
Rethinking CLIP-based Video Learners in Cross-Domain Open-Vocabulary Action Recognition

Kun-Yu Lin^{1,2,3} Henghui Ding^{3,4} Jiaming Zhou⁵ Yu-Ming Tang^{1,2}
 Yi-Xing Peng^{1,2} Zhilin Zhao⁶ Chen Change Loy³ Wei-Shi Zheng^{1,2}

¹School of Computer Science and Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, China

²Key Laboratory of Machine Intelligence and Advanced Computing, Ministry of Education, China

³S-Lab, Nanyang Technological University ⁴Institute of Big Data, Fudan University

⁵AI Thrust, Hong Kong University of Science and Technology (Guangzhou)

⁶Data Science Lab, School of Computing & DataX Research Centre, Macquarie University

Abstract

Building upon the impressive success of CLIP (Contrastive Language-Image Pre-training), recent pioneer works have proposed to adapt the powerful CLIP to video data, leading to efficient and effective video learners for open-vocabulary action recognition. Inspired by that humans perform actions in diverse environments, our work delves into an intriguing question: Can CLIP-based video learners effectively generalize to video domains they have not encountered during training? To answer this, we establish a CROSS-domain Open-Vocabulary Action recognition benchmark named XOVACTION, and conduct a comprehensive evaluation of five state-of-the-art CLIP-based video learners under various types of domain gaps. The evaluation demonstrates that previous methods exhibit limited action recognition performance in unseen video domains, revealing potential challenges of the cross-domain open-vocabulary action recognition task. In this paper, we focus on one critical challenge of the task, namely scene bias, and accordingly contribute a novel scene-aware video-text alignment method. Our key idea is to distinguish video representations apart from scene-encoded text representations, aiming to learn scene-agnostic video representations for recognizing actions across domains. Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our method. The benchmark and code will be available at <https://github.com/KunyuLin/XOVACTION/>.

1 Introduction

Action recognition aims to recognize what actions humans are performing in videos, which has wide applications in surveillance systems, health monitoring, etc [1; 2]. Recently, inspired by the impressive success of CLIP (Contrastive Language-Image Pretraining) [3] across various image understanding tasks, pioneer works propose to adapt CLIP to video data for action recognition [4; 5; 6; 7; 8; 9]. Different from traditional models that focus on closed-set recognition [10; 11; 12; 13; 14], this *new CLIP-based recognition paradigm* leads to efficient video learners with remarkable *open-vocabulary* recognition abilities, *i.e.*, they achieve state-of-the-art performance for *both closed-set and open-set action categories* on various video datasets with moderate training cost. Such open-vocabulary abilities significantly enhance the practical value of action recognition models.

As shown in Figure 1 (a), in this work, we delve into an intriguing question: Can CLIP-based video learners effectively generalize to video domains that they have *not encountered* during training? This generalization ability in unseen video domains is crucial for action recognition models in practice, since models often suffer from environment changes when deployed in real-world applications [15;




Figure 1: (a) Can CLIP-based video learners effectively generalize to *unseen* test domains? For example, given a model trained with normal videos, we wonder if it can effectively recognize actions in dark videos. (b) We conduct a comprehensive evaluation for five state-of-the-art CLIP-based video learners on four test datasets, namely UCF [17], HMDB [18], ARID [19] and NEC-Dr [20]. For each test dataset, we report the accuracy of closed-set and open-set action categories according to the training categories in Kinetics400 [13]. As shown above, these CLIP-based video learners exhibit limited performance when recognizing actions in *unseen* test domains. Note that, for each metric, we report the best performance among all methods, please refer to Table 3 for the full results.

16]. For example, surveillance systems will encounter actions performed under illumination shifts caused by day-night change or weather change. Therefore, from a practical perspective, we expect that a CLIP-based video learner possessing open-vocabulary abilities can robustly adapt to domain changes for action recognition.

To answer this question, we establish the first CROSS-domain Open-Vocabulary Action recognition benchmark named XOV-Action, which includes four test datasets exhibiting various levels of domain gaps in comparison to the training datasets. Based on XOV-Action, we conduct a comprehensive evaluation of five state-of-the-art CLIP-based video learners in cross-domain open-vocabulary action recognition. As shown in Figure 1 (b), our evaluation reveals that these CLIP-based video learners exhibit limited performance when recognizing actions in *unseen test domains*. Specifically, these models exhibit very limited performance for closed-set categories in test domains with large domain gap (e.g., ACC of 53.89% for dark videos in ARID). Also, we note that the open-set recognition performance of these CLIP-based video learners is far from reaching saturation even in domains with moderate domain gap (i.e., ACC of 42.22% on HMDB). Overall, cross-domain open-vocabulary action recognition poses challenges for existing CLIP-based video learners, as it requires recognizing both closed-set and open-set action categories in unseen video domains.

To address this task, our work focuses on tackling domain gaps by defending against the scene bias when fitting training videos. Specifically, the scene bias is caused by the strong associations between actions and specific scenes in training videos (*aka.*, spurious correlation [21; 22; 23; 24; 25; 26]), and it would hinder models’ generalizability across domains. For example, as shown in Figure 1 (a), if humans usually perform jumping on track-and-field grounds in the training domain (Kinetics400), models will prefer to recognize the action based on the track-and-field grounds since static scenes are easier to fit [21; 22; 24]. However, humans may perform jumping in hallways (ARID) or on basketball courts (NEC-Dr), thus recognizing “jump” based on track-and-field grounds would result in recognition errors across domains.

To mitigate the scene bias, we propose a novel Scene-Aware video-Text Alignment (SATA) method for learning scene-agnostic video representations. Our key idea is to distinguish video representations apart from scene-encoded text representations, which encourages the video encoder to downweight the attention on scene information and thus pay more attention to action information. Experiments on XOV-Action demonstrate that our SATA can effectively improve the closed-set action recognition performance across domains while generally maintaining the open-set performance.

In summary, our contributions are listed as follows:

- (1) We establish the first CROSS-domain Open-Vocabulary Action recognition benchmark named XOV-Action, which includes four test domains exhibiting various levels of domain gap in comparison to the training domains. We identify closed-set and open-set categories for each test domain, thus providing a comprehensive way to evaluate models across various situations.

- (2) We conduct a thorough evaluation of five state-of-the-art CLIP-based video learners based on XOVACTION. Our experimental analysis demonstrates the limited performance of these methods in cross-domain open-vocabulary action recognition, revealing potential challenges of this task.
- (3) We propose a novel Scene-Aware video-Text Alignment (SATA) method, which aims to learn scene-agnostic video representations to recognize actions across domains. Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our method in tackling domain gaps.

