
TVTSv2: Learning Out-of-the-box Spatiotemporal Visual Representations at Scale

Ziyun Zeng^{1,2*} Yixiao Ge^{2,3†} Zhan Tong³ Xihui Liu⁴ Shu-Tao Xia¹ Ying Shan^{2,3}
¹ Tsinghua University ² ARC Lab, Tencent PCG ³ Tencent AI Lab
⁴ The University of Hong Kong
† project lead

Abstract

The ultimate goal for foundation models is realizing task-agnostic, *i.e.*, supporting out-of-the-box usage without task-specific fine-tuning. Although breakthroughs have been made in natural language processing and image representation learning, it is still challenging for video models to reach it due to the increasing uncertainty of spatiotemporal signals. To ease training, existing works leverage image foundation models' prior knowledge and equip them with efficient temporal modules. Despite the satisfactory fine-tuning performance, we empirically find they fall short of out-of-the-box usage, given the even degraded performance in zero-shot/linear protocols compared to their baseline counterparts. In this work, we analyze the factor that leads to degradation from the perspective of language supervision distortion. We argue that tuning a text encoder end-to-end, as done in previous work, is suboptimal since it may overfit in terms of styles, thereby losing its original generalization ability to capture the semantics of various language registers. The overfitted text encoder, in turn, provides a harmful supervision signal, degrading the video representation. To tackle this issue, we propose a degradation-free pre-training strategy to retain the generalization ability of the text encoder via freezing shallow layers while enabling the task-related semantics capturing in tunable deep layers. As for the training objective, we adopted the transcript sorting task in TVTS [70] incorporated with masking techniques [32] to enable scalable training. As a result, we produce a series of models, dubbed TVTSv2, with up to one billion parameters. We achieve new state-of-the-arts on various video benchmarks with a frozen backbone, surpassing the recent ImageBind, InternVideo, *etc.* Code is available at <https://github.com/TencentARC/TVTS>.

1 Introduction

Learning universal representations that work out of the box² on any downstream task is the ultimate goal for foundation models. Inspired by the significant success of large language models [46, 47, 5, 37, 39] in natural language processing, a series of efforts have been devoted to migrating this paradigm to computer vision, *e.g.*, CLIP [45], DINO v2 [38], and ImageBind [18]. They pre-train visual models with web-crawled or curated data and enable emerging image-centric applications with pre-trained and frozen visual representations, *e.g.*, zero-shot image classification, and retrieval.

Despite the progress in learning all-purpose image features, there is still a long way to go in the video domain. Given the increasing uncertainty of spatiotemporal signals compared to sole spatial ones, it poses a great challenge for learning task-agnostic and universal video representations. To meet the

*Work done during internship at ARC Lab, Tencent PCG

²The term "out-of-the-box" indicates that the learned features can be used directly for novel tasks (*e.g.*, zero-shot, linear probing) without tailored fine-tuning.




Figure 1: (a) An overview of the out-of-the-box capability of our learned video representations. ZS, AR, and T2V denote zero-shot, action recognition, and text-to-video retrieval, respectively. (b) Visualization of the self-attention distribution of our pre-trained video model. Taking the corresponding class name or caption as a reference, we observe that our video features can well capture the key spatiotemporal context, which explains our good out-of-the-box ability.

demand for out-of-the-box usage, a straightforward solution is to scale up the pre-trained video data to cover most distributions. Unfortunately, such an idea is in contrast to the fact that the magnitude of publicly accessible videos is much smaller than images, *e.g.*, HowTo100M [35] versus LAION-5B [50]. Moreover, the nearly quadratic-increased computational overhead in Transformer [53] is generally unaffordable for training video foundation models at a billion scale.

Some works, therefore, turn to exploit the pre-learned spatial prior in image foundation models and adapt them to the video domain by equipping them with temporal reasoning modules, *e.g.*, the recent CLIP-ViP [66]. Although such methods achieve state-of-the-art performance when fine-tuned on specific downstream tasks, off-the-shelf video representations are not yet suitable for out-of-the-box usage, exhibiting poor zero-shot/linear results and even degradation from CLIP baselines. This may be the reason why frame-level CLIP features are still widely used as video feature extractors [29, 9] despite many efforts that have been made in developing video models. There is a need for real video foundation models that can generate general-purpose video representations.

In this paper, we conduct an in-depth empirical analysis of why previous video models degraded. Intuitively, the performance degradation mainly comes from the overfitting on the relatively small-scale post-pretrain data, sacrificing the generalization ability of the original foundation models. To this end, many existing works focused on efficient visual tuning with adapters [40, 68], while ignoring the potentially overfitted text encoder, which produces distorted text supervision that could, in turn, degrades video representations.

Different from the sole caption knowledge learned from the image foundation models, video data introduces ASR transcripts, which contain temporal dependency and facilitate temporal reasoning, and have been widely adopted in recent literature [66, 70] to boost spatiotemporal learning. Such supervision provides valuable temporal information but shows a great domain gap from the pre-learned alt-text. Our extensive experiments reveal that performance degradation in prior methods stems from the text encoder’s compromised capabilities of generalizing to various language styles due to the end-to-end fine-tuning with noisy ASR transcripts. This not only hinders the proper semantic capture behind the ASR transcripts but also impairs pre-learned language knowledge within the text model, thus negatively affecting video representation learning.

Given the observations, we propose a degradation-free pre-training strategy with a partially frozen text encoder, *i.e.*, the shallow layers are frozen while the deep layers are tunable. With such a strategy, the pre-trained text encoder can generalize well to various language registers with different styles, *e.g.*, ASR transcripts for training, and search queries for downstream retrieval. The new language semantics and structures can be captured in deep layers, thus producing semantically meaningful learning targets to advance out-of-the-box video representation learning. Regarding the training objective, we adopt the pretext task of Turning to Video for Transcript Sorting (TVTS) [70] for its superior performance. To further scale up training to pursue state-of-the-art performance, we adopt

the masking strategy without reconstruction [32] to enable affordable training with larger backbone architectures. As a result, we successfully trained huge-size models with one billion parameters in total using 80 V100 GPUs in one week.

Finally, we offer a series of pre-trained models, dubbed TVTSv2, from base size to huge size. Compared to the original TVTS [70], we inherit the rich semantic knowledge learned from CLIP-pretrained models and scale up the models by up to 7 times. The knowledge inheritance is actually not trivial given the degradation of prior methods [66, 58] as we discussed above. As illustrated in Figure 1 (a), our pre-trained model produces all-purpose spatiotemporal visual representations, that can be used for zero-shot/linear video classification, and zero-shot video-text retrieval on various datasets out of the box. It is well noticeable that our TVTSv2 surpasses the recent SOTAs, *i.e.*, ImageBind [18] and InternVideo [61], on zero-shot video classification and retrieval, despite more data or more modalities they leveraged. Surprisingly, we also achieve comparable performance to DINOv2-g [6] on linear K400 with 40% fewer parameters. The encouraging results shed light on the direction of developing general-purpose video foundation models.

