# Importance of Social Interactions:

People participate in social interactions every day with friends, family, co-workers and strangers. A strong set of social skills is critical in life—for example, they help us make new friends or make good first impressions at job interviews. Sociologists believe that social interactions are the underpinnings of over modern society and good social skills begin to develop at an early age and are essential for social development and acceptance within our society [1]. Social interactions refer to all forms of interpersonal communication between the participants. This could be bilateral (between two individuals) or group interactions (between multiple people). Irrespective, all the participants are engaged in continuous exchange of social information through their behaviors, mannerisms, gaze, posture, proxemics and kinesis [2].

## Psychological Support:

Recent studies by Segrin et al. have shown that poor social skills are antecedents to psychosocial problems including depression, loneliness, social anxiety, etc. The authors conducted a battery of tests on college students to determine the effect of stress on the students when they live at away from home. Figure XXX shows Depression and Loneliness plotted against stress levels of undergraduate students. Depression was measured using the Beck Depression Inventory which is a one-dimensional instrument that has been used in various studies and has been proven to have excellent reliability and validity. Loneliness was measured on the UCLA Loneliness Scale version 3 as an index into the students experience of loneliness. For both of these tests, the participating students were categorized into high, medium and low social skilled groups based on the Social Skills Inventory which a battery of tests administered to determine the socialization ability of an individual.





Figure XXX: Depression and Loneliness of students plotted against stress levels in high, medium and low social skilled undergraduate students. (Please see text for the scales used for the measurement.)

One can immediately identify a positive correlation between stress and an increased experience of psychosocial problems in all the students, but the ones that rank higher on social skills show higher resistance to stress and in turn higher resistance to mental breakdown. Students assessed with mild or lesser social skills were highly vulnerable to social issues as the stress increased.

Similar results were found in [7] and the authors conclude that people with high competence in communication are known to display immense capability towards adapting their social behavior based on others in their surrounding. Such competence has been acknowledged to reinforce social skills thereby creating a reinforcement feedback that allows these individuals to be successful in their social endeavors and in turn successful in their life. In a tangential study, though Magnusson was not looking for social interaction needs in people, found that social interaction is an important dimension in the cognitive organization of human behaviors. When college students were assessed individually and as a group to determine how they classified everyday activities into different situations, Magnusson discovered 5 dimensions (Principle Dimensions). These included two dimensions based on whether the students perceived a situation as being positive (*positivity*) or negative (*negativity*) influence on their behavior, two dimensions based on whether the situations were *active* or *passive,* and finally, the fifth dimension was based on *social interaction* with others. His study emphasizes how social interactions are perceived by individuals as an important scale for judgments on their activity of daily living.

It is imperative that efforts be made towards understanding development and learning of social skills in humans so that effective tools can be built to cater to people with needs.

## Social Intelligence:

Studies in Cognitive Psychology support the hypothesis that social interactions play a vital role in the overall development of intelligence in humans, especially, in the development of Social Intelligence (or Interpersonal Intelligence as defined by Howard Gardner [10]) and Emotional Intelligence [11]. *Social Intelligence (SI)* can be defined as the competence in initiating and maintaining group interactions and behaviors. First defined by Edward Thorndike, Social Intelligence is “the ability to understand and manage men and women, boys and girls, to act wisely in human relations” [12]. Recently, Karl Albrecht [13] has proposed that Social Intelligence provides for five important aspects of everyday societal inner workings, including, 1) Situational awareness, 2) Presence, 3) Authenticity (or Individuality), 4) Clarity (of action), and 5) Empathy. *Emotional Intelligence (EI)* describes the ability, capacity, skill to identify, assess and manage the emotions of one’s self, others and of groups of individuals. Many models have been proposed in the past to explain EI, such as Ability based models [14], Mixed models [15] and Trait based models [16]. All these models provide a means to measure an individual’s social and emotional skill and place him/her on a scale of abilities/disabilities. Most of these measurements are based on the person’s social interaction skills and the metrics correlate directly to one’s ability in initiating, maintaining and delivering appropriate social cues. Recently, these EI metric scales have been used to diagnose autism spectrum disorders, including autism and Asperger syndrome, semantic pragmatic disorder or SPD, schizophrenia, and Attention-deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD). While most of these disorders are still a mystery to the medical community, increasing the social interactions of the individual has shown to alleviate some of the symptoms.

While most SI and EI models have been theoretical in their approach to expaling the importance of social interactions, primate researcher, Humphrey [17], has demonstrated the real-world effect of social interactions to cultural transmission of knowledge and the development of intelligence. His studies with rhesus monkey have emphasized the positive influence of social interactions on the development of general intelligence. For example, Helen (a rhesus monkey) had her visual cortex surgically removed and studies were conducted on her recovery of spatial vision. Over four years in the laboratory, Helen hardly recovered any of her spatial knowledge. However, when she was taken out of the laboratory into the real world and allowed to interact with objects and other monkeys, she regained three dimensional spatial vision within a few weeks. Humphrey argues that the interactions with other monkeys were key to Helen’s learning of spatial interactions (both with objects and other monkeys).

From a neuro-physiological perspective, advanced functional brain imaging is enabling researchers to study the workings of human brain under various functional conditions. Brothers [18] has worked extensively on the neuro-physiological patterns in primate brains that are associated with social behavior. Her work has established the presence of brain regions that are dedicated to *social cognition* (Social cognition is the processing of information that culminates in the accurate perception of dispositions and intentions of other people). She has proposed a network of neural regions that comprise the social brain: the orbito-frontal cortex (OFC), superior temporal gyrus (STG) and amygdala. Her work has been recently bolstered by [19], where the authors study autistics and controls under functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI). The subjects watched another person’s eye expressions, and guessed what that person was thinking or feeling. The fMRI images confirmed Brothers observations of STG and amygdala activations during social cognition, and showed that people with autism display a cognitive disability in the amygdala which prevents them from making appropriate mental inferences of other people’s emotions or facial expressions. Authors conclude that a social brain does exist, and that teaching children and adults social skills could offer a means of increasing activations in the social brain. This conclusion is supported by the behavioral research in autism that employs social interaction training and language skill training in children to ameliorate the social deficits characteristic of autism spectrum disorders (ASD).

## Summary:

In summary, social interactions are vital aspect of everyday living in our society. Humans learn through their social interactions and these interactions form the basis of our psychological balance. While sociologists and psychologists have been studying social interactions from the perspective of learning innate human behavioral models, social interaction models have not been studied from an

# Non-verbal Cues:

Social interactions and social skills primarily correspond to the two main channels of communication

* *Verbal communication:* Explicit communication through the use of words in the form of speech or transcript.
* *Non-verbal communication:* Implicit communication cues that use prosody, body kinesis, facial movements and spatial location to communicate information that may be unique or overlapping with verbal information.