2 Related Works

Action Recognition aims to recognize human actions in videos. In the past decade, motivated by the success of deep learning [27; 28; 29; 30; 31; 32; 33], many video classification architectures have been proposed. These architectures can primarily be categorized into 2D CNNs, 3D CNNs and Video Transformers. Typically, 2D CNNs adopt 2D convolution for spatial modeling, and conduct temporal modeling beyond spatial modeling [11; 34] or embed temporal shift into spatial modeling [12; 35; 36]. 3D CNNs extend 2D convolution to 3D convolution for adapting video data [37; 13; 38; 39; 40; 41; 42]. By adopting attention mechanisms, Video Transformers expand the receptive field of 2D and 3D CNNs, leading to remarkable performance [43; 44; 45; 46; 14; 47]. Although above models show promising performance for closed-set action recognition, they usually lack the ability to recognize open-set categories.

Recently, inspired by the success of CLIP (Contrastive Language-Image Pretraining) [3; 48], some pioneer works propose to adapt CLIP to video data for action recognition [49; 4; 5; 49; 6; 7; 8; 9; 50; 51; 52; 53; 54; 55]. Owing to the image-text alignment power of CLIP, these CLIP-based video learners are endowed with remarkable open-vocabulary action recognition abilities with moderate training cost. These methods adapt CLIP to video data in various ways. For example, ActionCLIP [4] stacks temporal fusion layers on top of the image encoder for modeling temporal dynamics, Ju et al. [6] cooperate continuous prompting with temporal Transformer, and X-CLIP [5] proposes cross-frame communication attention for temporal modeling. OpenVCLIP [9] and FROSTER [54] propose to improve open-set recognition by harnessing the power of raw CLIP. In our work, we focus on the underexplored *cross-domain* setting for open-vocabulary action recognition, which aims to develop generalizable open-vocabulary action recognition models for *unseen* video domains.

Cross-Domain Action Recognition aims to learning video classification models by transferring knowledge from source domains to target domains. This area mainly includes two tasks, namely *domain-adaptive and domain-generalizable action recognition*. In domain-adaptive action recognition [56; 57; 58; 15; 59; 60; 61], unlabeled videos from target domains are accessible for training, thus prevailing works usually focusing on developing models oriented to specific target domains. Typical works address domain-adaptive action recognition by learning cross-domain invariance [15; 62; 62; 63; 64; 65]. Other works usually explore to leverage the multi-modal nature of video data [66; 67; 68; 69; 70].

Differently, domain-generalizable action recognition [16; 71; 72; 73] aims to learn generalizable models in unseen test domains, *i.e.*, videos of the target domains are not accessible during training. In the absence of target videos, existing works usually assume specific types of invariance across domains for generalizable action representation learning, *e.g.*, Yao et al. assume that local features are more invariant across domains compared with global features [16]. Our cross-domain open-vocabulary action recognition task is closely related to domain-generalizable action recognition, since test domains are unseen during training. However, our task is much more challenging as we strive for cross-domain open-vocabulary abilities, leading to significantly different technical designs.

Vision-Language Pretraining [3; 48; 74; 75; 76; 77; 78] has made great progress in recent years, and one of the most impressive works is CLIP [3]. By utilizing web-scale paired image-text data for training, CLIP shows robust zero-shot object recognition abilities. Also, some advanced works have demonstrated that CLIP can effectively solve specific downstream tasks by efficient adaptation [79; 80; 81; 82; 8; 83]. Moreover, integrating CLIP with specialized techniques shows remarkable open-vocabulary abilities on various image understanding tasks, *e.g.*, object detection and segmentation [84; 85; 86; 49]. Although large-scale image-text pretraining has achieved great success, video-text pretraining still has room for development [87; 88; 89; 90; 91; 92; 93; 94; 95]. It is because videos are inherently more complex than images, and large-scale paired video-text datasets are less available.

Table 1: Category statistics of four test domains in our XOV-Action. The closed-set and open-set categories are identified according to Kinetics400.

Test Domains	UCF	HMDB	ARID	NEC-Dr
# of closed-set actions	50	33	6	7
# of open-set actions	51	18	5	9
# of all actions	101	51	11	16
Domain gap	Small	Moderate	Large	Large

Therefore, it is valuable to develop methods for adapting pretrained image-text models to video understanding tasks.

3 The Proposed XOV-Action Benchmark

Our work focuses on the cross-domain open-vocabulary action recognition task. This task aims to develop open-vocabulary action recognition models that are generalizable in *unseen* target domains by training in the source domain, *i.e.*, recognizing *both closed-set and open-set action categories* in new test domains. To evaluate models in this task, we establish XOV-Action, a CROSS-domain Open-Vocabulary Action recognition benchmark, which provides a comprehensive way to analyze models across various situations. In what follows, we introduce the components of our XOV-Action benchmark in detail, as well as evaluation metrics and potential challenges.

Benchmark Components: Our proposed XOV-Action benchmark consists of two source datasets for training and four target datasets for test. The two **source datasets** for training are as follows:

- (1) *Kinetics400* [13]: One of the most widely-used action recognition datasets, consisting of 400 action categories. Videos in Kinetics400 are collected from YouTube, which are usually recorded in *normal* environments (*e.g.*, normal illumination and weather). Existing CLIP-based video learners typically use Kinetics400 for training, and we use the original split following them.
- (2) *Kinetics150*: A subset of Kinetics400, composed of 150 action categories selected from the full Kinetics400. These 150 categories include all the closed-set categories of the four target datasets in comparison to Kinetics400, and the remaining categories are randomly sampled. We will illustrate the definition of closed-set categories later. We construct this subset to conduct detailed analysis for cross-domain open-vocabulary action recognition models.

The four **target datasets** for test are as follows:

- (1) *UCF* [17]: One of the most widely-used action recognition datasets, consisting of 101 action categories. Videos in UCF are collected from YouTube, and videos of each action are usually captured from specific or similar environments. UCF has a *small* domain gap compared with the Kinetics (source) domain, and previous CLIP-based video learners commonly use UCF to evaluate their open-vocabulary recognition abilities.
- (2) *HMDB* [18]: A widely-used action recognition datasets consisting of 51 action categories. Compared with UCF, videos in HMDB are captured from more unconstrained environments and more different camera views. Specifically, Videos in HMDB are collected mainly from movies, and remaining videos are from Prelinger archive, YouTube or Google videos. Overall, HMDB has a *moderate* domain gap compared with the Kinetics domain [61; 96].
- (3) *ARID* [19]: A dataset consisting of 11 categories of action videos, which are recorded under dark environments. These actions include singular person actions (*e.g.*, jump, run) and actions associated with objects (*e.g.*, drink, pick). Due to the significantly different illumination conditions, ARID exhibits a *large* domain gap compared with the Kinetics domain (see Figure 1 for an example). When training data are limited to videos with normal illumination, developing models that are generalizable in ARID is challenging.
- (4) *NEC-Dr* [20]: A dataset consisting of 16 categories of action videos, which are recorded by drones in the same basketball court. These actions include single-person actions (*e.g.*, jump, walk) and interactive actions (*e.g.*, hug, shake hands). Due to the different shooting equipments and scenarios, NEC-Dr exhibits a *large* domain gap compared with the Kinetics domain (see Figure 1 for an example). Therefore, it is challenging to make a Kinetics-trained model generalizable in such a drone video domain.