2 Related Works

Out-of-the-box Video Representations. In out-of-the-box image representation learning, the supervision signal may come from web-crawled images [38], descriptive texts [45, 22], or other modalities [18], where the second one dominates the literature. Similarly, in the video domain, a bunch of works has made an effort to shift such a paradigm to pursue out-of-the-box video representations. For instance, TVTS [70] adopts a dual-stream architecture and learns fine-grained spatiotemporal representation by resorting to videos for transcript sorting. CLIP4Clip [34] stacks a temporal Transformer on top of the origin CLIP to aggregate frame representations. CLIP-ViP [66] plugs several video proxy tokens that attend to different frames for temporal summarization. InternVideo [61] inherits UniFormerV2 [30] and stacks a cross-modal decoder to enable delicate video-text interaction. Other works either focus on improving vision signals [62] or accessing more modalities [18]. However, their improvement in zero-shot and linear probe evaluation is marginal, indicating there is still a long way to reach general-purpose video representation.

Domain Specialists for Video Tasks. Besides the video pre-training, another line of research adapted the pre-trained foundation models to the specific video tasks for obtaining domain experts. They reach in-domain gains in two technical routes: (i) Designing proper objectives. For instance, Pace [55] and SVT [48] learn invariant spatiotemporal characteristics, *e.g.*, motion correspondences of different objects, by aligning clips sampled in a different frame rate. (ii) Parameter-efficient tuning. For example, ST-adapter [40] and AIM [68] plug several tunable spatial and temporal adapters into each attention block, leaving the original parameters frozen. Similarly, visual prompts [24, 23] replace the manually constructed prompt [45] with learnable ones to raise instance-specific representations. Nevertheless, such a paradigm is opposite to general-purpose video representation learning, making them inflexible in novel scenarios for real-world applications.

Scalable Visual Pre-training. Plenty of work are devoted to improving the model scalability in two aspects: (i) Scale-up data. In the video domain, some work harvests from alt-text-video pairs [2, 67] due to the high-quality descriptions, while the available data is limited. The follow-up works utilize ASR transcripts derived from the raw video [69, 35, 65] for better scalability. In this work, we reuse the transcript sorting objective [70] for scalable spatiotemporal learning. (ii) Reducing computational overheads. The video pre-training is restricted to the quadratically-increased self-attention complexity so far. Masked visual modeling is proposed to improve the efficiency of pre-training, which drops a large portion of visual tokens and reconstructs them given unmasked ones. Although solid results have been reached under a high masking ratio [13, 52, 56], these works are short of out-of-the-box transferability due to train-test mismatch. Recently, FLIP [32] directly conducts image-text contrastive pre-training based on masked visual tokens and achieves favorable results. Inspired by this work, we train the models with up to one billion parameters by properly incorporating masking.

3 Method

In this section, we introduce how to learn out-of-the-box video representations at scale without the performance degradation of the image pre-trained knowledge. Our main framework is illustrated




Figure 2: Our training framework. A large portion of patches from sampled frames is first dropped out via random tube masking before being sent into a Vision Transformer equipped with divided space-time attention for encoding video representations. The corresponding ASR transcripts are shuffled and embedded by a partially frozen text encoder. The disposable joint attention (only for training) is performed among all video and text representations for predicting the transcripts’ chronological order, formulated by a K -way classification objective.

in Figure 2, where the trained Vision Transformer is deployed for extracting video features that work out of the box on downstream tasks. We will introduce our model architectures in Section 3.1, our partially frozen training strategy to avoid knowledge degradation in Section 3.2, our masking mechanism to enable scalable pre-training in Section 3.3, and our training objectives in Section 3.4.

3.1 Model Architectures

To inherit the knowledge of pre-trained image foundation models, *i.e.*, CLIP, we apply the dual-stream framework, which consists of a visual encoder and a text encoder. We extend the visual encoder to the video domain by equipping it with divided space-time attention following the practice in [3].

Video Encoder. We adopt the standard Vision Transformer (ViT) [12] with L_V layers as the video encoder and add divided space-time attention [3] in each layer for spatiotemporal reasoning. Given T frames sampled from a video with a resolution of $3 \times H \times W$, we split each frame into patches of size $P \times P$, then project them to a token sequence $v \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times N \times D_V}$, where $N = HW/P^2$ and $v_i \in \mathbb{R}^{D_V}$ denotes the i -th token with a dimension D_V . Next, learnable spatial and temporal positional embeddings, denoted as $\mathbf{E}^s \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D_V}$ and $\mathbf{E}^t \in \mathbb{R}^{T \times D_V}$, are added to each token, *i.e.*,

$$v_{x,y}^{(0)} = v_{x,y} + \mathbf{E}_x^s + \mathbf{E}_y^t \quad (1)$$

where $v_{x,y}$ denotes the x -th token sampled from the y -th frame. All x -th tokens sampled from different frames are given the same spatial positional embedding, and all tokens belonging to the y -th frame are given the same temporal positional embedding. Finally, a learnable [CLS] token $v_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{D_V}$ is concatenated at the beginning of the sequence, and we perform divided space-time attention across the L_V layers. The [CLS] token output by the L_V -th layer is further projected to a D -dimensional shared space and used as our final video representation for out-of-the-box usage.

Text Encoder. The text encoder contains L_T stacked Transformer blocks. Following CLIP [45], we adopt the casual attention mechanism. Similar to the visual branch, we project the [CLS] token $t_0 \in \mathbb{R}^{D_T}$ output by the last layer to the D -dimensional shared space as the final text representation.

3.2 Degradation-free Pre-Training with Partially Frozen Text Encoder

Learning video representations with the assistance of text dominates recent literature [2, 16, 66]. There are two main lines of research: (i) Learning video features under alt-text supervision, *i.e.*, video caption. The alt-text is generally clean but hard to scale up, *e.g.*, WebVid-10M [2]. (ii) Using the ASR transcripts as supervision which are naturally tied with the video and easy to scale up,

e.g., YT-Temporal [69]. Despite some noise, transcripts generally provide temporal dependency that facilitates temporal reasoning.

Existing methods using only alt-text [2, 16, 17] are proven to improve video tasks marginally due to the limited amount of such data. Subsequent works [70, 66] have focused more on the proper utilization of large-scale ASR transcripts in order to improve the ability of temporal modeling on downstream tasks. Despite the impressive results after fine-tuning, their out-of-the-box video representations are actually degraded compared to the pre-trained image counterparts, i.e., the zero-shot capability is inferior to simply aggregating the frame-level image features. The recent CLIP-ViP [66] argued that it is mainly caused by the domain gap between ASR transcripts and downstream captions, and proposed to use auxiliary captions generated by OFA [59] for training. Unfortunately, the generated captions actually do not work for out-of-the-box video representation learning. Our detailed empirical analysis is as follows.

An empirical study of video degradation. As shown in Table 1, we test the out-of-the-box capability of the learned video representations by measuring the video-text Mean Matched Similarity and text-to-video Recall@1 on DiDeMo [1], and Top-1/5 linearly probing accuracies on Kinetics-400 [25].