From a communication point of view, nearly 64% of all information communication happens through non-verbal cues. Out of this large chunk, 48% of the communication is through visual encoding of face and body kinesis and posture while the rest is encoded in the prosody (intonation, pitch, pace and loudness of voice). Inability or difficulty to access any part of this non-verbal cues, seriously affects the overall understanding of the social scene and reduces the involvement of an individual in the social interactions.

From the perspective of encoding information into non-verbal cues, speech, voice, face and body form the primary channels of communication in any social interaction. Speech forms the primary channel for verbal communication, while prosody (intonation, pace and loudness of one’s voice), face and body (posture, gesture and mannerisms) form the medium for nonverbal communication. Unlike speech, which is mostly under the conscious control of the user, the non-verbal communication channels are engaged from a subconscious level. Though people can increase their control on these channels through training, innately, individuals demonstrate certain inability to control their non-verbal cues. This inability to control non-verbal channels is referred to as the leakiness and humans (evolutionarily) have learnt to pick up these leaked signals during social interactions. For example, people can read very subtle body mannerisms very easily to determine the mental state of their interaction partner. Eye Gaze is a classic example of such subtle cues where interaction partners can detect interest, focus, involvement and role play, to name a few. On this leakiness scale, it has been found that the voice is the leakiest of all channels, implying that emotions of individuals are revealed first in their voice before any of the other channels are engaged. The voice is followed by body, face and finally the verbal channel, speech. The leakiness is plotted on the abscissa of Figure XXX with the ordinate showing the amount of information encoded in these three channels. It can be seen that the face communicates the most amount of non-verbal cues, while the prosody (voice) forms the first channel to leak emotional information.




Figure XXX: Plot of communicative information encoded in the three important non-verbal channels of encoding. Speech forms the verbal channel. Face, body and voice form the non-verbal communication channels.

From the perspective of decoding non-verbal communication cues, the non-verbal channels can be analyzed under,

a) the auditory channel (includes conscious, verbal speech and unconscious, nonverbal voice),

b) the visual channel (includes nonverbal face and body mannerisms and gestures, which are distributed fuzzily between the conscious and unconscious mediums),

c) the combined Audiovisual channel (includes simultaneous verbal and nonverbal communication mediums), and

d) touch (includes the nonverbal conscious haptic sensory perceptions).




Figure XXX: Shows the encoding and decoding aspects of interpersonal communication. From an encoding perspective, humans use verbal and non-verbal cues to communicate while from a decoding perspective, face and body encoded data is received visually and verbal speech and non-verbal prosody are received through audio.

## Components of Non-verbal Communication:

In [2], Knapp and Hall describe nonverbal communication in three units, namely,

a) the communication environment,

2) the physical characteristics of the communicators, and

c) the various behaviors of the communicators.

***The Communication Environment:***

The communication environment or surroundings where the interactions are taking place make a huge difference of how humans respond or react [22] [23]. For example, lengthy periods of extreme heat [24] are known to increase discomfort, irritability, reduced work output and unfavorable evaluations of other. Along with the interaction partners, the environment either reinforces or depreciates the emotional experience of an individual. For example, wide open spaces and natural environments are known to be conducive for psychological stability [25]. Though the environmental factors just perceptual, they impose a lot of control on how humans react towards them. Some of the important environmental factors that affect interpersonal communication and non-verbal cueing are shown in the table below. These are some of the well identified factors towards which psychologists and sociologists are working towards.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **The Communication Environment** |  |
| Familiarity of the environment | [26][27] |
| Colors in the environment | [28][29] |
| Other people in the environment | See next two subsections. |
| Architectural Designs | [30] |
| Objects in the environment | [31] |
| Sounds | [32][33] |
| Lighting | [34] |
| Temperature | [24] |

***The Physical Characteristics of the communicators:***

The physical appearance of a person is very important aspect of non-verbal cueing. People draw impressions of their communication partner as soon as they see them. The human body acts like means for communicating important sociological parameters like status, interest, dominance etc. Researchers have found cultural and global preferences in overall body image and any deviations from the norm affects interactions between people. For example, facial babyishness [35] has been found affect judgment of facial attractiveness, honesty, warmth and sincerity. Any deviation from the babyishness has been correlated to immediate reduction in the judgment of these traits. A similar such example is the clothing that people wear. It has been found that first impressions are positive if the interviewer and interviewee are clothed similarly [36]. The table below shows the important aspects of a person’s physical appearance that affects the interpersonal interaction. Various psychological studies have been conducted towards understanding the model of human perception of character. Very little is known on the reasons for some of the human norms, but it is an active area of research that is being explored rigorously, especially, in the context of group behaviors and personal mannerisms with work environments [37].

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Physical Characteristics that affect interpersonal communication** |  |
| The human facial attractiveness | [35][38][39] |
| body shape | [40][41] |
| height of a person | [42] |
| self image | [43] |
| body color | [44] |
| body smell | [45][46][47] |
| body hair | [48] |
| clothing | [36][49] |
| personality | [50][51] |
| body decoration or artifacts | [52] |

***Behavior of the Communicator:***

The last of the three units of non-verbal communication is the behavior of the communicators. While the term behavior is used loosely in defining this unit, this encompasses both static posture and dynamic movements demonstrated by communicators. Of the three units of non-verbal communication, the behavior forms the most important aspect. Most part of the emotional information encoded by humans is delivered through the behavior of individuals during social interactions. Gestures, Posture, Touch and Voice form the basic subdivisions in behavioral non-verbal cueing. While the entire human body is important for the communication of these cues, the face and eyes play a major role.

*Gesture:*

Gestures are dynamic movement of face and limbs displayed during interpersonal communication. Together, they convey a lot of information that is sometimes redundant (with speech) while other times deliver emotional information about the enactor. Most often gestures are classified based on their occurrence with speech. Accordingly, there are

1. Speech-independent gestures, or emblems (like shrug, thumbs up, victory sign etc), that are mostly visual in nature and convey the user’s response to the situation .
2. Speech-related gestures, or illustrators (pointing to a thing, drawing a shape while describing etc) .
3. Punctuation gestures, that emphasize, organize and accent important segments of a communication, like pounding the hand, raising a fist in the air etc.

*Posture:*

Posture refers to the temporary limb and body positions assumed by individuals during interpersonal interactions. Posture is a very effective medium for communicating some of the important non-verbal cues like leadership, dominance , submissiveness and social hierarchy . For example, people who show a tendency of dominance tend to extend their limbs out while sitting thereby displaying an overall larger body size. Similarly, submissiveness seems to be correlated to reducing the overall body size by keeps the limbs together.

