTIC} \downarrow$ | $VAD_{ODOR-e} \downarrow$ |
|-----------|------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|
| ResNet-18 | 25.61 | 13.25 | 0.97 | 1.89 |
| ResNet-50 | 26.13 | 13.33 | 0.96 | 1.91 |

³The training is conducted using the implementation from Abhishek Tandon: https://github.com/Tandon-A/emotic/blob/master/Colab_train_emotic.ipynb

3.2 Improvements on Baseline Performance

To overcome this performance degradation, we adapt the original configurations in two ways:

1. We replace the backbone of the context branch, which was originally pretrained with Places365 [23] with an ImageNet-pretrained backbone.
2. We increase the size of the person crops that are being fed to the body feature extraction branch of the network to incorporate more detailed local features.

Results of these alterations are reported in table 2. Changing the pre-training scheme improves performance when evaluated on EMOTIC. Evaluated on ODOR-e, we observe a decrease in classification accuracy while at the same time reducing the VAD regression error. Increasing the size of the person crops, however, increases the classification performance on both datasets while the regression error stays roughly the same. When both techniques are combined, the classification performance on EMOTIC is slightly improved while being decreased for ODOR-e. Since we are mostly interested in predominant emotion classification on ODOR-e, we conducted further experiments with the increased image size of 224.

Table 2: Ablation study of Hyperparameter tuning, models trained with ImageNet weights in context branch (INW) or increased body image size to 224 (224B) or in the combination of both. Models with increased body image size perform better than models trained only with INW in the context branch.

| Model | INW | 224B | AP _{EMOTIC} ↑ | AP _{ODOR-e} ↑ | VAD _{EMOTIC} ↓ | VAD _{ODOR-e} ↓ |
|-----------|-----|------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|
| ResNet-50 | | | 26.13 | 13.33 | 0.96 | 1.91 |
| ResNet-50 | ✓ | | 26.50 | 10.22 | 0.96 | 1.81 |
| ResNet-50 | | ✓ | 26.90 | 13.49 | 0.95 | 1.92 |
| ResNet-50 | ✓ | ✓ | 27.04 | 13.33 | 0.95 | 1.88 |

3.3 Impact of Style Transfer

To further increase model performance on the artistic person representations in ODOR-e, we experiment with a stylized version of the EMOTIC dataset (EMOTIC-s). Table 3 compares the performance of ResNet-18 and ResNet-50 models when trained on EMOTIC and EMOTIC-s datasets, respectively.

Table 3: Ablation study comparing model performance when trained on EMOTIC vs when trained on EMOTIC-s dataset. Both configurations are evaluated on EMOTIC-s and ODOR-e datasets.

| Model | Train Set | AP _{EMOTIC-s} ↑ | AP _{ODOR-e} ↑ | VAD _{EMOTIC-s} ↓ | VAD _{ODOR-e} ↓ |
|------------------|-----------|--------------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|
| ResNet-18 + 224B | EMOTIC | - | 15.05 | - | 1.97 |
| ResNet-18 + 224B | EMOTIC-s | 23.45 | 12.28 | 0.99 | 1.94 |
| ResNet-50 + 224B | EMOTIC | - | 13.49 | - | 1.92 |
| ResNet-50 + 224B | EMOTIC-s | 23.59 | 13.93 | 0.98 | 1.86 |

While we observe a slight improvement in the performance of ResNet-50 models trained on the EMOTIC-s dataset, the performance for the strongest ResNet-18 model deteriorates drastically. However, the performance increase for the larger backbone motivates us to further explore the potential of style transfer in future work. Unfortunately, neither the models with a ResNet-18 backbone nor those with a ResNet-50 backbone exhibit improved performance compared to their counterparts trained on the unmodified EMOTIC dataset. We hypothesize that the style transfer leads to a loss of crucial information about the facial features of depicted persons. This is exemplified in the transition from fig. 3a to fig. 1c. Developing conditioned style-transfer methods that ensure consistency in the facial expression of depicted persons could mitigate this issue and provide a promising angle for future work.

4 Conclusion

The study shows the feasibility of recognizing emotions in individuals portrayed in artworks and highlights the importance of contextual information for identifying these emotions. However, we observe a performance decrease

compared to emotion recognition in natural images. We employed customized Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) models, pre-trained on the photographic EMOTIC dataset, and achieved modest improvements through hyperparameter tuning. Furthermore, we explored the potential of style transfer to overcome the domain gap between natural and artistic representations. The recognition performance in artworks has substantial room for improvement, given the complexity and subjectivity of the problem. However, the proposed method presents a first exploration of the domain, enabling further research in emotion recognition in artworks. Future studies might focus on extending the dataset to enable fine-tuning in the artistic target domain. Similarly, improving style transfer methods might retain features crucial for emotion recognition. Ultimately, we hope this work encourages interdisciplinary scholars to investigate the interplay between olfactory and emotional dimensions of artworks.

Acknowledgments

This paper has received funding from the Odeuropa EU H2020 project under grant agreement No. 101004469. We gratefully acknowledge the donation of the NVIDIA corporation of two Quadro RTX 8000 that we used for the experiments.