As illustrated in L1-2 of Table 1, we observe that the CLIP-ViP [66] trained with OFA-generated captions still faces performance degradation compared to the CLIP baseline. In order to further distinguish the effects of the noisy generated captions from the domain gap, we first build a baseline initialized from CLIP-ViT-B/32, namely **M₁-FT**, and end-to-end optimize the visual and text models with Video-Text Contrastive solely. The results in Table 1 show more degradation than CLIP-ViP. Next, we add an alt-text training source, i.e., WebVid2.5M [2], denoted as **M₂-FT**, and slightly outperforms CLIP-ViP because the text quality is better than OFA-generated ones. However, **M₂-FT** still lags behind the baseline, indicating that *simply reducing the domain gap has minor improvements but cannot solve the degradation problem.*

Since CLIP has reached the highest MMS and R@1 so far, we assume that the text knowledge learned from alt-text-image pairs is somewhat suitable for zero-shot inference in the video domain. The end-to-end tuning paradigm is suboptimal and incurs catastrophic forgetting for the text branch, which in turn provides distorted supervision for the visual branch and hurts out-of-the-box ability. To verify our assumption, we retrain **M₂-FT** with a fully frozen text encoder, denoted as **M₂-FF**. However, it performs worse, indicating that the pre-trained and frozen text encoder fails to correctly capture the language semantics and produce harmful learning targets.

Given the above observations, we come up with a simple yet effective training strategy, namely partially frozen (PF), which freezes the shallow layers of the text encoder. Such a strategy promotes the text encoder’s generalizability *w.r.t.* different language registers with varying styles. The semantics and structures of ASR transcripts are captured in deep layers, producing semantically meaningful supervision signals to facilitate out-of-the-box video representation learning. In our practice, we freeze the first three-quarters of layers, leaving other layers trainable. As shown in Table 1, the model that adopts the partially frozen training strategy, i.e., **M₂-PF**, yields a significant improvement over the baseline. *Pre-training with a partially frozen text encoder could well preserve the knowledge of the CLIP-pretrained model and unleash it for learning strong out-of-the-box video representations.*

3.3 Scalable Pre-training with Masked Video Encoder

We aim to pursue scalable video representation learning with larger backbone architectures in order to achieve better out-of-the-box capabilities. However, the token length, i.e., $T * N$, is always a bottleneck for scaling up video training due to spatiotemporal attention’s drastically increased computational budget. The recent VideoMAEs [52, 56] improve training efficiency by masking a high proportion of patches, significantly reducing the token length. A similar practice was observed in

Table 1: The Mean Matched Similarity (MMS), Recall@1 (R@1) and top-K (K=1, 5) accuracy of different models. The tests are done with the officially released ViT-B/32 models. **M₁** is trained with YT-Temporal, and **M₂** is jointly trained with YT-Temporal and WebVid-2.5M.

Method	Text Corpus	DiDeMo		Kinetics-400	
		MMS	R@1	Top-1	Top-5
CLIP	-	0.295	24.7	64.5	86.7
CLIP-ViP	ASR + generated-alt-text	0.221	22.6	-	-
M₁-FT	ASR	0.215	19.3	61.7	84.9
M₂-FT	ASR + alt-text	0.234	24.2	64.0	86.1
M₂-FF	ASR + alt-text	0.187	21.9	63.5	85.9
M₂-PF	ASR + alt-text	0.340	29.8	67.1	88.2

image pre-training, *i.e.*, FLIP [32]. Inspired by their success, we experiment with video pre-training at high mask ratios without reconstruction.

Specifically, we employed the tube masking approach introduced by VideoMAE [52] because it’s compatible with divided space-time attention and can effectively diminish temporal redundancy. Essentially, this method randomly blocks $\rho\%$ of patches from the same position across various frames, resulting in a token length of $TN(1 - \rho)$. For this study, we set $\rho \geq 50\%$, translating to at least half of the computational budget being reduced. This ensures our approach can be scaled to models with billions of parameters.

3.4 Training Objectives

Transcript Sorting (TS). Sorting the unordered transcripts given ordered video patches has been proven effective for learning sophisticated spatiotemporal interaction [70]. In this work, we further reveal the scalability of TS for training large models under a high mask ratio. Given translated words and their timestamps $\{w_i, a_i\}_{i=1}^{N_w}$, where w_i denotes the i -th word, a_i denotes its corresponding timestamp (in seconds), and N_w denotes the word number, we first sample K transcript segments $\{T_k\}_{k=1}^K$ of length l (in seconds) with an interval of 1s between consecutive segments:

$$\begin{aligned} L_k &= L_{\text{start}} + (k - 1) * (l + 1) \\ T_k &= \{w_i | a_i \in [L_k, L_k + l]\} \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where L_{start} denotes a randomly picked starting time, and L_k denotes the beginning time of the k -th segments. Then we randomly shuffle the K segments to $\{T_{o_i}\}_{i=1}^K$, where T_{o_i} denotes the i -th segment in the shuffled sequence corresponding to the ground-truth chronological order o_i . As for frame sampling, we follow TSN [57] to divide the overall interval, *i.e.*, $[L_1, L_K + l]$, into T equal-space intervals and randomly sample 1 frame per interval.

After encoding sampled transcript segments and frames, we concatenate the text [CLS] tokens $\{t_0^i\}_{i=1}^K$ with all unmasked video tokens $\{v_i\}_{i=0}^{TN\rho}$ and perform joint attention across them. Next, we send the attend text [CLS] tokens into a K -way classifier and predict their orders separately. Finally, the transcript sorting objective is formulated as a cross-entropy:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{TS}} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K - \log \frac{\exp(p_{o_i}^i)}{\sum_{j=1}^K \exp(p_j^i)} \quad (3)$$

where $p^i \in \mathbb{R}^K$ denotes the prediction for the i -th transcript segment in the shuffled sequence, p_j^i indicates the probability that its chronological order is j , and o_i represents the ground-truth order.

It is worth noting that the model may learn shortcuts, *e.g.*, natural language order, without attending to visual information. We prevent such cases from hurting training by stopping gradients flowing to the text encoder, which forces the video model to provide well-learned spatiotemporal context for TS.

Video-Text Contrastive. We adopt the widely-used Video-Text Contrastive (VTC) as the basic objective for semantic alignment, which is formulated as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{VTC}} &= \text{NCE}(\bar{t}, v_0) + \text{NCE}(v_0, \bar{t}) \\ \text{s.t. } \text{NCE}(q, k) &= - \log \frac{\exp(q^T k_+ / \tau)}{\sum_{i=1}^B \exp(q^T k_i / \tau)} \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where τ denotes the temperature parameter, \bar{t} denotes the averaged text [CLS] token, *i.e.*, $\bar{t} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K t_0^i$, and v_0 denotes the video [CLS] token. Note that v_0 only attends to the unmasked patches during encoding. Our overall training objective is $\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{VTC}} + \lambda \mathcal{L}_{\text{TS}}$, where λ is a hyperparameter.

4 Experiments

4.1 Experimental Setup

Pre-training Datasets. We jointly pre-train our model on two datasets: (a) **YT-Temporal** [69] contains 6M YouTube videos with ASR transcribed words and timestamps. (b) **WebVid-2.5M** [2] contains 2.5M alt-text-video pairs. Since the timestamps are unavailable, we only perform VTC on it.