Both gestures and postures are influenced heavily by the cultural background of the individual and also varied with the geographical location . Though the cultural influence if true with other non-verbal and verbal cues, the perceived difference is the highest in gestures and posture displayed by individuals.

*Touch:*

Social touch has been a very important aspect of non-verbal communication in humans. Developmental biologists believe that the first set of sensory responses in a human fetus is touch . From a social context this sensory channel is very well used in conveying important interpersonal cues such as interest, intimacy, warmth, confidence, leadership and sympathy . Touch is a powerful means of unconscious interaction and it is believed that people who are very good in their social skills rely upon touch a lot .

Historically, the sense of touch (Haptics Communication ) has been studied by psychologists in the perspective of understanding the human sensory system, but recently, haptics has grown out into the technology front providing human machine interfaces that augment or replace visual and auditory interfaces .

*Face:*

The face is the primary channel for non-verbal communication. Humans are efficient in conveying and receiving plethora of information through subtle movements of their face and head. This focus on the face develops from a very young age and it has been shown that by 2 months, infants are adept in understanding facial gestures and mannerisms . The human face has very fine muscular control allowing it to perform complex patterns that are common to humans, while at the same time being vastly individual . The facial appearance of an individual is due to their genetic makeup, transient moods that stimulate the facial muscles and due to chronically held expressions that seem to set in and become permanent. Human visual system has developed the ability to read these subtleties on people’s faces and interpret all the three aspects of the face - genetic makeup (person’s identity through face recognition), transient mood (facial expression and emotion recognition), and permanent expression on the face (default neutral face of individuals). While the aspects of permanent facial appearance are important in the recognition of the individual, from a non-verbal communication perspective, the primary function of the face is directed towards communicating emotions and expressions.

The understanding of the human facial expression space was immensely increased by the work of Ekman, Frisen and Izard in the late 1970s. They independently measured precise facial movement patterns and correlated these individual movements with facial expressions on the human face. While Izard developed these patterns on infants, the Facial Action Coding System (FACS) developed by Ekman and Frisen has become the de facto standard for measuring facial expressions and emotions. FACS allow expression and emotion researchers to encode facial movements into accurate contraction and relaxation of facial muscles. Based on these facial actions, Ekman and Frisen discovered the global occurrence of seven basic judged emotions. As psychologists have started to master the FACS system of analyzing facial actions, human computer interaction specialists have started to use the same FACS encodings for building better interfaces that can determine human affect and respond accordingly.

*Facial Action Coding System (FACS):*

FACS defines all possible facial feature movements into Action Units (AU) which represent movement of facial features (like lips, eye brow, chin etc). The AUs are the net effect of facial muscle contraction and relaxation, though they are not directly related to the muscles. Table below shows the different AUs that form the basis of FACS based facial coding with the appropriate number and the associated facial feature movement.

* 1 Inner Brow Raiser
* 2 Outer Brow Raiser
* 4 Brow Lowerer
* 5 Upper Lid Raiser
* 6 Cheek Raiser
* 7 Lid Tightener
* 9 Nose Wrinkler
* 10 Upper Lip Raiser
* 11 Nasolabial Deepener
* 12 Lip Corner Puller
* 13 Cheek Puffer
* 14 Dimpler
* 15 Lip Corner Depressor
* 16 Lower Lip Depressor
* 17 Chin Raiser
* 18 Lip Puckerer
* 19 Tongue Out
* 20 Lip stretcher
* 21 Neck Tightener
* 22 Lip Funneler
* 23 Lip Tightener
* 24 Lip Pressor
* 25 Lips part
* 26 Jaw Drop
* 27 Mouth Stretch
* 28 Lip Suck
* 29 Jaw Thrust
* 30 Jaw Sideways
* 31 Jaw Clencher
* 32 Lip Bite
* 33 Cheek Blow
* 34 Cheek Puff
* 35 Cheek Suck
* 36 Tongue Bulge
* 37 Lip Wipe
* 38 Nostril Dilator
* 39 Nostril Compressor
* 41 Lid Droop
* 42 Slit
* 43 Eyes Closed
* 44 Squint
* 45 Blink
* 46 Wink

*Eye:*

## Summary:

# Visual Impairment - a hindrance to Social Interaction:

As explained in the section XXX, most part of the non-verbal encoding happens through visual media. While some parts of these cues are delivered along with speech, most part of the nonverbal communication is inaccessible to someone with visual impairment or blindness. This disconnect from the visual stimulations deprive the individuals of vital communicative cues that enrich the experience of social interactions. People who are blind cannot independently access this visual information, putting them at a disadvantage in daily social encounters. For example, during a group conversation it is common for a question to be directed to an individual without using his or her name—instead, the gaze of the questioner indicates to whom the question is directed. In such situations, people who are blind find it difficult to know when to speak because they cannot determine the direction of the questioner’s gaze. Consequently, individuals who are blind might be slow to respond or talk out of turn, possibly interrupting the conversation. As another example, consider that people who are blind cannot use visual cues to determine when their conversation partners change positions (e.g., pacing the floor or moving to a more comfortable chair). In this scenario, an individual who is blind might inadvertently create a socially awkward situation by speaking in the wrong direction.

To compound these problems, sighted individuals are often unaware of their non-verbal cues and often do not (or cannot) make appropriate adjustments when communicating with people who are blind. Also, people who are blind often do not feel comfortable asking others to interpret non-verbal information during social encounters because they do not want to burden friends and family. The combination of all these factors can lead people who are blind to become socially isolated [3], which is a major concern given the importance of social interaction. While people who are blind and visually impaired face a difficulty in social interactions, research in rehabilitation training for these populations recommends that the social involvement for these individuals have to substantially increase in order to enable their acceptance of the society.

National Center for Health Statistics reported in 2007 that the estimated number of visually impaired and blind people totals up to 21.2 million in the United States alone[[1]](#footnote-1). Global numbers are daunting. In 2002 more than 161 million people were visually impaired, of whom 124 million people had low vision and 37 million were blind[[2]](#footnote-2). WHO reports that more than 82% of the populations who are blind or visually impaired are of age 50 or older. With the life expectancy going up in most developing countries, the percentage of general population entering into some sort of visual impairment is going to increase in the coming years.

Recently, Jindal-Snape carried out extensive research in understanding social skill development in the blind and visually impaired. She has studied individual children (who are blind) from India where the socio-economic conditions do not provide for trained professionals to work with children with disabilities. Her seminal work in understanding social needs of children who are blind have revealed two important aspects of visual impairment that restricts seamless social interactions. These include.