In our experiments, we use videos from Kinetics400 or Kinetics150 for training. Then, we evaluate models on the four target datasets, which exhibit various levels of domain gap in comparison to the training datasets. Please refer to the Appendix for more details of our XOV-Action benchmark.

Evaluation Metrics: First, we illustrate the definitions of *closed-set* and *open-set* categories for test domains: (a) The closed-set categories refer to the categories that share similar meanings and have a common lexicon with the categories in the training domain, following a similar approach in previous zero-shot action recognition works [97; 98]. (b) The open-set categories refer to the remaining categories that are not involved in the training domain. Then, we identify closed-set and open-set categories for each test domain, according to the Kinetics400 categories. Category statistics are summarized in Table 1.

In our experiments, we adopt three evaluation metrics: (1) The *closed-set accuracy* measures the recognition performance of closed-set categories, which primarily evaluates the model abilities of tackling domain gaps when fitting training videos. (2) The *open-set accuracy* measures the performance of open-set categories, which evaluates the generalization abilities across both video domains and action categories. (3) The *overall accuracy* measures the recognition performance over all categories, which provides a holistic view of model effectiveness across various situations.

Note that, some previous works of CLIP-based video learners treat all the categories in UCF and HMDB as open-set for models trained on Kinetics400. However, UCF and HMDB have many overlapping categories with Kinetics400, thus these works make an inaccurate assessment of models’ open-vocabulary abilities. Unlike these works, we provide a more accurate way for evaluation by distinguishing between closed-set and open-set categories. By evaluating across various domains and different action categories, our proposed XOV-Action benchmark enables us to perform a wide range of analysis for cross-domain open-vocabulary action recognition models.

Potential Challenges: Although cross-domain open-vocabulary action recognition is valuable and practical, it is challenging and underexplored. Based on XOV-Action, we conduct a comprehensive evaluation of five state-of-the-art CLIP-based video learners. As shown in Table 3, the experimental results on XOV-Action demonstrate that these CLIP-based video learners exhibit limited performance when recognizing actions in *unseen test domains*. In addition, the results reveal three fundamental challenges of the cross-domain open-vocabulary action recognition task as follows:

I. How to improve the generalization of closed-set categories in unseen test domains? Previous CLIP-based video learners exhibit very limited performance in test domains with large domain gaps, *i.e.*, the best closed-set ACCs are only 53.89% and 31.48% on ARID and NEC-Dr, respectively. To address this challenge, it is crucial to learn domain-invariant video representations from training domains. Our method mainly targets this challenge by focusing on the mitigation of scene bias.

II. How to improve the generalization of open-set categories in the presence of domain gaps? The cross-domain open-set recognition performance is far from reaching saturation even in test domains with moderate domain gaps, *e.g.*, the best open-set ACC is only 42.22% on HMDB. To address this challenge, it is crucial to harness the power of language models for recognizing open-set categories across domains. Additionally, another possible direction is to alleviate overfitting of closed-set categories in training domains [9; 54].

III. How to develop a single model that performs excellently for all categories in all test domains? This is very challenging, since existing models show varied performance across various domains, and empirically improvements in cross-domain closed-set performance do not guarantee improvements for open-set categories and could even cause a decrease. Given the unique characteristics of each test domain and category type, it is crucial to find a trade-off solution, especially when no additional annotations/data are introduced and the model size remains consistent.

4 Methodology

4.1 Problem Formulation

In cross-domain open-vocabulary action recognition, a set of labeled videos $\mathcal{D} = \{(x, y)\}$ from a source domain are given for training, where x and y denote a source video and its ground-truth action label index. The source domain consists of K action categories, and the action names (label texts) are denoted by $\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_K\}$. Given only source videos for training, our goal is to develop a model




Figure 2: An overview of our proposed Scene-Aware video-Text Alignment (SATA) method. Our method basically includes a video encoder and a text encoder for representation extraction, with a contrastive loss for video-text alignment. Based on the scene-encoded text prompts, we propose the Scene-Aware Discrimination and Action-Aware Discrimination losses, aiming to learn scene-agnostic video representations for cross-domain open-vocabulary action recognition. Best viewed in color.

that is generalizable in *unseen* target domains, where the source and target domains follow different distributions and different label spaces. Following previous open-vocabulary action recognition works, we sample T frames from each video as model input during training and test.

4.2 Model Overview

Building upon CLIP, our model consists of a video encoder $f_{\text{vid}}(\cdot)$ and a text encoder $f_{\text{txt}}(\cdot)$. Following OpenVCLIP [9], we construct a video encoder by integrating patches from neighboring frames in each self-attention layer of the original CLIP image encoder. For the video x , the video representation $e_x = f_{\text{vid}}(x)$ is obtained by the average of local video representations (each local representation corresponds to one frame). We use the original CLIP text encoder and keep it frozen during training. Following previous works [9; 8], we use a video-text alignment loss to adapt video data, which is formulated as follows:

$$L_{\text{vta}} = -\log \frac{\exp(s(e_x, e_{a_y})/\tau)}{\sum_{k=1}^K \exp(s(e_x, e_{a_k})/\tau)}, \quad (1)$$

where $s(\cdot, \cdot)$ denotes the cosine similarity, τ is the temperature, $e_{a_k} = f_{\text{txt}}(g(a_k))$ is the text representation of the k -th action category. The function $g(\cdot)$ transforms an action name into a text prompt in the form of “a video of a person [doing something].”, e.g., “a video of a person abseiling.” for the action “abseiling”. To mitigate scene bias, we contribute a *Scene-Aware Discrimination* loss and a *Action-Aware Discrimination* loss for learning scene-agnostic video representations, which will be illustrated in the next subsection. An overview of our proposed method is shown in Figure 2.

4.3 Scene-Aware Video-Text Alignment

To learn scene-agnostic video representations for cross-domain open-vocabulary action recognition, we contribute a novel Scene-Aware video-Text Alignment (SATA) method. The key idea of our SATA is to distinguish video representations apart from scene-encoded text representations, which encourages the video encoder to downweight the attention on scene information in videos.

Scene-Aware Discrimination: First of all, we randomly sample N scene suffixes and construct scene-encoded text prompts for each training video. Each scene suffix is in the form of “[at/on/in the/a scene]”, e.g., “in the park”, “on the street”. In our implementation, we ask GPT-4 [99] to automatically generate a pool of scene suffixes for random sampling, which involves no human annotation cost. Based on these suffixes, we construct scene-encoded text prompts of ground-truth action category for each video, which is in the form of “a video of a person [doing something] [at/on/in the/a scene].” For example, for the action “abseiling”, we obtain N scene-encoded text prompts, e.g., “a video of a person abseiling in the park.”