Table 2: The **zero-shot text-to-video retrieval** results. † denotes using post-processing DSL [8]. * means accessing extra modalities, e.g., audio. The underlined number indicates absolute SOTA. Single-stream models are de-emphasized.

Method	Venue	MSR-VTT				DiDeMo				LSMDC			
		R@1	R@5	R@10	MdR	R@1	R@5	R@10	MdR	R@1	R@5	R@10	MdR
<i>Non-CLIP models</i>													
VideoCLIP [62]	EMNLP'21	10.4	22.2	30.0	-	16.6	46.9	-	-	-	-	-	-
Frozen [2]	ICCV'21	18.7	39.5	51.6	10.0	21.1	46.0	56.2	7.0	9.3	22.0	30.1	51.0
ALPRO [28]	CVPR'22	24.1	44.7	55.4	-	23.8	47.3	57.9	-	-	-	-	-
VIOLET [14]	arXiv'22	25.9	49.5	59.7	-	23.5	49.8	59.8	-	-	-	-	-
BridgeFormer [16]	CVPR'22	26.0	46.4	56.4	7.0	25.6	50.6	61.1	5.0	12.2	25.9	32.2	42.0
OmniVL [54]	NeurIPS'22	34.6	58.4	66.6	-	33.3	58.7	68.5	-	-	-	-	-
<i>CLIP-B/32</i>													
CLIP [45]	ICML'21	30.6	54.4	64.3	4.0	24.7	49.3	60.9	6.0	13.6	27.9	35.5	32.0
CLIP-straight [42]	MCPR'21	31.2	53.7	64.2	4.0	-	-	-	-	11.3	22.7	29.2	56.5
CLIP4Clip [34]	NC'22	32.0	57.0	66.9	4.0	-	-	-	-	15.1	28.5	36.4	28.0
BridgeFormer [16]	CVPR'22	33.2	58.0	68.6	4.0	-	-	-	-	15.5	30.7	38.7	22.0
CLIP-ViP [66]	ICLR'23	29.0	51.2	61.3	5.0	22.6	43.9	56.4	7.0	11.3	25.3	31.3	38.0
Ours-B/32	-	34.5	58.5	67.7	3.5	31.2	56.9	68.3	4.0	16.1	30.6	38.7	25.0
Ours-B/32†	-	36.4	58.0	69.0	3.0	37.0	61.6	70.9	3.0	15.6	31.8	38.6	22.0
<i>CLIP-B/16</i>													
CLIP [45]	ICML'21	31.8	53.9	64.5	4.0	27.7	51.0	62.5	5.0	15.2	29.7	37.6	25.0
CLIP-ViP [66]	ICLR'23	31.7	53.8	63.2	4.0	24.6	50.7	59.7	5.0	12.5	26.1	33.3	39.0
UMT-B [31]	arXiv'23	29.6	52.8	61.9	-	33.4	58.3	67.0	-	16.8	30.5	37.6	-
Ours-B/16	-	35.9	61.2	71.3	3.0	33.4	60.1	70.6	3.0	16.9	31.5	38.2	22.0
Ours-B/16†	-	37.8	62.9	72.4	3.0	39.0	63.9	72.6	3.0	18.3	33.7	41.9	19.0
<i>Larger Models</i>													
ImageBind* [18]	CVPR'23	36.8	61.8	70.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
InternVideo	arXiv'22	40.0	65.3	74.1	2.0	31.5	57.6	68.2	3.0	17.6	32.4	40.2	23.0
UMT-L	arXiv'23	33.3	58.1	66.7	-	34.0	60.4	68.7	-	20.0	37.2	43.7	-
Ours-H/14	-	38.2	62.4	73.2	3.0	34.6	61.9	71.5	3.0	17.3	32.5	41.4	20.0
Ours-H/14†	-	41.3	63.0	74.0	2.0	39.5	63.6	73.1	3.0	20.0	37.8	48.6	11.0

Text-to-Video Retrieval. We evaluate *zero-shot* performance of our model on three benchmarks: (a) **MSR-VTT** [63]. (b) **DiDeMo** [1]. (c) **LSMDC** [49]. The Recall@K (R@K) and Median Rank (MdR) are reported as the evaluation metric.

Action Recognition. Four benchmarks are used in this task: (a) **HMDB-51** [26], (b) **UCF-101** [51], (c) **Kinetics-400** [25], (d) **SSV2** [19]. The evaluation is two-fold: (i) *Zero-shot Action Recognition*. Following [66], we use the prompt template “a person [CLASS]” for the first three datasets and evaluate SSV2 on a multi-choice setting, namely **SSV2-MC**. See Appendix for details. (ii) *Linear Classification*, where we optimize a linear classifier added on top of the frozen visual encoder.

4.2 Implementation Details

We inherit weights from CLIP [45] for the standard ViT modules and initialize the parameters of time attention with zeros [3]. The temperature parameter in \mathcal{L}_{VTC} is set to be 0.05, and we sample $K = 4$ transcript segments for the transcript sorting task. As for pre-training and downstream evaluation, $T = 12$ frames are sampled with an input resolution of 224×224 . Note that the joint attention for sorting is duplicated in downstream tasks. The masking ratio ρ is set to 50% for ViT-B/16 and 70% for ViT-H/14, and we do not mask patches for ViT-B/32. Most hyper-parameters are shared across different models, and we list the training details in Appendix.

4.3 Main Results

Text-to-Video Retrieval. The zero-shot retrieval results are reported in Table 2. Compared to previous dual-stream SOTA, our model reaches an absolute gain of 1.4%, 6.9% and 1.8% in terms of R@1 on MSR-VTT, DiDeMo, and LSMDC, respectively. Using post-processing techniques like DSL [8] further boosts performance. It is worth noting that we even surpass or achieve comparable performance with single stream models, e.g., InternVideo [61], where the latter has a much higher retrieval complexity and does not own out-of-the-box ability for extracting video features alone. Moreover, the solid result further verifies the effectiveness of our proposed degradation-free pre-

Table 3: The **zero-shot action recognition** results of top-1 accuracy. The underlined number indicates absolute SOTA. Single-stream models are de-emphasized. “Our impl.” denotes we use official pre-trained weights for evaluation.