1. Inability to learn social skills due to the lack of visual feedback.

Jindal-Snape observed that significant others in the environment often fail to give feedback, and even when they do, it is not meaningful or understandable to an individual who is visually impaired—for example, nodding one's head in reply to a question or gesturing. Lack of meaningful feedback could make it difficult for visually impaired persons to comprehend a conversation [69] [71]and, at times, may stop conversing. Similar studies carried out by Celeste [72] indicated that social intervention by parents and teachers are very important in the formative years of a child with visual impairment. Developing on the work by [73], which emphasizes that short-term feedbacks are never effective, Celeste insists that professionals must identify strategies related to social skills that work, provide consistent support and follow children longitudinally to ensure effective development of social skill set.

People who are sighted do not necessarily have the training to work with individuals who are blind or visually impaired. Thus, unconsciously they tend to neglect people who are blind. For example, sighted people use gaze as a primary means of keeping attention with people they communicate with. While conversing with a person who is blind or visually impaired, sighted individuals expect the same gaze feedback. The lack of such a feedback distracts the sighted individuals to turn their attention to or assume disinterest from the visually impaired individual. Research indicates that blind individuals with the ability to accommodate social requirements of their sighted counterparts have exhibited immense personal and professional growth.

1. Development of stereotypic body mannerisms, especially body rocking, as they don’t get a reinforcement feedback on their mannerisms.

Due to the lack of visual feedback, people who are blind and visually impaired do not have access to learn mannerisms from their social counterparts. Especially, people who are impaired at a very young age find it very difficult to learn appropriate social actions and mannerisms. A stereotypic body mannerism is one such scenario where positive reinforcement through visual stimulation would have prevented the individual from developing acute non-social conditions.

For over three decades, researchers in behavioral psychology have been publishing case studies on individuals who exhibit stereotypic body rocking. Most of these studies have targeted at reducing or controlling stereotypic body rocking. The methodologies used by these researchers, though varying in nature, can be broadly classified into two important categories.

*Intervention:*

Intervention relates to any form of feedback provided to an individual at the moment of exhibiting stereotype behaviors. Researchers have attempted to reduce body rocking by providing audio and/or tactual intervention whenever an individual started to rock. They have tried aversive punishment as well as less restrictive positive feedback in such situations. Felps and Devlin [74] issued an annoying tone in the ears of the subject while [75] used a recording of stone scratching on blackboard as the feedback tone whenever the individual started rocking. Both reported that the subjects responded well to the intervention. In contrast, [76], [77] and [78] have used verbal praise, physical guidance, verbal reprimands, and brief time-outs as intervention tools. Most of these researches have shown that intervention has worked in reducing and controlling body rocking without the use of aversive techniques. Aversive or not, these techniques validate a claim that it is possible to control or reduce body rocking (or any other stereotypic body mannerism) through feedback.

*Self Monitoring:*

In contrast to intervention, self-monitoring does not stop at intervening into the activities of the individual. It attempts to teach these individuals subtle cognitive skills to replace the current mannerism with more socially acceptable behavior, exercise, or medications. McAdam and O`Cleirigh [79] identifies that self monitoring is a very effective way of reducing the body rock behavior. They introduce the case of a congenitally blind individual who is trained (with constant monitoring and positive feedback) to count the number of body rocks he goes through. Researchers noticed that the individual slowly waned off body rocking as he came to recognize and count his body’s oscillatory movements. The research concludes that a well designed self monitoring program could benefit in reducing stereotypic body rocking. Shabani, Wilder and Flood [80] presents the case of a 12 year old child who was diagnosed with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) having an excessive body rocking and hand flapping stereotypy. The authors introduce an elaborate and positively rewarding self monitoring scheme that allows the child to improve on his behavior effectively. A follow-up with the child's teacher indicated that the social outlook of the child had improved over the course of rehabilitation and the case further reiterates ability to rehabilitate individuals with stereotypic behavior. Estevis and Koenig [81] introduces a cognitive approach to reducing body rocking on an 8 year old congenitally blind child through self monitoring. Teachers or family members would tap on the shoulders of the child when he started rocking, while the child was taught to recite his own monitoring script. The authors conclude that rocking can be significantly reduced through notification to the individual combined with self monitoring.

Supporting such case studies of behavioral mannerisms, psychologists have been studying intervention and feedback as an integral component of social development. Feedback can be defined as the provision of evaluative information to an individual with the aim of either maintaining present behavior or improving future behavior [82]. According to [83], feedback is critical to social development because after an individual receives information about his or her performance, he or she can make the necessary modifications to improve social skills. Most social skills develop during early years and in order for children to evaluate themselves accurately and to modify social skills, it is essential that children to be given feedback [68][70], since without clear feedback, the children are unable to identify how their social behavior differs from others or is perceived by others in the environment [84]. Based on these studies there is enough evidence that feedback that offers intervention, possibly followed by a well planned self-monitoring program could benefit in reducing or controlling body rocking behavior.

Technology specialist Shinohara , observed the everyday activities of a college student who was blind named Sara. Shinohara categorized Sara’s daily needs into functional categories and has arrived with 5 important aspects in Sara’s life where she needs assistance. These include (in order of importance) increased *socialization*, increased *independence* in doing things, increased *control* over things she does, *feedback* from objects around her, and increased *efficiency* in her activities. As seen from the list, socialization was a very important aspect of this college student’s requirement. Shinohara concludes that design ideas for technology that supports socialization capabilities for people with visual impairment is of absolute necessity.

## Summary:

# Design of assistive technology towards social interactions:

Historically, the development of assistive devices has tended to be characterized by a technology-centric approach, which begins by asking ``What can we do?'' This approach is often inspired by a newly emerging technology, and it tends to produce one-size-fits-all technological solutions to the obvious problems that people with disabilities might have already largely solved for themselves. One example of this type of technology-centric approach is a recent research project at Utah State University’s *Robotic Guide* [88], which is a robot that employs multiple sensors to provide navigational assistance to users who are blind within a shopping environment. The user interacts with the robot through speech, a wearable keyboard, and audio icons. Although the multimodality approach offers significant advantages, feedback from the participants who are blind and who used the robotic guide indicated that the robot problems that reveal a very technology centric approach to the problem. The robotic guide moved at an average of 0.5 miles per hour which was too restrictive for any person. Additionally, the navigation system for the robot was based on SONAR, which caused jerky movements, and sometimes provided unreliable results, due to specular reflections and cross talk. The feedback from the focus group indicated that a major portion of decision-making was unnecessarily being off-loaded to the robot thereby restricting their freedom, which was viewed as an undesirable feature. This solution approached the problem from a navigational view point rather than as an accessibility issue. This is an important limitation because people who are blind can navigate independently through an environment using traditional methods, but they cannot read the printed signs, shelf tags, or package labels, nor can they determine the size, color, or pattern in a fabric of clothing in a retail shop. Focusing on the right problem is very important, especially while building assistive technologies.