Then, based on the scene-encoded text prompts, we design a Scene-Aware Discrimination loss, which is formulated as follows:

$$L_{\text{scene}} = -\log \frac{\exp(s(e_x, e_{a_y}))}{\exp(s(e_x, e_{a_y})) + \sum_{n=1}^N \exp(s(e_x, \tilde{e}_{a_y}^n))}. \quad (2)$$

In this loss, $\tilde{e}_{a_y}^n = f_{\text{txt}}(\tilde{g}(a_y, n))$ is the representation of a scene-encoded text prompt, which encodes the semantic information of the n -th scene. The function $\tilde{g}(\cdot, n)$ transforms an action name into a scene-encoded text prompt using the n -th scene suffix. According to Eq. (2), our Scene-Aware Discrimination loss pushes the video representations away from the scene-encoded text representations in video-text alignment. In this way, the loss leverages the strong power of CLIP text encoder, which encourages the video encoder to pay less attention to scene information and thus pay more attention to action information, thereby mitigating the scene bias when fitting training videos.

Action-Aware Discrimination: In our experiments, we find that although the Scene-Aware Discrimination loss L_{scene} effectively improves the cross-domain action recognition performance for the closed-set categories, it reduces the cross-domain performance for open-set categories. Thus, it leads to limited improvement in the overall cross-domain open-vocabulary performance.

A critical reason is that L_{scene} pushes a video away from a scene-encoded text prompt in representation space, and this may result in higher similarity between the video and some non-ground-truth action texts in representation space, *relative to the scene-encoded text prompt*. However, since the scene-encoded text prompt encodes semantic information of the ground-truth category (in addition to a scene), the video should have a more different representation from the non-ground-truth action texts, compared with the scene-encoded text prompt. For example, consider a video that depicts a person playing basketball in a court. This video should have a dissimilar representation to the text prompts of other categories (e.g., “a video of a person kicking soccer.”) compared with the scene-encoded text prompts (e.g., “a video of a person playing basketball in the park.”). Overall, this issue would cause some confusion in video representation space.

Accordingly, to alleviate the degradation of cross-domain open-set performance, we propose a Action-Aware Discrimination loss to constrain video representation learning. Relative to the scene-encoded text representations that encodes ground-truth action semantics, our Action-Aware Discrimination loss pushes the video representations away from the text presentations of non-ground-truth categories, which is formulated as follows:

$$L_{\text{action}} = \frac{1}{N(K-1)} \sum_{n=1}^N \sum_{k \neq y}^K \max\left(0, \delta - s(e_x, \tilde{e}_{a_y}^n) + s(e_x, e_{a_k})\right), \quad (3)$$

where δ is the margin. In principle, L_{action} introduces a constraint for non-ground-truth action text a_k ($k \neq y$), i.e., $s(e_x, \tilde{e}_{a_y}^n) - s(e_x, e_{a_k}) \geq \delta$. By using both L_{scene} and L_{action} , our SATA aims to learn a more reasonable video representation space, i.e., $s(e_x, e_{a_y}) > s(e_x, \tilde{e}_{a_y}^n) > s(e_x, e_{a_k})$ when $k \neq y$.

In summary, the overall training loss of our SATA is given as follows:

$$L = L_{\text{vta}} + \lambda_{\text{scene}} L_{\text{scene}} + \lambda_{\text{action}} L_{\text{action}}, \quad (4)$$

where λ_{scene} and λ_{action} are coefficients for trade-off. During test, we use text presentations of action categories in target domains for classification.

5 Experiments

5.1 Experimental Setups

Implementation Details: For each video, our model takes $T = 16$ frames of size 224×224 as inputs. Following ViFiCLIP [8], we adopt temporal jitter, multi-scale random spatial crop and color jitter for augmentation during training. During test, we use one temporal clip composed of center-cropped frames for inference. Regarding the architecture of the video encoder, we adopt ViT-B/32 and ViT-B/16 initialized by CLIP image encoder for Kinetics150 and Kinetics400, respectively. For temporal modeling, we set the temporal receptive field of self-attention layers to 7 in the video encoder. We ask GPT-4 [99] to output 300 scene suffixes that are common in daily life, and randomly sample $N = 50$ scene suffixes for our losses in each batch. The parameters are optimized using AdamW optimizer with a batch size of 512, a learning rate of $8e-6$, a momentum of 0.9 and a weight decay of $1e-3$. If not specified, we set the loss coefficients as $\lambda_{\text{scene}} = 0.2$ and $\lambda_{\text{action}} = 0.2$, the margin as $\delta = 0.5$, and the temperature coefficient as $\tau = 0.01$. Following OpenVCLIP [9], we adopt the SWA technique [100] for producing the final model. All experiments are conducted by PyTorch with 8 NVIDIA RTX 3090 GPUs.

Evaluation Protocol: We adopt five state-of-the-art CLIP-based video learners for evaluation and comparison. To conduct a solid evaluation on Kinetics400, we utilize the officially released

Table 2: Evaluation of CLIP-based video learners trained on Kinetics150 on XOV-Action. “C”, “O” and “A” denote the ACC (%) for closed-set, open-set and all action categories, respectively. “AVG” denotes the average ACC over four test domains. * indicates the model variant with frozen text encoder. The bold/underlined numbers indicate the best/second best. We prioritize the average overall ACC as the primary metric in model comparison.

Models	UCF			HMDB			ARID			NEC-Dr			AVG		
	C	O	A	C	O	A	C	O	A	C	O	A	C	O	A
CLIP	61.51	57.85	59.67	42.92	38.62	41.40	32.04	12.04	24.02	18.52	6.44	12.33	38.75	28.74	34.35
ActionCLIP [4]	84.76	56.27	70.44	56.78	33.02	48.40	42.25	19.75	33.23	18.75	4.22	11.30	50.63	28.32	40.84
LSTM [4]	84.54	58.38	71.39	58.30	36.38	50.56	42.04	26.85	35.95	17.13	12.44	14.73	50.50	33.51	43.16
TConv [4]	84.54	58.61	71.24	57.29	36.19	49.84	44.29	27.78	37.67	17.59	12.22	14.84	50.93	33.56	43.40
XCLIP [5]	89.89	59.38	74.59	53.44	30.78	45.62	35.10	13.72	26.64	16.90	5.70	11.26	48.83	27.40	39.53
Text4Vis [7]	83.40	49.84	66.54	54.25	38.06	48.54	41.43	31.71	37.53	12.50	4.17	8.23	47.90	30.94	40.21
ViFiCLIP [8]	87.77	49.32	68.44	61.94	27.05	49.63	40.20	21.95	32.89	14.58	0.00	7.10	51.12	24.58	39.52
*ViFiCLIP [8]	82.93	62.07	72.44	58.60	41.60	52.60	44.69	27.13	37.65	17.36	10.53	13.86	50.90	35.33	44.14
OpenVCLIP [9]	82.98	63.17	73.03	56.48	44.96	52.41	48.16	27.13	39.73	19.68	13.38	16.45	<u>51.82</u>	37.16	<u>45.40</u>
SATA (Ours)	84.89	62.86	73.82	58.40	44.59	53.53	48.78	29.57	41.08	24.54	12.72	18.48	54.15	37.44	46.73

Table 3: Evaluation of CLIP-based video learners trained on Kinetics400 on XOV-Action. We use the *officially released checkpoints* of previous methods for evaluation, and we use one temporal clip during inference for a fair comparison. “C”, “O” and “A” denote the ACC (%) for closed-set, open-set and all action categories, respectively. “AVG” denotes the average ACC over four test domains. * indicates the model variant with frozen text encoder. The bold/underlined numbers indicate the best/second best. We prioritize the average overall ACC as the primary metric in model comparison.