Method	Venue	Cite From	Params	HMDB-51	UCF-101	Kinetics-400	SSV2-MC
<i>Non-CLIP models</i>							
MTE [64]	ECCV’16	X-CLIP		19.7	15.8	-	-
ASR [60]	ECML’17	X-CLIP		21.8	24.4	-	-
ZSECOG [44]	CVPR’17	X-CLIP		22.6	15.1	-	-
UR [72]	CVPR’18	X-CLIP		24.4	17.5	-	-
TS-GCN [15]	AAAI’19	X-CLIP	< 200M	23.2	34.2	-	-
E2E [4]	CVPR’20	X-CLIP		32.7	48.0	-	-
ER-ZSAR [7]	ICCV’21	X-CLIP		35.3	51.8	-	-
ClipBert [27]	CVPR’21	BridgeFormer		20.0	27.5	-	-
Frozen [2]	ICCV’21	BridgeFormer		27.5	45.4	-	-
BridgeFormer [16]	CVPR’22	BridgeFormer		38.0	51.1	-	-
<i>CLIP-B/16</i>							
CLIP [45]	ICML’21	Our impl.		43.2	68.9	48.0	29.6
ActionCLIP [58]	arXiv’21	X-CLIP	< 200M	40.8	58.3	-	-
X-CLIP [36]	ECCV’22	X-CLIP		44.6	72.0	-	-
CLIP-ViP [66]	ICLR’23	Our impl.		41.2	58.9	37.6	35.5
Ours-B/16	-	-		50.4	69.8	54.3	42.1
<i>Larger Models</i>							
ImageBind [18]	CVPR’23	ImageBind	632M (V) 354M (T)	-	-	50.0	-
X-Florence [36]	ECCV’22	X-CLIP	637M (V) 256M (T)	48.4	73.2	-	-
Ours-H/14	-	-	632M (V) 354M (T)	52.1	78.0	59.6	48.4

Table 4: The **linear action recognition** results of top-1 accuracy. We de-emphasize DINOv2 [38] because it uses a larger model than ours, *i.e.*, ViT-g/14. “Our impl.” denotes we use official pre-trained weights for evaluation.

Method	Venue	Cite From	Supervision	Params	HMDB-51	UCF-101	Kinetics-400
MemDPC [20]	ECCV’20	SVT			30.5	54.1	-
CoCLR [21]	NeurIPS’20	SVT			52.4	77.8	-
Vi ² CLR [11]	ICCV’21	SVT			47.3	75.4	63.4
VideoMoCo [41]	CVPR’21	SVT	Self	100M	49.2	78.7	-
CVRL [43]	CVPR’21	SVT			57.3	89.2	67.6
DINO [6]	ICCV’21	DINOv2		v	-	85.0	64.5
SVT [48]	CVPR’22	SVT			57.8	90.8	68.1
iBOT [71]	ICLR’22	DINOv2			-	88.6	72.6
VideoMAE-B [52]	NeurIPS’22	Our impl.			30.9	52.7	20.4
DINOv2-g [38]	arXiv’23	DINOv2		1.0B	-	91.2	78.4
VideoMAEv2-H [56]	CVPR’23	Our impl.		632M	34.1	56.4	25.8
<i>Language</i>							
CLIP-B/16 [45]	ICML’21	Our impl.			62.8	87.6	66.9
Frozen [2]	ICCV’21	Our impl.			57.8	88.7	62.9
MERLOT [69]	NeurIPS’21	MERLOT			49.6	74.9	-
BridgeFormer [16]	CVPR’22	Our impl.	Language	100M	60.7	89.2	65.6
MILES [17]	CVPR’22	Our impl.			60.0	89.6	64.0
TVTS [70]	CVPR’23	Our impl.		v	60.1	87.6	60.8
Ours-B/16	-	-			64.7	90.0	70.1
Ours-H/14	-	-		632M	65.7	91.8	73.1

training strategy, especially given the fact that CLIP-ViP [66] degrades and CLIP4Clip [34] only makes marginal improvement.

Action Recognition. We report the zero-shot action recognition results in Table 3. Our model brings significant improvements, *i.e.*, 8.9%, 9.1%, 11.6%, and 12.9% absolute gain on HMDB-51, UCF-101, Kinetics-400, and SSV2-MC, respectively. The prompt-based method, *i.e.*, ActionCLIP [58], also degrades on this test, possibly due to overfitting to manually constructed templates. When it turns to larger models, we even surpass X-Florence [36], a single-stream model with comparable video encoder parameters, by a large margin, revealing the superior scalability of our training paradigm. Even for the more challenging benchmark that contains various motion dynamics, *i.e.*, SSV2-MC, our model still achieves promising results, solidifying the contribution of masked transcript sorting that promotes fine-grained spatiotemporal representation learning.

In addition, we provide the linear classification results in Table 4, where we surpass either self-supervised or language-guided models. Notably, we find the linear accuracy of VideoMAE [52] and VideoMAEv2 [56] lags far behind other models. It implies that representation learned by MAE-style objectives concentrates on the pixel level instead of the semantic level, making them impractical for

learning general-purpose features. By contrast, with the aid of language supervision, our model is capable of out-of-the-box transferring and retains training efficiency like MAE variants.

4.4 Ablation Study

Considering efficiency, all ablations are based on the ViT-B/32 model if no specified.

Training Objectives. We first analyze the impact of each training objective in Table 5 and reach the following conclusions: (i) M_{base} outperforms the CLIP baseline, implying that both ASR transcripts and alt-texts are reliable supervision that benefits video representation learning. (ii) M_{ours} outperforms M_{base} , while $M_{\text{w/o sg}}$ underperforms. It indicates that without stopping gradients flowing to the text encoder, the model turns to learn shortcuts, in other words, optimize the transcript representation to ease the sorting task. The wrong optimization direction harms training efficiency. Instead, M_{ours} encourages enhancing spatiotemporal representation to provide enough knowledge for transcript sorting, remarkably improving the performance.

Table 5: The zero-shot text-to-video retrieval results *w.r.t.* different objectives. “sg” denotes stopping gradients.

Name	\mathcal{L}_{VTC}	\mathcal{L}_{TS}	sg	MSR-VTT		DiDeMo		LSMDC	
				R@1	R@5	R@1	R@5	R@1	R@5
CLIP	n/a	n/a	n/a	30.6	54.4	24.7	49.3	13.6	27.9
M_{base}	✓	✗	n/a	33.0	56.7	29.8	55.5	15.2	29.3
$M_{\text{w/o sg}}$	✓	✓	✗	31.9	56.2	29.2	54.9	14.9	28.9
M_{ours}	✓	✓	✓	34.5	58.5	31.2	56.9	16.1	30.6
$M_{\text{ours}++}$	✓	✓	✓	35.0	58.4	31.7	57.3	16.5	31.2

Note that we cannot perform TS on WebVid2.5M because the timestamps are unavailable. In this case, we further generalize TS from transcript sorting to text sorting by concatenating different clips and their corresponding alt-texts in a batch, then predicting the alt-text order, namely $M_{\text{ours}++}$. Such a naive trial boosts the performance to some extent, revealing the potential of “resorting to video for text sorting” in facilitating spatiotemporal representation learning.

Masking Ratio. We report the Recall@1 under different masking ratio ρ in Figure 3 (a) based on the ViT-B/16 model. We empirically find that, given the same training steps, smaller masking ratios lead to better performance due to the more learned tokens. We imply that overmasking, *e.g.*, $\rho = 80\%$ is too hard for the model to capture enough visual semantics despite more training efficiency. As a result, for different scales of models, we need to find a proper masking ratio that could trade off the performance and training cost.




Figure 3: The sensitivity of (a) masking ratio ρ , (b) tuneable layer L_{tune} . Default settings are marked with [†].