Another problem with the technology-centered approach is that it often focuses only on the disabilities of the user, without taking into full account the user's abilities. For example, people who are blind are often able to perceive the presence of large objects in the environment around them. Ambient sound sources in the environment provide a form of audio illumination and the resulting sounds bouncing off of objects (or sounds shadowed by objects) allow a person who is blind to detect the presence of those objects. Sometimes in attempting to overcome a disability, developers of assistive devices unintentionally interfere with the user's abilities. For example, assistive devices that require the user to wear headphones or earphones deprive the user of sounds that are vital to the perception of the environment.

In an attempt to develop an assistive technology for delivering facial expression information to individuals who are blind, developed a *haptic chair* for presenting facial expression information. It was equipped with vibrotactile actuators on the back of the chair in a three arm star configuration. The vibrations on the chair are related to the facial expression pattern of the interaction partner. For this experiment, the authors focus only on the mouth of the participant and deliver sad, happy and surprise expressions to the user. Experiments conducted by the researchers showed that people were able to distinguish between three basic emotions. However, this solution had the obvious limitation that the user needed to be sitting in the chair to use the system. The practical applicability of an assistive technology lies in its ubiquity in an everyday environment. Devices should be mobile and/or wearable for them to be useful in different professional and personal settings.

People with disabilities are not always able to perceive or interpret implicit social feedback as a guide to improving their social interaction. However, they might be able to use explicit feedback provided by a technological device. Rana and Picard developed a device called Self Cam, which provides explicit feedback to people with Autism Spectrum Disorder (ASD). The system employs a wearable, self-directed camera that is supported on the users own shoulder to capture the user’s facial expressions. The system attempts to categorize the facial expressions of the user during social interactions to evaluate the social interaction performance of the ASD user. Unfortunately, the technology does not take into account the social implication of assistive technologies. Since it is being developed to address social interaction problems, it is important to take into account the social artifacts of technology. A device that has unnatural extensions could become more of a social distraction for both the participants and users than as an aid.

Current trends in pervasive and wearable computing allow miniature sensors to be placed on an individual discretely and inconspicuously. Vinciarelli et. al. have described the use of discrete technologies for understanding social interactions within groups, specifically targeting professional environments where individuals take decisions as a group. They analyze the use of bodily mannerisms and prosody to extract nonverbal cues that allow group dynamics analysis. They rely on simple sensors in the form of wearable tags which detect face to face interaction events along with prosody analysis to determine turn taking, emotion of the speaker, distance to an individual etc. Pentland describes these signals captured during group interactions as *honest signals*. Some of his recent works in the area of social monitoring hopes to capture these signals and provide feedback to individuals about their social presence within a group. The use of social feedback is illustrated elegantly in their work but their findings relied on sensors carried by all individuals involved in the study. Having everyone in a group wear sensors has proved to be a viable and productive approach for studying group dynamics. However, this approach is not viable as a strategy for developing an assistive technology for people who are blind, as it is not realistic to assume that everyone who interacts with that individual will wear sensors. Thus, it is important to develop technologies that are both egocentric and exocentric in nature, thereby allowing the monitoring of self and others in their environment.

In two independent experiments [97] and [74], researchers developed a social feedback device that provides intervention when a person with visual impairment starts to rock their body displaying a stereotypy. designed a device that consisted of a metal box with a mercury level switch that detects any bending actions. The feedback was provided with a tone generator that was also located inside the metal box. The entire box was mounted on a strap that the user wears around his/her head. The authors tested it on a congenitally blind individual who had severe case of body rocking and they conclude that the use of any assistive technology is useful only temporarily while the device is in use. They state that the body rocking behavior returned to baseline levels as soon as the device was removed. Since the time of this experiment, behavioral psychology studies have explored short term feedback for rehabilitation , and these studies support the above observation that short term feedback is often detrimental to rehabilitation and subject's case invariably worsens. Unfortunately, due to the prohibitively large design of the device developed by these researchers, it was impossible to have the individual wear the device over long durations.

In researchers used a 'Drive Alert' (driver alerting system that monitors head droop) to detect body rocking and provide feedback to a congenitally blind 21 year old student. The research concludes that they were able to control body rocking effectively, but the device could not differentiate between body rocks from any other functional body movements. This device, primarily built to sense drooping in drivers provides no opportunity to differentiate between a body rock and a functional droop. Use of such devices could only be negative on the user as a large number of false alarms would only discourage an individual from using any assistive technology.

## Summary:

# Sensing Non-verbal Cues:

## Exocentric sensing

## Egocentric sensing

From the discussions above, egocentric sensing mostly pertains to the behavior patterns of an individual who is blind or visually impaired. Specifically, we are monitoring their body movements and detecting stereotypic mannerisms. Recently, human activity detection and recognition using motion sensors have taken a front seat in technology and behavioral research. This is due to the availability of micro mechanized electronic systems (MEMS) that have started to implement complex mechanical systems at a micro scale on integrated circuit chips. These offers advantages like reliability, cheaper cost of production, smaller form factor and above all extremely precise measurement with least or no maintenance. One such sensor is the accelerometer that is capable of measuring the effect of gravity on three perpendicular axes. When mounted on any moving object, the opposing motion (opposing gravity) of the entity allows these sensors to measure the speed and direction of motion. Integrating the magnitude and orientation information over time it is possible to accurately measure the exact motion pattern of the moving entity. These accelerometers have been used by researchers to track motion activity in almost every joint of the human body [98]. Researchers have used single, double or triple orthogonal axis accelerometers to detect various activities of humans. They all follow the same underlying supervised learning architecture [99] with difference in learning algorithm used. A simplified representation of the same is shown in Figure 1.



Fig. 1: Training and testing phases of a typical learning framework found in literature.

In [100], the researchers provide a nice discussion on some of the ambulatory movements that can be extracted from accelerometers. Five bi-axial accelerometers are used in [98], along with a decision tree classifier to detect and recognize 20 different activities of daily life. They report a recognition rate of over 85%. In [98], the authors evaluated different meta classifiers for recognizing seven lower body motion patterns from a single biaxial accelerometer data and reported the best performance for boosted Support Vector Machines (SVM) [101] with a subject independent accuracy of 64%. Since each dimension of the accelerometer data is similar to audio waveform, popular Hidden Markov Models [102] can be used to learn motion patterns. Reference [103] used HMM to learn the accelerometer data for specific tasks performed by participants and reports a recognition rate of over 90%. In [104], researchers have used two accelerometers placed on the arms of Kung-Fu practitioner and report a recognition accuracy of 3 Kung-Fu arm movements at 96.6%. Research work [105] demonstrates the use of accelerometer data to not only recognize activity, but also localize people within a building. Though the technique is rudimentary, the authors report a high accuracy in recognition of activities while localization still remains a research topic. [106] have demonstrated the use of accelerometers in not only monitoring movements, but also static posture of the human body. They report a recognition rate of 95% using four sensors placed on the chest, thigh, forearm and wrist of participants. Extending this work, [107] have demonstrated an assistive technology solution that uses low cost accelerometers on stroke patients and monitor their posture and walking patterns. Using this information, a feedback is provided to the patient to self-correct their posture and walking pattern.