Models	UCF			HMDB			ARID			NEC-Dr			AVG		
	C	O	A	C	O	A	C	O	A	C	O	A	C	O	A
CLIP	66.71	59.53	63.15	49.19	35.26	44.27	37.76	12.65	27.69	10.42	22.44	16.59	41.04	32.47	37.92
ActionCLIP [4]	91.13	59.76	75.36	64.24	27.78	51.37	48.68	29.09	40.83	27.88	15.54	21.55	57.98	33.04	47.28
XCLIP [5]	92.02	55.11	73.49	54.76	26.31	44.75	34.49	28.35	31.99	28.93	5.70	17.16	52.55	28.87	41.85
Text4Vis [7]	90.47	61.03	75.69	58.47	29.60	48.37	53.43	38.10	46.97	29.77	9.05	19.20	58.04	34.45	<u>47.56</u>
ViFiCLIP [8]	84.01	68.28	72.54	64.68	22.02	49.48	53.89	28.09	43.51	31.48	14.00	22.57	<u>58.52</u>	33.10	47.03
*ViFiCLIP [8]	91.58	62.01	76.75	60.02	29.85	49.15	33.88	28.09	31.74	16.89	14.35	15.58	50.59	33.58	43.31
OpenVCLIP [9]	89.80	77.28	83.51	58.08	42.22	52.48	45.64	26.36	37.91	8.29	10.28	9.32	50.45	39.04	45.81
SATA (Ours)	88.51	65.70	77.05	61.54	41.98	54.63	56.94	25.61	44.38	32.41	10.53	21.18	59.45	35.95	49.31

checkpoints of each method, instead of retraining models. In the case of Kinetics150, we ensure a fair comparison by adopting consistent network architectures and training recipes across all the methods based on their official codes. During inference, we use one temporal clip for a fair comparison. We evaluate each checkpoint on all the four test domains of our XOV-Action benchmark, where different test domains have various types of domain gaps and differ in action category. For a comprehensive analysis, we report the accuracy of closed-set, open-set and all categories in individual test domains as well as the average accuracies. When conducting a comparison between different methods, we prioritize the average overall accuracy as the primary metric.

5.2 Results

Comparison with State-of-the-arts: The results are summarized in Table 2 and 3. As shown in the tables, by adapting CLIP to video data, previous CLIP-based video learners obtain substantial improvement over the original CLIP for cross-domain open-vocabulary action recognition. Although these methods show impressive performance for the domain with a small gap (UCF), they still exhibit limited performance for the domains with large gaps (ARID and NEC-Dr). These results reveal potential challenges of the task, as discussed in Section 1 and 3. By learning scene-agnostic video representations, our proposed SATA outperforms previous state-of-the-arts by 1.33% and 1.75% in terms of average overall accuracy for Kinetics150 and Kinetics400, respectively. These improvements are significant, especially considering that the metric is an average across four test domains.

Table 4: Ablation study of our proposed SATA trained on Kinetics150. ‘‘C’’, ‘‘O’’ and ‘‘A’’ denotes the ACC (%) for closed-set, open-set and all action categories, respectively. ‘‘AVG’’ denotes the average ACC over four test domains. The closed-set accuracy primarily evaluates the model abilities of tackling domain gaps when fitting training videos.

Models	UCF			HMDB			ARID			NEC-Dr			AVG		
	C	O	A	C	O	A	C	O	A	C	O	A	C	O	A
Baseline	84.04	62.22	73.08	57.59	44.59	53.00	47.35	26.52	39.00	21.30	14.04	17.57	52.57	36.84	45.66
+ L_{scene}	84.63	60.43	72.47	59.41	43.10	53.65	49.18	25.31	39.61	25.93	10.53	18.03	54.79	34.84	45.94
+ $L_{\text{scene}} \& L_{\text{action}}$	84.89	62.86	73.82	58.40	44.59	53.53	48.78	29.57	41.08	24.54	12.72	18.48	54.15	37.44	46.73

Ablation Study: Table 4 summarizes the results of our ablation study. In the table, the baseline refers to the model trained with the basic video-text alignment loss L_{vta} . By introducing our proposed Scene-Aware Discrimination loss L_{scene} , our model obtains improvement on XOV-Action in terms of closed-set accuracy on all the four test domains. Specifically, our model obtains significant improvements of 1.83% and 4.63% in terms of closed-set accuracy on ARID and NEC-Dr, which have large domain gaps with the training domain. This is because that L_{scene} encourages the video encoder to downweight the attention on scene information in videos and thus pay more attention to action information that are generalizable across different domains. However, we find that introducing only the Scene-Aware Discrimination loss reduces the open-set performance, leading to limited improvement in average overall accuracy on XOV-Action. By further introducing the Action-Aware Discrimination loss L_{action} , our model can obtain improved cross-domain closed-set accuracy over the baseline while maintaining the open-set accuracy on each test domain as much as possible, and this leads to an improvement of 1.07% in terms of average overall accuracy over the baseline.




Figure 3: Quantitative analysis of the total number of scene suffixes.




Figure 4: Quantitative analysis of the coefficient λ_{scene} for the Scene-Aware Discrimination loss by closed-set accuracy on four test domains. The horizontal axis shows the value of λ_{scene} .

Effect of Scene-Aware Discrimination: We conduct a quantitative analysis to the loss coefficient λ_{scene} , and the results on the four test domains are shown in Figure 4. The results in the figure show that our model consistently obtains better closed-set performance on all test domains with a larger loss weight. The comprehensive results demonstrate that our proposed Scene-Aware Discrimination loss effectively tackles various types of domain gaps by mitigating scene bias in fitting training videos.

Effect of Scene Suffixes: In Figure 3, we show how the suffix number affects the model performance. To show the loss effect more clearly, we set the loss coefficient $\lambda_{\text{scene}} = 0.5$ in this experiment. As shown in the figure, our model obtains better closed-set accuracy as the total number of scene suffixes increases. According to the design of our Scene-Aware Discrimination loss, we distinguish videos apart from more scene-encoded text prompts in representation space with more scene suffixes used. In this way, the video representations are less likely to be confused with scenes, leading to stronger abilities for recognizing actions in unseen domains.