Tuneable Layer. The performance in terms of different tuneable layers L_{tune} (count from the last layer) for the text encoder is reported in Figure 3 (b). $L_{\text{tune}} = 0$ equals to fully freeze the text encoder, and $L_{\text{tune}} = 12$ means fully fine-tuning. Both $L_{\text{tune}} = 0$ and $L_{\text{tune}} = 12$ lag far behind partially freezing the text encoder, verifying the effectiveness of the proposed degradation-free pre-training strategy, which preserves the image foundation model’s pre-learned knowledge while unleashing it to learn powerful out-of-the-box spatiotemporal representation.

5 Conclusion

In this work, we pursue out-of-the-box spatiotemporal visual representations with a newly proposed TVTSv2. Compared to TVTS [70], we introduce a degradation-free pre-training strategy to solve the representation degradation from the pre-trained image foundation model, which is actually non-trivial given the failure of previous models [66, 58]. We further adopt the masking technique [32] to improve scalability. With TVTSv2, we train a series of models with up to one billion parameters, achieving state-of-the-art results in terms of zero-shot and linear probe evaluation on various video tasks. Notably, our model even surpasses or is competitive with those trained on more data or modality, *e.g.*, InternVideo [61] and ImageBind [18]. In a nutshell, we make a step towards learning out-of-the-box spatiotemporal visual representation despite some limitations: (i) Though performance improvements on the public benchmark, the emergent abilities are not present yet. (ii) The largest model studied in this paper is still far from the SOTA model in the image domain (*i.e.*, ViT-22B [10]).

References

- [1] Lisa Anne Hendricks, Oliver Wang, Eli Shechtman, Josef Sivic, Trevor Darrell, and Bryan Russell. Localizing moments in video with natural language. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 2017. 5, 7, 13
- [2] Max Bain, Arsha Nagrani, Gül Varol, and Andrew Zisserman. Frozen in time: A joint video and image encoder for end-to-end retrieval. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 13
- [3] Gedas Bertasius, Heng Wang, and Lorenzo Torresani. Is space-time attention all you need for video understanding? In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021. 4, 7
- [4] Biagio Brattoli, Joseph Tighe, Fedor Zhdanov, Pietro Perona, and Krzysztof Chalupka. Rethinking zero-shot video classification: End-to-end training for realistic applications. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020. 8
- [5] Tom Brown, Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared D Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, et al. Language models are few-shot learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2020. 1
- [6] Mathilde Caron, Hugo Touvron, Ishan Misra, Hervé Jégou, Julien Mairal, Piotr Bojanowski, and Armand Joulin. Emerging properties in self-supervised vision transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, 2021. 3, 8
- [7] Shizhe Chen and Dong Huang. Elaborative rehearsal for zero-shot action recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021. 8
- [8] Xing Cheng, Hezheng Lin, Xiangyu Wu, Fan Yang, and Dong Shen. Improving video-text retrieval by multi-stream corpus alignment and dual softmax loss. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.04290*, 2021. 7
- [9] Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale Fung, and Steven Hoi. Instructblip: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning, 2023. 2
- [10] Mostafa Dehghani, Josip Djolonga, Basil Mustafa, Piotr Padlewski, Jonathan Heek, Justin Gilmer, Andreas Steiner, Mathilde Caron, Robert Geirhos, Ibrahim Alabdulmohsin, et al. Scaling vision transformers to 22 billion parameters. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.05442*, 2023. 9
- [11] Ali Diba, Vivek Sharma, Reza Safdari, Dariush Lotfi, Saquib Sarfraz, Rainer Stiefelshagen, and Luc Van Gool. Vi2clr: Video and image for visual contrastive learning of representation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2021. 8
- [12] Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, et al. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. 4
- [13] Christoph Feichtenhofer, Yanghao Li, Kaiming He, et al. Masked autoencoders as spatiotemporal learners. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 2022. 3
- [14] Tsu-Jui Fu, Linjie Li, Zhe Gan, Kevin Lin, William Yang Wang, Lijuan Wang, and Zicheng Liu. Violet: End-to-end video-language transformers with masked visual-token modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.12681*, 2021. 7
- [15] Junyu Gao, Tianzhu Zhang, and Changsheng Xu. I know the relationships: Zero-shot action recognition via two-stream graph convolutional networks and knowledge graphs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, 2019. 8
- [16] Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, Xihui Liu, Dian Li, Ying Shan, Xiaohu Qie, and Ping Luo. Bridging video-text retrieval with multiple choice questions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022. 4, 5, 7, 8, 13
- [17] Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, Xihui Liu, Jinpeng Wang, Jianping Wu, Ying Shan, Xiaohu Qie, and Ping Luo. Miles: visual bert pre-training with injected language semantics for video-text retrieval. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference*, 2022. 5, 8
- [18] Rohit Girdhar, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, Zhuang Liu, Mannat Singh, Kalyan Vasudev Alwala, Armand Joulin, and Ishan Misra. Imagebind: One embedding space to bind them all, 2023. 1, 3, 7, 8, 9
- [19] Raghav Goyal, Samira Ebrahimi Kahou, Vincent Michalski, Joanna Materzynska, Susanne Westphal, Heuna Kim, Valentin Haefel, Ingo Fruend, Peter Yianilos, Moritz Mueller-Freitag, et al. The "something something" video database for learning and evaluating visual common sense. In *Proceedings of the IEEE international conference on computer vision*, 2017. 7, 13
- [20] Tengda Han, Weidi Xie, and Andrew Zisserman. Video representation learning by dense predictive coding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision Workshops*, 2019. 8
- [21] Tengda Han, Weidi Xie, and Andrew Zisserman. Self-supervised co-training for video representation learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020. 8
- [22] Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021. 3
- [23] Menglin Jia, Luming Tang, Bor-Chun Chen, Claire Cardie, Serge Belongie, Bharath Hariharan, and Ser-Nam Lim. Visual prompt tuning. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference*, 2022. 3