## Summary:

# Processing Non-verbal Cues:

## Summary:

# Delivering Non-verbal Cues:

## Summary:

# Research Questions:

What are the most important non-verbal cues that are important for enriching social interactions for people who are blind and visually impaired?

What assistive technology framework can be developed towards addressing the important needs identified in research question 1?

Given the above framework, how effectively can the egocentric and exocentric social interaction cues be extracted in real-time?

How effectively can the interaction partner’s non-verbal cues be delivered to individuals who are blind and visually impaired?

References:

[1] A. Perret-Clermont, C. Pontecorvo, L.B. Resnick, T. Zittoun, and B. Burge, *Joining Society: Social Interaction and Learning in Adolescence and Youth*, Cambridge University Press, 2003.

[2] M.L. Knapp and J.A. Hall, *Nonverbal Communication in Human Interaction*, Harcourt College Pub, 1996.

[3] C. Segrin and J. Flora, “Poor Social Skills Are a Vulnerability Factor in the Development of Psychosocial Problems.,” *Human Communication Research*, vol. 26, 2000, pp. 489-514.

[4] A. Beck, C. Ward, M. Mendelson, J. Mock, and J. Erbaugh, “An Inventory for Measuring Depression,” *Archives of General Psychiatry*, vol. 4, Jun. 1961, pp. 571, 561.

[5] D.W. Russell, “UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3): reliability, validity, and factor structure,” *Journal of Personality Assessment*, vol. 66, Feb. 1996, pp. 20-40.

[6] R.E. Riggio, *Social Skills Inventory*, Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 1989.

[7] R.E. Riggio, “Assessment of basic social skills,” *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 51, 1986, pp. 649-660.

[8] R.E. Riggio and J. Zimmermann, “Social skills and interpersonal competence: Influences on social support and social seeking,” *Advances in Personal Relationships*, W.H. Jones and D. Perlman, eds., London: Jessica Kingsley, 1991, pp. 133-155.

[9] D. Magnusson, “An Analysis of Situational Dimensions,” *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, vol. 32, 1991, pp. 851-867.

[10] H.E. Gardner, *Frames Of Mind: The Theory Of Multiple Intelligences*, Basic Books, 1993.

[11] T. Bradberry and J. Greaves, *Emotional Intelligence 2.0*, TalentSmart, 2009.

[12] E.L. Thorndike, “Intelligence and its uses,” *Harper's Magazine*, vol. 140, 1920, pp. 227–235.

[13] K. Albrecht, *Social Intelligence: The New Science of Success*, Pfeiffer, 2005.

[14] G. Matthews, M. Zeidner, and R.D. Roberts, *Science of Emotional Intelligence: Knowns and Unknowns*, Oxford University Press, USA, 2007.

[15] D. Goleman, *Working with Emotional Intelligence*, Bantam, 2000.

[16] K.V.[. Petrides, R.[. Pita, and F.[. Kokkinaki, “The location of trait emotional intelligence in personality factor space,” *British Journal of Psychology*, vol. 98, May. 2007, pp. 273-289.

[17] N.K. Humphrey, *Vision in a monkey without striate cortex: a case study*, 1974.

[18] L. Brothers, “The social brain: A project for integrating primate behavior and neurophysiology in a new domain.,” *Concepts in Neuroscience*, vol. 1, 1990a. , pp. 51, 27.

[19] S. Baron-Cohen, H. Ring, S. Wheelwright, E. Bullmore, M. Brammer, A. Simmons, and S. Williams, “Social intelligence in the normal and autistic brain: An fMRI study,” *European Journal of Neuroscience*, vol. 11, 1999, pp. 1898, 1891.

[20] Brent D. Ruben, *Human communication handbook*, (Rochelle Park, N.J): Hayden Book Co., 1975.

[21] R. Brown, *Social Psychology*, New York, NY: Free Press, 1986.

[22] O. Hargie, *Social Skills in Interpersonal Communication*, Routledge, 1994.

[23] W.B. Walsh, K.H. Craik, and R.H. Price, *Person-environment psychology*, Routledge, 2000.

[24] D.T. Kenrick and S.W. MacFarlane, “Ambient Temperature and Horn Honking: A Field Study of the Heat/Aggression Relationship,” *Environment and Behavior*, vol. 18, Mar. 1986, pp. 179-191.

[25] E. Krupat, *People in Cities: The Urban Environment and its Effects*, Cambridge University Press, 1985.

[26] R. Sommer, *Personal Space: The Behavioral Basis of Design*, Prentice Hall Trade, 1969.

[27] R. Sommer, *Tight spaces; hard architecture and how to humanize it*, Prentice-Hall, 1974.

[28] A. Schauss, “The psysiological effect of color on the suppression of human aggression,” *International Journal of Biosocial Research*, vol. 7, 1985, pp. 55-64.

[29] P.A. Bottomley and J.R. Doyle, “The interactive effects of colors and products on perceptions of brand logo appropriateness,” *Marketing Theory*, vol. 6, Mar. 2006, pp. 63-83.

[30] T. Farrenkopf and V. Roth, “The University Faculty Office as an Environment.,” *Environment and Behavior*, vol. 12, Dec. 1980, pp. 467-77.

[31] R.H. Moos, *The Human Context: Environmental Determinants of Behavior*, Krieger Pub Co, 1985.

[32] V. Manusov and J.H. Harvey, *Attribution, Communication Behavior, and Close Relationships*, Cambridge University Press, 2001.

[33] A.C. North, D.J. Hargreaves, and J. McKendrick, “In-store music affects product choice,” *Nature*, vol. 390, Nov. 1997, p. 132.

[34] J. Meer, “The light touch,” *Psychology Today*, vol. 19, 1985, pp. 60-67.

[35] D.S. Berry, “Attractive Faces Are not all Created Equal: Joint Effects of Facial Babyishness and Attractiveness on Social Perception,” *Pers Soc Psychol Bull*, vol. 17, Oct. 1991, pp. 523-531.