Effect of Action-Aware Discrimination: Figure 5 intuitively shows how the Action-Aware Discrimination loss L_{action} affects representation space. As shown in the figure, without the L_{action} introduced, our Scene-Aware Discrimination loss may lead to higher similarity between a video and some non-ground-truth action texts compared with the scene-encoded text prompts in representation space, which would lead to confusion in video classification. By introducing L_{action} , our SATA produces a much more reasonable representation




Figure 5: Qualitative analysis by t-SNE [101].

space, where a video is more distant from the non-ground-truth action texts compared with the scene-encoded text prompts. For the analysis to the loss weight λ_{action} , please refer to the Appendix.

6 Conclusion

This work concentrates on a valuable but underexplored task, namely cross-domain open-vocabulary action recognition. By contributing the XOV-Action benchmark, we provided a comprehensive way to evaluate models across various types of domain gaps and different action categories, and our evaluation of five state-of-the-art CLIP-based video learners revealed the challenging nature of this valuable task. To address this task, we proposed a novel Scene-Aware video-Text Alignment (SATA) method, aiming to mitigate the scene bias when fitting training videos. Quantitative comparison on XOV-Action showed that our SATA can effectively improve the closed-set action recognition performance across domains while generally maintaining the open-set performance, and extensive analysis demonstrated the effectiveness of our method.

This work focuses on resolving the scene bias in current methodology, which mainly targets the cross-domain generalization for closed-set categories (*i.e.*, Challenge I discussed in Section 3). Despite our efforts, the task of cross-domain open-vocabulary action recognition still presents numerous challenges, including improving open-set recognition across domains and developing a unified model for all cases (Challenges II and III in Section 3). Fortunately, our proposed XOV-Action benchmark provides a comprehensive way for evaluation and analysis. We believe that our work will serve as a catalyst for further advancement, and we hope it will inspire future innovative solutions for this field.

References

- [1] Yu Kong and Yun Fu. Human action recognition and prediction: A survey. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 130(5):1366–1401, 2022.
- [2] Zehua Sun, Qihong Ke, Hossein Rahmani, Mohammed Bennamoun, Gang Wang, and Jun Liu. Human action recognition from various data modalities: A review. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 45(3):3200–3225, 2023.
- [3] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021.
- [4] Mengmeng Wang, Jiazheng Xing, and Yong Liu. ActionCLIP: A new paradigm for video action recognition. *CoRR*, abs/2109.08472, 2021.
- [5] Bolin Ni, Houwen Peng, Minghao Chen, Songyang Zhang, Gaofeng Meng, Jianlong Fu, Shiming Xiang, and Haibin Ling. Expanding language-image pretrained models for general video recognition. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2022.
- [6] Chen Ju, Tengda Han, Kunhao Zheng, Ya Zhang, and Weidi Xie. Prompting visual-language models for efficient video understanding. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2022.
- [7] Wenhao Wu, Zhun Sun, and Wanli Ouyang. Revisiting classifier: Transferring vision-language models for video recognition. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2023.
- [8] Hanoona Abdul Rasheed, Muhammad Uzair Khattak, Muhammad Maaz, Salman H. Khan, and Fahad Shahbaz Khan. Fine-tuned CLIP models are efficient video learners. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023.
- [9] Zejia Weng, Xitong Yang, Ang Li, Zuxuan Wu, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Open-VCLIP: Transforming CLIP to an open-vocabulary video model via interpolated weight optimization. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2023.
- [10] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Two-stream convolutional networks for action recognition in videos. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2014.
- [11] Limin Wang, Yuanjun Xiong, Zhe Wang, Yu Qiao, Dahua Lin, Xiaoou Tang, and Luc Van Gool. Temporal Segment Networks: Towards good practices for deep action recognition. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2016.

- [12] Ji Lin, Chuang Gan, and Song Han. TSM: Temporal shift module for efficient video understanding. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019.
- [13] João Carreira and Andrew Zisserman. Quo Vadis, Action Recognition? A new model and the kinetics dataset. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2017.
- [14] Gedas Bertasius, Heng Wang, and Lorenzo Torresani. Is space-time attention all you need for video understanding? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021.
- [15] Min-Hung Chen, Zsolt Kira, Ghassan Alregib, Jaekwon Yoo, Ruxin Chen, and Jian Zheng. Temporal attentive alignment for large-scale video domain adaptation. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019.
- [16] Zhiyu Yao, Yunbo Wang, Jianmin Wang, Philip S. Yu, and Mingsheng Long. VideoDG: Generalizing temporal relations in videos to novel domains. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 44(11):7989–8004, 2022.
- [17] Khurram Soomro, Amir Roshan Zamir, and Mubarak Shah. UCF101: A dataset of 101 human actions classes from videos in the wild. *CoRR*, abs/1212.0402, 2012.
- [18] Hildegard Kuehne, Hueihan Jhuang, Estíbaliz Garrote, Tomaso A. Poggio, and Thomas Serre. HMDB: A large video database for human motion recognition. In *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2011.
- [19] Yuecong Xu, Jianfei Yang, Haozhi Cao, Kezhi Mao, Jianxiong Yin, and Simon See. ARID: A comprehensive study on recognizing actions in the dark and a new benchmark dataset. *CoRR*, abs/2006.03876, 2020.
- [20] Jinwoo Choi, Gaurav Sharma, Manmohan Chandraker, and Jia-Bin Huang. Unsupervised and semi-supervised domain adaptation for action recognition from drones. In *IEEE Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2020.
- [21] Yingwei Li, Yi Li, and Nuno Vasconcelos. RESOUND: Towards action recognition without representation bias. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2018.
- [22] Jinwoo Choi, Chen Gao, Joseph C. E. Messou, and Jia-Bin Huang. Why Can't I Dance in the Mall? Learning to mitigate scene bias in action recognition. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- [23] Jinwoo Choi, Gaurav Sharma, Samuel Schulter, and Jia-Bin Huang. Shuffle and attend: Video domain adaptation. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2020.
- [24] Jinpeng Wang, Yuting Gao, Ke Li, Yiqi Lin, Andy J. Ma, Hao Cheng, Pai Peng, Feiyue Huang, Rongrong Ji, and Xing Sun. Removing the background by adding the background: Towards background robust self-supervised video representation learning. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021.
- [25] Haoxin Li, Yuan Liu, Hanwang Zhang, and Boyang Li. Mitigating and evaluating static bias of action representations in the background and the foreground. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023.
- [26] Yuanhao Zhai, Ziyi Liu, Zhenyu Wu, Yi Wu, Chunluan Zhou, David S. Doermann, Junsong Yuan, and Gang Hua. SOAR: Scene-debiasing open-set action recognition. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023.
- [27] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. ImageNet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2012.
- [28] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2015.
- [29] Christian Szegedy, Wei Liu, Yangqing Jia, Pierre Sermanet, Scott E. Reed, Dragomir Anguelov, Dumitru Erhan, Vincent Vanhoucke, and Andrew Rabinovich. Going deeper with convolutions. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2015.
- [30] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016.