- [24] Chen Ju, Tengda Han, Kunhao Zheng, Ya Zhang, and Weidi Xie. Prompting visual-language models for efficient video understanding. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, 2022*. 3
- [25] Will Kay, Joao Carreira, Karen Simonyan, Brian Zhang, Chloe Hillier, Sudheendra Vijayanarasimhan, Fabio Viola, Tim Green, Trevor Back, Paul Natsev, et al. The kinetics human action video dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.06950*, 2017. 5, 7, 13
- [26] Hildegard Kuehne, Hueihan Jhuang, Estíbaliz Garrote, Tomaso Poggio, and Thomas Serre. Hmdb: a large video database for human motion recognition. In *2011 International conference on computer vision*, 2011. 7, 13
- [27] Jie Lei, Linjie Li, Luwei Zhou, Zhe Gan, Tamara L Berg, Mohit Bansal, and Jingjing Liu. Less is more: Clipbert for video-and-language learning via sparse sampling. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021. 8
- [28] Dongxu Li, Junnan Li, Hongdong Li, Juan Carlos Niebles, and Steven CH Hoi. Align and prompt: Video-and-language pre-training with entity prompts. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022. 7
- [29] KunChang Li, Yinan He, Yi Wang, Yizhuo Li, Wenhai Wang, Ping Luo, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Videochat: Chat-centric video understanding, 2023. 2
- [30] Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yinan He, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Uniformerv2: Spatiotemporal learning by arming image vits with video uniformer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.09552*, 2022. 3
- [31] Kunchang Li, Yali Wang, Yizhuo Li, Yi Wang, Yinan He, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Unmasked teacher: Towards training-efficient video foundation models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.16058*, 2023. 7
- [32] Yanghao Li, Haoqi Fan, Ronghang Hu, Christoph Feichtenhofer, and Kaiming He. Scaling language-image pre-training via masking. *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023. 1, 3, 6, 9
- [33] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019. 13
- [34] Huaishao Luo, Lei Ji, Ming Zhong, Yang Chen, Wen Lei, Nan Duan, and Tianrui Li. Clip4clip: An empirical study of clip for end to end video clip retrieval and captioning. *Neurocomputing*, 508:293–304, 2022. 3, 7, 8, 13
- [35] Antoine Miech, Dimitri Zhukov, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Makarand Tapaswi, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. Howto100m: Learning a text-video embedding by watching hundred million narrated video clips. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019. 2, 3
- [36] 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 *Computer Vision–ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, 2022*. 8
- [37] OpenAI. Gpt-4 technical report, 2023. 1
- [38] Maxime Oquab, Timothée Darcet, Théo Moutakanni, Huy Vo, Marc Szafraniec, Vasil Khalidov, Pierre Fernandez, Daniel Haziza, Francisco Massa, Alaaeldin El-Nouby, et al. Dinov2: Learning robust visual features without supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.07193*, 2023. 1, 3, 8
- [39] Long Ouyang, Jeffrey Wu, Xu Jiang, Diogo Almeida, Carroll Wainwright, Pamela Mishkin, Chong Zhang, Sandhini Agarwal, Katarina Slama, Alex Ray, et al. Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. 1
- [40] Junting Pan, Ziyi Lin, Xiatian Zhu, Jing Shao, and Hongsheng Li. St-adapter: Parameter-efficient image-to-video transfer learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. 2, 3
- [41] Tian Pan, Yibing Song, Tianyu Yang, Wenhao Jiang, and Wei Liu. Videomoco: Contrastive video representation learning with temporally adversarial examples. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021. 8
- [42] Jesús Andrés Portillo-Quintero, José Carlos Ortiz-Bayliss, and Hugo Terashima-Marín. A straightforward framework for video retrieval using clip. In *Pattern Recognition: 13th Mexican Conference, MCP R 2021*, 2021. 7
- [43] Rui Qian, Tianjian Meng, Boqing Gong, Ming-Hsuan Yang, Huisheng Wang, Serge Belongie, and Yin Cui. Spatiotemporal contrastive video representation learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021. 8
- [44] Jie Qin, Li Liu, Ling Shao, Fumin Shen, Bingbing Ni, Jiaxin Chen, and Yunhong Wang. Zero-shot action recognition with error-correcting output codes. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2017. 8
- [45] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2021. 1, 3, 4, 7, 8, 13
- [46] Alec Radford, Karthik Narasimhan, Tim Salimans, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Improving language understanding by generative pre-training. 2018. 1
- [47] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog*, 1(8):9, 2019. 1
- [48] Kanchana Ranasinghe, Muzammal Naseer, Salman Khan, Fahad Shahbaz Khan, and Michael S Ryoo. Self-supervised video transformer. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022. 3, 8

- [49] Anna Rohrbach, Marcus Rohrbach, Niket Tandon, and Bernt Schiele. A dataset for movie description. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2015. 7, 13
- [50] Christoph Schuhmann, Romain Beaumont, Richard Vencu, Cade W Gordon, Ross Wightman, Mehdi Cherti, Theo Coombes, Aarush Katta, Clayton Mullis, Mitchell Wortsman, et al. Laion-5b: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. In *Thirty-sixth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2022. 2, 13
- [51] Khurram Soomro, Amir Roshan Zamir, and Mubarak Shah. Ucf101: A dataset of 101 human actions classes from videos in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1212.0402*, 2012. 7, 13
- [52] Zhan Tong, Yibing Song, Jue Wang, and Limin Wang. Videomae: Masked autoencoders are data-efficient learners for self-supervised video pre-training. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2022. 3, 5, 6, 8
- [53] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017. 2
- [54] Junke Wang, Dongdong Chen, Zuxuan Wu, Chong Luo, Luowei 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. 7
- [55] Jiangliu Wang, Jianbo Jiao, and Yun-Hui Liu. Self-supervised video representation learning by pace prediction. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference*, 2020. 3
- [56] Limin Wang, Bingkun Huang, Zhiyu Zhao, Zhan Tong, Yanan He, Yi Wang, Yali Wang, and Yu Qiao. Videomae v2: Scaling video masked autoencoders with dual masking. *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023. 3, 5, 8
- [57] 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. 6
- [58] Mengmeng Wang, Jiazheng Xing, and Yong Liu. Actionclip: A new paradigm for video action recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.08472*, 2021. 3, 8, 9
- [59] Peng Wang, An Yang, Rui Men, Junyang Lin, Shuai Bai, Zhikang Li, Jianxin Ma, Chang Zhou, Jingren Zhou, and Hongxia Yang. Unifying architectures, tasks, and modalities through a simple sequence-to-sequence learning framework. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2022. 5
- [60] Qian Wang and Ke Chen. Alternative semantic representations for zero-shot human action recognition. In *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases: European Conference, ECML PKDD 2017*, 2017. 8
- [61] Yi Wang, Kunchang Li, Yizhuo Li, Yanan He, Bingkun Huang, Zhiyu Zhao, Hongjie Zhang, Jilan Xu, Yi Liu, Zun Wang, et al. Internvideo: General video foundation models via generative and discriminative learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.03191*, 2022. 3, 7, 9, 13
- [62] 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 *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2021. 3, 7
- [63] Jun Xu, Tao Mei, Ting Yao, and Yong Rui. Msr-vtt: A large video description dataset for bridging video and language. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016. 7, 13
- [64] Xun Xu, Timothy M Hospedales, and Shaogang Gong. Multi-task zero-shot action recognition with prioritised data augmentation. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference*, 2016. 8
- [65] Hongwei Xue, Tiankai Hang, Yanhong Zeng, Yuchong Sun, Bei Liu, Huan Yang, Jianlong Fu, and Baining Guo. Advancing high-resolution video-language representation with large-scale video transcriptions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2022. 3
- [66] Hongwei Xue, Yuchong Sun, Bei Liu, Jianlong Fu, Ruihua Song, Houqiang Li, and Jiebo Luo. Clip-vip: Adapting pre-trained image-text model to video-language representation alignment. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13
- [67] A Yang, A Miech, J Sivic, I Laptev, and C Schmid. Learning to answer visual questions from web videos. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2022. 3
- [68] Taojiannan Yang, Yi Zhu, Yusheng Xie, Aston Zhang, Chen Chen, and Mu Li. Aim: Adapting image models for efficient video action recognition. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2023. 2, 3
- [69] Rowan Zellers, Ximing Lu, Jack Hessel, Youngjae Yu, Jae Sung Park, Jize Cao, Ali Farhadi, and Yejin Choi. Merlot: Multimodal neural script knowledge models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021. 3, 5, 6, 8
- [70] Ziyun Zeng, Yuying Ge, Xihui Liu, Bin Chen, Ping Luo, Shu-Tao Xia, and Yixiao Ge. Learning transferable spatiotemporal representations from natural script knowledge. *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023. 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 13
- [71] Jinghao Zhou, Chen Wei, Huiyu Wang, Wei Shen, Cihang Xie, Alan Yuille, and Tao Kong. ibot: Image bert pre-training with online tokenizer. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022. 8
- [72] Yi Zhu, Yang Long, Yu Guan, Shawn Newsam, and Ling Shao. Towards universal representation for unseen action recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2018. 8