[36] B.H. Johnson, R.H. Nagasawa, and K. Peters, “Clothing Style Differences: Their Effect on the Impression of Sociability,” *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, vol. 6, Sep. 1977, pp. 58-63.

[37] Helen H. Jennings, *Sociometry in group relations*, (Washington): American Council on Education, 1959.

[38] L.A. Zebrowitz, *Reading Faces*, Boulder CO: Westview Press, 1997.

[39] D.S. Berry and L.Z. McArthur, “Perceiving character in faces: the impact of age-related craniofacial changes on social perception,” *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 100, Jul. 1986, pp. 3-18.

[40] J.B. Cortés and F.M. Gatti, “Physique and self-description of temperament,” *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, vol. 29, Oct. 1965, pp. 432-439.

[41] L.A. Tucker, “Physical Attractiveness, Somatotype, and the Male Personality: A Dynamic Interactional Perspective.,” *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, vol. 40, 1984, pp. 1226-34.

[42] C. Cameron, S. Oskamp, and W. Sparks, “Courtship American Style: Newspaper Ads,” *The Family Coordinator*, vol. 26, Jan. 1977, pp. 27-30.

[43] C.L. Ogden, K.M. Flegal, M.D. Carroll, and C.L. Johnson, “Prevalence and Trends in Overweight Among US Children and Adolescents, 1999-2000,” *JAMA*, vol. 288, Oct. 2002, pp. 1728-1732.

[44] J.H. Griffin, R. Bonazzi, J.H. Griffin, and R. Bonazzi, *Black Like Me*, Signet, 1996.

[45] R. Porter, “Olfaction and human kin recognition,” *Genetica*, vol. 104, Dec. 1998, pp. 259-263.

[46] T. Lord and M. Kasprzak, “Identification of self through olfaction.,” *Perceptual and motor skills*, vol. 69, 1989, pp. 224, 219.

[47] M.J. RUSSELL, “Human olfactory communication,” *Nature*, vol. 260, Apr. 1976, pp. 520-522.

[48] N. Barber, “Mustache Fashion Covaries with a Good Marriage Market for Women,” *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, vol. 25, Dec. 2001, pp. 261-272.

[49] W.E. Hensley, “The effects of attire, location, and sex on aiding behavior: A similarity explanation,” *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior*, vol. 6, 1981, pp. 3-11.

[50] N. Joseph, *Uniforms and Nonuniforms: Communication Through Clothing*, Greenwood Press, 1986.

[51] T.L. Rosenfeld and T.G. Plax, “Clothing as communication,” *Journal of Communication*, vol. 27, pp. 24-31.

[52] C. Sanders and D.A. Vail, *Customizing the Body: The Art and Culture of Tattooing*, Temple University Press, 2008.

[53] P. Ekman, “Nonverbal Communication: Movements with Precise Meanings,” 1976.

[54] M. Wagner and N. Armstrong, *Field Guide to Gestures: How to Identify and Interpret Virtually Every Gesture Known to Man*, Quirk Books, 2003.

[55] D. Efron, *Gesture, Race and Culture*, Walter de Gruyter, Inc., 1972.

[56] G.E. Weisfeld and J.M. Beresford, “Erectness of posture as an indicator of dominance or success in humans,” *Motivation and Emotion*, vol. 6, Jun. 1982, pp. 113-131.

[57] E.C. Grant and J.H. Mackintosh, “A Comparison of the Social Postures of Some Common Laboratory Rodents,” *Behaviour*, vol. 21, 1963, pp. 246-259.

[58] A. Kleinsmith, P.R.D. Silva, and N. Bianchi-Berthouze, “Cross-cultural differences in recognizing affect from body posture,” *Interacting with Computers*, vol. 18, Dec. 2006, pp. 1371-1389.

[59] A. Montagu, *Touching: The Human Significance of the Skin*, Harper Paperbacks, 1986.

[60] W.A. Afifi and M.L. Johnson, “The Use and Interpretation of Tie Signs in a Public Setting: Relationship and Sex Differences,” *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, vol. 16, Feb. 1999, pp. 9-38.

[61] “The communicative functions of touch in humans, nonhuman primates, and rats: a review and synthesis of the empirical research.(infants),” 2006.

[62] M.J. Hertenstein, D. Keltner, B. App, A.B. Bulleit, and R. Jaskolta, “Touch communicates distinct emotions,” *Emotion*, vol. 6, 2006, pp. 528-533.

[63] G. Robles-De-La-Torre, “Principles of haptic perception in virtual environments,” *Human Haptic Perception: Basics and Applications*, 2008, pp. 363-379.

[64] L.J. Carver and G. Dawson, “Development and neural bases of face recognition in autism,” *Molecular Psychiatry*, vol. 7, 2002, pp. S18-S20.

[65] W.E. Rinn, “The neuropsychology of facial expression: A review of neurological and psychological mechanisms for producing facial expressions,” *Psychological Bulletin*, vol. 95, 1984, pp. 52-77.

[66] P. Ekman and W. Friesen, *Facial Action Coding System: A Technique for the Measurement of Facial Movement.*, Consulting Psychologists Press, 1978.

[67] C.E. Izard, “maximally discriminative facial movement coding system,” 1979.

[68] D. Jindal-Snape, “Generalization and Maintenance of Social Skills of Children with Visual Impairments: Self-Evaluation and the Role of Feedback,” *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness*, vol. 98, 2004, pp. 470-483.

[69] D. Jindal-Snape, “Use of Feedback from Sighted Peers in Promoting Social Interaction Skills,” *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness*, vol. 99, Jul. 2005, pp. 1-16.

[70] D. Jindal-Snape, “Using self-evaluation procedures to maintain social skills in a child who is blind,” *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness*, vol. 92, 1998, pp. 362-366.

[71] C.G. McGaha and D.C. Farran, “Interactions in an Inclusive Classroom: The Effects of Visual Status and Setting.,” *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, vol. 95, 2001, pp. 80-94.

[72] L. Kekelis, *The Development of Social Skills by Blind and Visually Impaired Students: Exploratory Studies and Strategies*, Amer Foundation for the Blind, 1992.

[73] T. D'Allura, “Enhancing the Social Interaction Skills of Preschoolers with Visual Impairments.,” *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, vol. 96, 2002, pp. 576-84.

[74] J.N. Felps and R.J. Devlin, “Modification of Stereotypic Rocking of a Blind Adult.,” *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness*, vol. 82, 1988, pp. 107-08.

[75] B.B. Blasch, “Blindisms: Treatment by Punishment and Reward in Laboratory and Natural Settings,” *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, 1972, pp. 215-230.