- [31] Ilya Sutskever, Oriol Vinyals, and Quoc V. Le. Sequence to sequence learning with neural networks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2014.
- [32] Kyunghyun Cho, Bart van Merriënboer, Çaglar Gülçehre, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Fethi Bougares, Holger Schwenk, and Yoshua Bengio. Learning phrase representations using RNN encoder-decoder for statistical machine translation. In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2014.
- [33] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.
- [34] Bolei Zhou, Alex Andonian, Aude Oliva, and Antonio Torralba. Temporal relational reasoning in videos. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2018.
- [35] Hao Shao, Shengju Qian, and Yu Liu. Temporal interlacing network. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2020.
- [36] Swathikiran Sudhakaran, Sergio Escalera, and Oswald Lanz. Gate-shift networks for video action recognition. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020.
- [37] Du Tran, Lubomir D. Bourdev, Rob Fergus, Lorenzo Torresani, and Manohar Paluri. Learning spatiotemporal features with 3D convolutional networks. In *IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2015.
- [38] Du Tran, Heng Wang, Lorenzo Torresani, Jamie Ray, Yann LeCun, and Manohar Paluri. A closer look at spatiotemporal convolutions for action recognition. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2018.
- [39] Du Tran, Heng Wang, Matt Feiszli, and Lorenzo Torresani. Video classification with channel-separated convolutional networks. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019.
- [40] Christoph Feichtenhofer. X3D: Expanding architectures for efficient video recognition. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020.
- [41] Shiwen Zhang, Sheng Guo, Weilin Huang, Matthew R. Scott, and Limin Wang. V4D: 4D convolutional neural networks for video-level representation learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [42] Kunchang Li, Xianhang Li, Yali Wang, Jun Wang, and Yu Qiao. CT-Net: Channel tensorization network for video classification. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [43] Rohit Girdhar, João Carreira, Carl Doersch, and Andrew Zisserman. Video action transformer network. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019.
- [44] Daniel Neimark, Omri Bar, Maya Zohar, and Dotan Asselmann. Video transformer network. *CoRR*, abs/2102.00719, 2021.
- [45] Hao Zhang, Yanbin Hao, and Chong-Wah Ngo. Token shift transformer for video classification. In *ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2021.
- [46] Yanyi Zhang, Xinyu Li, Chunhui Liu, Bing Shuai, Yi Zhu, Biagio Brattoli, Hao Chen, Ivan Marsic, and Joseph Tighe. VidTr: Video transformer without convolutions. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021.
- [47] Anurag Arnab, Mostafa Dehghani, Georg Heigold, Chen Sun, Mario Lucic, and Cordelia Schmid. ViViT: A video vision transformer. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021.
- [48] Junnan Li, Ramprasaath R. Selvaraju, Akhilesh Gotmare, Shafiq R. Joty, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Chu-Hong Hoi. Align before Fuse: Vision and language representation learning with momentum distillation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [49] Ziyi Lin, Shijie Geng, Renrui Zhang, Peng Gao, Gerard de Melo, Xiaogang Wang, Jifeng Dai, Yu Qiao, and Hongsheng Li. Frozen CLIP models are efficient video learners. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2022.
- [50] Wenhao Wu, Xiaohan Wang, Haipeng Luo, Jingdong Wang, Yi Yang, and Wanli Ouyang. Bidirectional cross-modal knowledge exploration for video recognition with pre-trained vision-language models. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023.

- [51] Zhiwu Qing, Shiwei Zhang, Ziyuan Huang, Yingya Zhang, Changxin Gao, Deli Zhao, and Nong Sang. Disentangling spatial and temporal learning for efficient image-to-video transfer learning. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023.
- [52] Kumara Kahatapitiya, Anurag Arnab, Arsha Nagrani, and Michael S. Ryoo. Victr: Video-conditioned text representations for activity recognition. *CoRR*, abs/2304.02560, 2023.
- [53] Yifei Chen, Dapeng Chen, Ruijin Liu, Hao Li, and Wei Peng. Video action recognition with attentive semantic units. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023.
- [54] Xiaohu Huang, Hao Zhou, Kun Yao, and Kai Han. FROSTER: Frozen CLIP is a strong teacher for open-vocabulary action recognition. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.
- [55] Mengmeng Wang, Jiazheng Xing, Boyuan Jiang, Jun Chen, Jianbiao Mei, Xingxing Zuo, Guang Dai, Jingdong Wang, and Yong Liu. A multimodal, multi-task adapting framework for video action recognition. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2024.
- [56] Waqas Sultani and Imran Saleemi. Human action recognition across datasets by foreground-weighted histogram decomposition. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2014.
- [57] Tiantian Xu, Fan Zhu, Edward K. Wong, and Yi Fang. Dual many-to-one-encoder-based transfer learning for cross-dataset human action recognition. *Image and Vision Computing*, 55:127–137, 2016.
- [58] Arshad Jamal, Vinay P. Namboodiri, Dipti Deodhare, and K. S. Venkatesh. Deep domain adaptation in action space. In *British Machine Vision Conference*, 2018.
- [59] Yuecong Xu, Jianfei Yang, Haozhi Cao, Zhenghua Chen, Qi Li, and Kezhi Mao. Partial video domain adaptation with partial adversarial temporal attentive network. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021.
- [60] Pau Panareda Busto, Ahsan Iqbal, and Juergen Gall. Open set domain adaptation for image and action recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 42(2):413–429, 2020.
- [61] Yuecong Xu, Jianfei Yang, Haozhi Cao, Keyu Wu, Min Wu, and Zhenghua Chen. Source-free video domain adaptation by learning temporal consistency for action recognition. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2022.
- [62] Boxiao Pan, Zhangjie Cao, Ehsan Adeli, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Adversarial cross-domain action recognition with co-attention. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2020.
- [63] Yuecong Xu, Haozhi Cao, Kezhi Mao, Zhenghua Chen, Lihua Xie, and Jianfei Yang. Aligning correlation information for domain adaptation in action recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2023.
- [64] Yadan Luo, Zi Huang, Zijian Wang, Zheng Zhang, and Mahsa Baktashmotlagh. Adversarial bipartite graph learning for video domain adaptation. In *ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 2020.
- [65] Aadarsh Sahoo, Rutav Shah, Rameswar Panda, Kate Saenko, and Abir Das. Contrast and mix: Temporal contrastive video domain adaptation with background mixing. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- [66] Jonathan Munro and Dima Damen. Multi-modal domain adaptation for fine-grained action recognition. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020.
- [67] Xiaolin Song, Sicheng Zhao, Jingyu Yang, Huanjing Yue, Pengfei Xu, Runbo Hu, and Hua Chai. Spatio-temporal contrastive domain adaptation for action recognition. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021.
- [68] Donghyun Kim, Yi-Hsuan Tsai, Bingbing Zhuang, Xiang Yu, Stan Sclaroff, Kate Saenko, and Manmohan Chandraker. Learning cross-modal contrastive features for video domain adaptation. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021.
- [69] Lijin Yang, Yifei Huang, Yusuke Sugano, and Yoichi Sato. Interact before align: Leveraging cross-modal knowledge for domain adaptive action recognition. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022.
- [70] Yunhua Zhang, Hazel Doughty, Ling Shao, and Cees G. M. Snoek. Audio-adaptive activity recognition across video domains. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022.