A Downstream Tasks

Text-to-Video Retrieval. The statistics of the three zero-shot text-to-video retrieval benchmarks are listed as follows: (a) **MSR-VTT** [63] consists of 10K videos harvested from YouTube, and there are around 200K descriptions. We follow prior works [34, 66, 61] to conduct evaluations on the 1K-A test set. (b) **DiDeMo** [1] consists of 10K Flickr videos with around 40K sentences. Following [34, 16, 2], we concatenate all sentences that describe the same video to form a single query and conduct paragraph-to-video retrieval. Specifically, we do not crop and concatenate the localized moments but directly use the whole video in the retrieval set, as done by [16, 2]. (c) **LSMDC** [49] has 118,081 videos cropped from 202 movies. The evaluation protocol follows [70, 16], where the test set contains 1,000 videos.

Action Recognition. The statistics of the four zero-shot/linear action recognition benchmarks are listed as follows: (a) **HMDB-51** [26] contains 5K videos of 51 action categories. The training and test sets have 3.5K and 1.5K videos, respectively. (b) **UCF-101** [51] contains 13K videos of 101 action categories. The training set has 9.5K videos, and the test set has 3.5K videos. (c) **Kinetics-400** [25] is a large-scale dataset with 260K videos belonging to 400 categories, where 240K videos are used for training, and 20K videos are used for validation. (d) **SSV2** [19] consists of 189K videos showing humans performing 174 pre-defined fine-grained actions with everyday objects. The training set has 169K videos, and the validation set contains 20K videos.

In zero-shot action recognition, we follow the prior work [45] to use the prompt template “a person [CLASS]” for **HMDB-51**, **UCF-101**, and **Kinetics-400**, where the cosine similarity is calculated between all video-category pairs for classification. As for **SSV2**, we turn it into a multi-choice task, namely **SSV2-MC**. For each video, we randomly pick 173 negative descriptions from other categories (one description per category) and put them along with the ground-truth one into a candidate set. The model is expected to retrieve the right one from the 174 candidates.

B Implementation Details

For our ViT-B/32 and ViT-B/16 models, we load the weights released by OpenAI [45]. As for the largest ViT-H/14 model, we inherit weights from OpenCLIP [50]. The detailed model architectures are listed in Table 7.

We use AdamW [33] as the optimizer with a weight decay of 0.05. The initial learning rates are set to be 1×10^{-4} and 1×10^{-7} for the newly added modules and the origin CLIP modules, respectively. We fix the weight parameter λ in \mathcal{L} to be 2 for roughly scaling the gradient magnitudes of \mathcal{L}_{VTC} and \mathcal{L}_{TS} to be the same. For the text encoder of all models, we freeze the first three-quarters of layers, leaving other layers trainable. Due to computation source limitation, we vary the batch size for different models, and all hyper-parameters are listed in Table 8.

C Divided Space-Time Attention

In this section, we describe the divided space-time attention in our video encoder detailedly. As illustrated in Figure 4, for the intra-frame tokens, *i.e.*, spatial-related tokens, we add the same spatial positional embeddings, and for tokens at the same position across different frames, *i.e.*, temporal-related tokens, we add the same temporal positional tokens. For each token, it first attends to the temporal-related tokens, then attend to the spatial-related tokens. Note that the [CLS] token is attended in both temporal and spatial self-attention.

D Additional Experiments

Temporal Initialization. We analyze the proper way to instantiate temporal modules based on the ViT-B/32 model. As shown in Table 6, initializing temporal attention weights with zeros beats its random initialization competitor by a large margin, indicating that growing temporal reasoning ability out of nothing avoids hurting the well-learned spatial prior, thus more suitable for training video foundation models.

Table 6: The R@1 *w.r.t.* different temporal initialization strategies.

Temp Init	MSR-VTT	DiDeMo
zero	34.5	31.5
random	31.2	29.3

Table 7: Our detailed model architectures. “Embed” and “Hidden” denote the dimension of the shared and hidden representations, respectively.

Model	Params	Embed	GFLOPs	Video Encoder					Text Encoder			
				Layers	Params	Hidden	Patch	GFLOPs	Layers	Params	Hidden	GFLOPs
B/32	149M	512	72	12	86M	768	32×32	69	12	63M	512	3
B/16	149M	512	281	12	86M	768	16×16	278	12	63M	512	3
H/14	1.0B	1024	2674	32	632M	1280	14×14	2650	24	354M	1024	24


Table 8: The hyper-parameters for pre-training and liner probe.

config	pre-training			linear probe
	B/32	B/16	H/14	all models
optimizer	AdamW			SGD
weight decay	0.05			0
training epochs	10		5	100
learning rate	1×10^{-4} (new modules)			0.1
	1×10^{-7} (CLIP modules)			
batch size	768	768	160	512
frozen text layers	1-9		1-18	n/a
input frames	12			12
masking ratio	0	50	70	0
augmentation	RandomCrop			CenterCrop
GPU for training	32 V100	64 V100	80 V100	16 V100


Attention Visualization. We visualize the zero-shot self-attention map of the visual [CLS] token on different datasets in Figure 5. The critical objects involved in the temporal interactions are captured precisely, indicating our model’s strong out-of-the-box ability intuitively.

E Broader Impact

The negative social impacts of our model may lie in intensifying global warming because of the large amount of carbon emission produced by GPU clusters. Though the pre-training phase is energy-consuming, the model can be used out-of-the-box, saving the potential carbon emission in fine-tuning. Since the model produces general-purpose representations, it might also raise the risk of abuse, such as unauthorized biometric recognition.




(a) An illustration of divided space-time attention




(b) The detailed structure of the divided space-time attention block

Figure 4: (a) We illustrate the divided space-time attention. For the orange token, it attends to tokens belonging to the same frame, *i.e.*, spatial-related tokens, and tokens in the same position across different frames, *i.e.*, temporal-related tokens, as well as the [CLS] token. (b) The structure of the divided space-time attention block, where we initialize the parameters of the temporal self-attention module with zeros and inherit weights from CLIP for the spatial self-attention and MLP modules.




Kinetics-400 category: smoking



SSV2-MC description: turning cup upside down



MSR-VTT caption: a black cat sits in a girl lap and playing



DiDeMo caption: the bird begins to eat the bread

Figure 5: The self-attention map of the visual [CLS] token. *Note that it does not involve cross-modal alignment.* The captions are for reference only and are not used for attention maps. All crucial objects involved in the temporal interaction are captured precisely, which indicates our model's powerful ability to produce general-purpose features.