References

- [1] Michael Bull, Paul Gilroy, David Howes, and Douglas Kahn. Introducing sensory studies. *The Senses and society*, 1(1):5–7, 2006.
- [2] Barbara H Rosenwein and Riccardo Cristiani. *What is the History of Emotions?* John Wiley & Sons, 2017.
- [3] Cecilia Bembibre and Matija Strlič. Smell of heritage: a framework for the identification, analysis and archival of historic odours. *Heritage Science*, 5(1):1–11, 2017.
- [4] Delfina Sol Martinez Pandiani and Valentina Presutti. Seeing the intangible: Surveying automatic high-level visual understanding from still images. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.10562*, 2023.
- [5] Manel Achichi, Pasquale Lisena, Konstantin Todorov, Raphaël Troncy, and Jean Delahousse. Doremus: A graph of linked musical works. In *The Semantic Web—ISWC 2018: 17th International Semantic Web Conference, Monterey, CA, USA, October 8–12, 2018, Proceedings, Part II 17*, pages 3–19. Springer, 2018.
- [6] Marieke van Erp, William Tullett, Vincent Christlein, Thibault Ehrhart, Ali Hürriyetoğlu, Inger Leemans, Pasquale Lisena, Stefano Menini, Daniel Schwabe, Sara Tonelli, et al. More than the name of the rose: How to make computers read, see, and organize smells. *The American Historical Review*, 128(1):335–369, 2023.
- [7] Luis Rei and Dunja Mladenčić. Detecting fine-grained emotions in literature. *Applied Sciences*, 13(13):7502, 2023.
- [8] M Beshar Massri, Inna Novalija, Dunja Mladenčić, Janez Brank, Sara Graça da Silva, Natasza Marrouch, Carla Murteira, Ali Hürriyetoğlu, and Beno Širčelj. Harvesting context and mining emotions related to olfactory cultural heritage. *Multimodal Technologies and Interaction*, 6(7):57, 2022.
- [9] Keyur Patel, Dev Mehta, Chinmay Mistry, Rajesh Gupta, Sudeep Tanwar, Neeraj Kumar, and Mamoun Alazab. Facial sentiment analysis using ai techniques: state-of-the-art, taxonomies, and challenges. *IEEE Access*, 8:90495–90519, 2020.
- [10] Ronak Kosti, Jose Alvarez, Adria Recasens, and Agata Lapedriza. Context based emotion recognition using emotic dataset. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2019.
- [11] Peter Hall, Hongping Cai, Qi Wu, and Tadeo Corradi. Cross-depiction problem: Recognition and synthesis of photographs and artwork. *Computational Visual Media*, 1:91–103, 2015.
- [12] Saif Mohammad and Svetlana Kiritchenko. Wikiart emotions: An annotated dataset of emotions evoked by art. In *Proceedings of the eleventh international conference on language resources and evaluation (LREC 2018)*, 2018.
- [13] Panos Achlioptas, Maks Ovsjanikov, Kilichbek Haydarov, Mohamed Elhoseiny, and Leonidas J Guibas. Artemis: Affective language for visual art. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 11569–11579, 2021.
- [14] Mathias Zinnen, Prathmesh Madhu, Ronak Kosti, Peter Bell, Andreas Maier, and Vincent Christlein. Odor: The icpr2022 odeuropa challenge on olfactory object recognition. In *2022 26th International Conference on Pattern Recognition (ICPR)*, pages 4989–4994. IEEE, 2022.
- [15] Mathias Zinnen. How to see smells: Extracting olfactory references from artworks. In *Companion Proceedings of the Web Conference 2021*, pages 725–726, 2021.

- [16] Ronak Kosti, Jose M Alvarez, Adria Recasens, and Agata Lapedriza. Emotic: Emotions in context dataset. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition Workshops*, pages 61–69, 2017.
- [17] Mathias Zinnen, Azhar Hussian, Hang Tran, Prathmesh Madhu, Andreas Maier, and Vincent Christlein. Sniffyart: The dataset of smelling persons. In *Proceedings of the 5th Workshop on analySis, Understanding and proMotion of heritAge Contents (SUMAC)*, pages 49–58, 2023.
- [18] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, Lubomir Bourdev, Ross Girshick, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, C. Lawrence Zitnick, and Piotr Dollár. Microsoft coco: Common objects in context, 2015.
- [19] Bolei Zhou, Hang Zhao, Xavier Puig, Tete Xiao, Sanja Fidler, Adela Barriuso, and Antonio Torralba. Semantic understanding of scenes through the ade20k dataset, 2018.
- [20] Haibo Chen, lei zhao, Zhizhong Wang, Huiming Zhang, Zhiwen Zuo, Ailin Li, Wei Xing, and Dongming Lu. Artistic style transfer with internal-external learning and contrastive learning. In M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P.S. Liang, and J. Wortman Vaughan, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 34, pages 26561–26573. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021.
- [21] Leon A. Gatys, Alexander S. Ecker, and Matthias Bethge. Image style transfer using convolutional neural networks. In *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 2414–2423, 2016.
- [22] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In F. Pereira, C.J. Burges, L. Bottou, and K.Q. Weinberger, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 25. Curran Associates, Inc., 2012.
- [23] Bolei Zhou, Agata Lapedriza, Aditya Khosla, Aude Oliva, and Antonio Torralba. Places: A 10 million image database for scene recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2017.
- [24] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2016.
- [25] Gao Huang, Zhuang Liu, Laurens van der Maaten, and Kilian Q. Weinberger. Densely connected convolutional networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, July 2017.