- [71] Mirco Planamente, Chiara Plizzari, Emanuele Alberti, and Barbara Caputo. Domain generalization through audio-visual relative norm alignment in first person action recognition. In *IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2022.
- [72] Kun-Yu Lin, Jia-Run Du, Yipeng Gao, Jiaming Zhou, and Wei-Shi Zheng. Diversifying spatial-temporal perception for video domain generalization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- [73] Chiara Plizzari, Toby Perrett, Barbara Caputo, and Dima Damen. What can a cook in Italy teach a mechanic in India? Action recognition generalisation over scenarios and locations. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023.
- [74] Yanghao Li, Haoqi Fan, Ronghang Hu, Christoph Feichtenhofer, and Kaiming He. Scaling language-image pre-training via masking. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023.
- [75] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, Roman Ring, Eliza Rutherford, Serkan Cabi, Tengda Han, Zhitao Gong, Sina Samangooei, Marianne Monteiro, Jacob L. Menick, Sebastian Borgeaud, Andy Brock, Aida Nematzadeh, Sahand Sharifzadeh, Mikolaj Binkowski, Ricardo Barreira, Oriol Vinyals, Andrew Zisserman, and Karén Simonyan. Flamingo: A visual language model for few-shot learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [76] Lu Yuan, Dongdong Chen, Yi-Ling Chen, Noel Codella, Xiyang Dai, Jianfeng Gao, Houdong Hu, Xuedong Huang, Boxin Li, Chunyuan Li, Ce Liu, Mengchen Liu, Zicheng Liu, Yumao Lu, Yu Shi, Lijuan Wang, Jianfeng Wang, Bin Xiao, Zhen Xiao, Jianwei Yang, Michael Zeng, Luwei Zhou, and Pengchuan Zhang. Florence: A new foundation model for computer vision. *CoRR*, abs/2111.11432, 2021.
- [77] Jiahui Yu, Zirui Wang, Vijay Vasudevan, Legg Yeung, Mojtaba Seyedhosseini, and Yonghui Wu. CoCa: Contrastive captioners are image-text foundation models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2022.
- [78] Yifan Du, Zikang Liu, Junyi Li, and Wayne Xin Zhao. A survey of vision-language pre-trained models. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2022.
- [79] Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. Learning to prompt for vision-language models. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 130(9):2337–2348, 2022.
- [80] Tao Yu, Zhihe Lu, Xin Jin, Zhibo Chen, and Xinchao Wang. Task residual for tuning vision-language models. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023.
- [81] Junting Pan, Ziyi Lin, Xiatian Zhu, Jing Shao, and Hongsheng Li. St-adapter: Parameter-efficient image-to-video transfer learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [82] Kaiyang Zhou, Jingkang Yang, Chen Change Loy, and Ziwei Liu. Conditional prompt learning for vision-language models. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022.
- [83] Ruyang Liu, Jingjia Huang, Ge Li, Jiashi Feng, Xinglong Wu, and Thomas H. Li. Revisiting temporal modeling for CLIP-based image-to-video knowledge transferring. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023.
- [84] Jianzong Wu, Xiangtai Li, Shilin Xu, Haobo Yuan, Henghui Ding, Yibo Yang, Xia Li, Jiangning Zhang, Yunhai Tong, Xudong Jiang, Bernard Ghanem, and Dacheng Tao. Towards open vocabulary learning: A survey. *CoRR*, abs/2306.15880, 2023.
- [85] Xiuye Gu, Tsung-Yi Lin, Weicheng Kuo, and Yin Cui. Open-vocabulary object detection via vision and language knowledge distillation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [86] Boyi Li, Kilian Q. Weinberger, Serge J. Belongie, Vladlen Koltun, and René Ranftl. Language-driven semantic segmentation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.
- [87] Syed Talal Wasim, Muzammal Naseer, Salman H. Khan, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Mubarak Shah. Vita-CLIP: Video and text adaptive CLIP via multimodal prompting. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023.
- [88] Hu Xu, Gargi Ghosh, Po-Yao Huang, Dmytro Okhonko, Armen Aghajanyan, Florian Metze, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. VideoCLIP: Contrastive pre-training for zero-shot video-text understanding. In *Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2021.

- [89] Dongxu Li, Junnan Li, Hongdong Li, Juan Carlos Niebles, and Steven C. H. Hoi. Align and Prompt: Video-and-language pre-training with entity prompts. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022.
- [90] Junke Wang, Dongdong Chen, Zuxuan Wu, Chong Luo, Luwei Zhou, Yucheng Zhao, Yujia Xie, Ce Liu, Yu-Gang Jiang, and Lu Yuan. OmniVL: One foundation model for image-language and video-language tasks. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022.
- [91] Liliane Momeni, Mathilde Caron, Arsha Nagrani, Andrew Zisserman, and Cordelia Schmid. Verbs in action: Improving verb understanding in video-language models. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023.
- [92] Jingjia Huang, Yinan Li, Jiashi Feng, Xinglong Wu, Xiaoshuai Sun, and Rongrong Ji. Clover: Towards a unified video-language alignment and fusion model. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023.
- [93] Feng Cheng, Xizi Wang, Jie Lei, David J. Crandall, Mohit Bansal, and Gedas Bertasius. VindLU: A recipe for effective video-and-language pretraining. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023.
- [94] Mamshad Nayeem Rizve, Fan Fei, Jayakrishnan Unnikrishnan, Son Tran, Benjamin Z. Yao, Belinda Zeng, Mubarak Shah, and Trishul Chilimbi. VidLA: Video-language alignment at scale. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024.
- [95] Fan Ma, Xiaojie Jin, Heng Wang, Jingjia Huang, Linchao Zhu, and Yi Yang. Stitching segments and sentences towards generalization in video-text pre-training. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2024.
- [96] Yuecong Xu, Jianfei Yang, Haozhi Cao, Keyu Wu, Min Wu, Zhengguo Li, and Zhenghua Chen. Multi-source video domain adaptation with temporal attentive moment alignment network. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 33(8):3860–3871, 2023.
- [97] Biagio Brattoli, Joseph Tighe, Fedor Zhdanov, Pietro Perona, and Krzysztof Chalupka. Rethinking zero-shot video classification: End-to-end training for realistic applications. In *IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020.
- [98] Shizhe Chen and Dong Huang. Elaborative rehearsal for zero-shot action recognition. In *IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021.
- [99] OpenAI. GPT-4 technical report, 2023.
- [100] Pavel Izmailov, Dmitrii Podoprikin, Timur Garipov, Dmitry P. Vetrov, and Andrew Gordon Wilson. Averaging weights leads to wider optima and better generalization. In *Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 2018.
- [101] Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. Visualizing data using t-SNE. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9(11), 2008.