[76] S. Raver, “Modification of Head Droop during Conversation in a 3-Year-Old Visually Impaired Child: A Case Study,” *Journal of Visual Impairment and Blindness*, vol. 78, 1984, pp. 307-10.

[77] R.L. Simpson and And Others, “Modification of Manneristic Behavior in a Blind Child via a Time-Out Procedure,” *Education of the Visually Handicapped*, vol. 14, 1982, pp. 50-55.

[78] R.L. Ohlsen, “Control of body rocking in the blind through the use of vigorous exercise,” *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, vol. 5, 1978, pp. 19-22.

[79] D.B. McAdam and C.M. O'Cleirigh, “Self-monitoring and verbal feedback to reduce stereotypic body rocking in a congenitally blind adult,” *Re:View*, vol. 24, Winter93. 1993, p. 163.

[80] D.B. Shabani, D.A. Wilder, and W.A. Flood, “Reducing stereotypic behavior through discrimination training, differential reinforcement of other behavior, and self-monitoring.,” *Behavioral Interventions*, vol. 16, Oct. 2001, pp. 279-286.

[81] A.H. Estevis and A.J. Koenig, “A cognitive approach to reducing stereotypic body rocking.,” *Re:View*, vol. 26, Fall94. 1994, p. 119.

[82] P.J. Schloss and M.A. Smith, “Increasing appropriate  
behavior through related personal characteristics,” *Applied Behavior Analysis in the Classroom*, Boston: Allyn & Bacon, 1994.

[83] G. Cartledge, *Teaching Social Skills to Children: Innovative Approaches*, Allyn & Bacon, 1986.

[84] S. Raver and P.W. Darsh, “Increasing social skills training for visually impaired children,” *Education of the Visually Handicapped*, vol. 19, 1988, pp. 147-155.

[85] K. Shinohara and J. Tenenberg, “A blind person's interactions with technology,” *Commun. ACM*, vol. 52, 2009, pp. 58-66.

[86] K. Shinohara, “Designing assistive technology for blind users,” *Proceedings of the 8th international ACM SIGACCESS conference on Computers and accessibility*, Portland, Oregon, USA: ACM, 2006, pp. 293-294.

[87] K. Shinohara and J. Tenenberg, “Observing Sara: a case study of a blind person's interactions with technology,” *Proceedings of the 9th international ACM SIGACCESS conference on Computers and accessibility*, Tempe, Arizona, USA: ACM, 2007, pp. 171-178.

[88] V. Kulyukin, C. Gharpure, J. Nicholson, and G. Osborne, “Robot-assisted wayfinding for the visually impaired in structured indoor environments,” *Autonomous Robots*, vol. 21, 2006, pp. 29-41.

[89] D. Yuan and R. Manduchi, “Dynamic environment exploration using a virtual white cane,” *Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, 2005. CVPR 2005. IEEE Computer Society Conference on*, 2005, pp. 243-249 vol. 1.

[90] S. ur Rehman, Li Liu, and Haibo Li, “Manifold of Facial Expressions for Tactile Perception,” 2007, pp. 239-242.

[91] S. Rehman, L. Liu, and H. Li, “Vibrotactile Rendering of Human Emotions on the Manifold of Facial Expressions,” *Journal of Multimedia*, vol. 3, 2008, pp. 18-25.

[92] A. Teeters, R. Kaliouby, and R. Picard, “Self-Cam: feedback from what would be your social partner,” *SIGGRAPH '06: ACM SIGGRAPH 2006 Research posters*, Boston, Massachusetts: ACM, 2006, p. 138.

[93] A. Vinciarelli, M. Pantic, H. Bourlard, and A. Pentland, “Social signals, their function, and automatic analysis: a survey,” *Proceedings of the 10th international conference on Multimodal interfaces*, Chania, Crete, Greece: ACM, 2008, pp. 61-68.

[94] T. Kim, A. Chang, L. Holland, and A. Pentland, “Meeting Mediator: Enhancing Group Collaboration and Leadership with Sociometric Feedback,” San Diego, CA, USA: 2008, pp. 457-466.

[95] A. Pentland, *Honest Signals: How They Shape Our World*, The MIT Press, 2008.

[96] A. Vinciarelli, M. Pantic, H. Bourlard, and A. Pentland, “Social signal processing: state-of-the-art and future perspectives of an emerging domain,” *Proceeding of the 16th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada: ACM, 2008, pp. 1061-1070.

[97] R.E. Transon, “Using the feedback band device to control rocking behavior,” *Journal of Visual Impairment & Blindness*, vol. 82, 1988, pp. 287 - 289.

[98] L. Bao and S.S. Intille, “Activity recognition from user-annotated acceleration data,” 2004, pp. 1-17.

[99] S.B. Kotsiantis, “Supervised machine learning: a review of classification techniques,” *Informatica*, vol. 31, 2007, pp. 249-268.

[100] J.B. Bussmann and W.L. Martens, “Second International Conference Proceedings, Pervasive Computing,” *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers*, vol. 33, 2001, pp. 349-356.

[101] N. Cristianini and J. Shawe-Taylor, *An Introduction to Support Vector Machines and Other Kernel-based Learning Methods*, Cambridge University Press, 2000.

[102] L. Rabiner, “A tutorial on hidden Markov models and selected applications in speech recognition,” *Proceedings of the IEEE*, vol. 77, 1989, pp. 257-286.

[103] O. Amft, H. Junker, and G. Troster, “Detection of eating and drinking arm gestures using inertial body-worn sensors,” 2005, pp. 160-163.

[104] G. Chambers, S. Venkatesh, G. West, and H. Bui, “Hierarchical recognition of intentional human gestures for sports video annotation,” 2002, pp. 1082-1085 vol.2.

[105] Seon-Woo Lee and K. Mase, “Activity and location recognition using wearable sensors,” *Pervasive Computing, IEEE*, vol. 1, 2002, pp. 24-32.

[106] F. Foerster, M. Smeja, and J. Fahrenberg, “Detection of posture and motion by accelerometry: a validation in amulatory monitoring,” *Computer in Human Behavior*, vol. 15, 1999, pp. 571-583.

[107] S. Arteaga, J. Chevalier, A. Coile, A.W. Hill, S. Sali, S. Sudhakhrisnan, and S.H. Kurniawan, “Low-cost accelerometry-based posture monitoring system for stroke survivors,” Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada: ACM, 2008, pp. 243-244.

1. J.R. Pleis and M. Lethbridge-Çejku, *Summary health statistics for U.S. adults: National Health Interview Survey, 2006*, National Center for Health Statistics, Vital Health Stat 10 (235), 2007. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. World Health Organization: *Magnitude and causes of visual impairment*, Fact Sheet N°282  
   November 2004. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)