

V-FLUTE: Visual Figurative Language Understanding with Textual Explanations

Arkadiy Saakyan¹ Shreyas Kulkarni¹ Tuhin Chakrabarty¹ Smaranda Muresan¹
¹Columbia University
a.saakyan@cs.columbia.edu

Abstract

Large Vision-Language models (VLMs) have demonstrated strong reasoning capabilities in tasks requiring a fine-grained understanding of literal images and text, such as visual question-answering or visual entailment. However, there has been little exploration of these models' capabilities when presented with images and captions containing *figurative phenomena* such as metaphors or humor, the meaning of which is often implicit. To close this gap, we propose a new task and a high-quality dataset: *Visual Figurative Language Understanding with Textual Explanations (V-FLUTE)*. We frame the visual figurative language understanding problem as an *explainable visual entailment* task, where the model has to predict whether the image (premise) entails a claim (hypothesis) and justify the predicted label with a textual explanation. Using a human-AI collaboration framework, we build a high-quality dataset, V-FLUTE, that contains 6,027 <image, claim, label, explanation> instances spanning five diverse multimodal figurative phenomena: metaphors, similes, idioms, sarcasm, and humor. The figurative phenomena can be present either in the image, the caption, or both. We further conduct both automatic and human evaluations to assess current VLMs' capabilities in understanding figurative phenomena.¹

1 Introduction

Figurative language is integral to human communication, enabling a variety of communicative goals (Roberts and Kreuz, 1994), including affective communication (Fussell and Moss, 2014). Figurative language presents a significant challenge to computational approaches as it




Figure 1: Explainable figurative visual entailment task: given an image (premise) and a claim (hypothesis), output whether the image entails or contradicts the claim along with a textual explanation.

requires understanding of implicit meaning behind an expression (Stowe et al., 2022; Shutova, 2011; Veale et al., 2016; Zhou et al., 2021). Recently, Chakrabarty et al. (2022) proposed a task and dataset for Figurative Language Understanding through Textual Explanations (FLUTE) that frames the problem as an explainable textual entailment covering a variety of figurative language phenomena in text: metaphors, similes, idioms, and sarcasm. This dataset has been used successfully to advance and benchmark the capabilities of LLMs for understanding figurative language in text (Saakyan et al., 2022; Ziems et al., 2024; Sra-vanthi et al., 2024; Dey et al., 2024).

However, figurative meaning is also prevalent in visual phenomena, such as visual metaphors (Akula et al., 2023; Chakrabarty et al., 2023),

¹Code and data will be available at github.com/asaakyan/V-FLUTE

multimodal sarcasm (Desai et al., 2022), and humor (Hessel et al., 2023; Hwang and Shwartz, 2023). Yet so far most of the work on vision and language models (VLMs) has focused on understanding literal meaning in images and captions (e.g., ScienceQA (Lu et al., 2022), MMMU (Yue et al., 2024)) including work on explainable visual entailment (Kayser et al., 2021). Building on the idea of FLUTE (Chakrabarty et al., 2022) for text, we present a new dataset for visual figurative language understanding with textual explanations (V-FLUTE). Our dataset contains 6,027 <image, claim, label, explanation> instances spanning diverse figurative phenomena. Each instance contains an image (premise) and a textual claim (hypothesis) that is either entailed or contradicted by the image. Deciding the entailment relation requires the vision-language model to understand the implicit meaning in both the visual and textual modalities. Our dataset contains figurative phenomena present in the image, in the caption, or in both. In addition, to mitigate the dependence on spurious correlations, to more rigorously investigate reasoning capabilities, and to promote explainability, our task requires the model to generate a plausible explanation for the output label. See Figure 1 for two examples from our dataset.

We make the following contribution towards assessing VLMs ability to understand multimodal figurative phenomena:

- V-FLUTE, a high-quality dataset of 6,027 <image, claim, label, explanation> instances built using a human-LLMs collaboration framework covering several phenomena: metaphors, similes, idioms, sarcasm, and humor (Section 3). We will make the dataset available.
- A suite of evaluations to assess current VLMs’ capabilities on this new task of explainable visual figurative entailment (Section 4.2 and 4.3).
- A detailed human evaluation with error analysis yielding insights into types of errors for different classes of models (Section 5).

2 Related Work

Textual entailment (MacCartney and Manning, 2008; Bowman et al., 2015) and visual entailment (Xie et al., 2019) tasks have been proposed to measure language and multimodal understanding. However, models trained to simply improve label accuracy on these data can be brittle and

suffer from spurious correlations (Poliak et al., 2018; Gururangan et al., 2018; McCoy et al., 2019; Gardner et al., 2021). Datasets such as e-SNLI (Camburu et al., 2018) and e-SNLI-VE (Kayser et al., 2021) augment existing entailment datasets with natural language explanations and train models to not only predict the label, but also generate a textual explanation for the reason behind the prediction. Such approach has been further adopted for a variety of tasks, such as common-sense reasoning (Rajani et al., 2019; Aggarwal et al., 2021) and social norm understanding (CH-Wang et al., 2023) among others (Wiegrefe and Marasovic, 2021). This approach has been extended to assess LLMs’ capabilities on understanding figurative language through the FLUTE dataset (Chakrabarty et al., 2022). FLUTE frames figurative language understanding as an explainable textual entailment task. Recent progress in multimodal models (Li et al., 2022; Alayrac et al., 2022; OpenAI, 2023; Team et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023b; Anthropic, 2024) prompts us to assess similar capabilities when extended to multimodal setting, testing the understanding of non-literal meaning contained in both images and text. We present an equivalent of the FLUTE dataset for the visual modality: V-FLUTE.

A number of previous works has focused on modeling figurative phenomena beyond text. Chakrabarty et al. (2023) use a human-AI collaboration framework to generate visual metaphors from linguistic metaphors (HAIVMet dataset) and propose a visual entailment task as an extrinsic evaluation of dataset quality. The dataset contains images, claims, and labels, but no textual explanations. Yosef et al. (2023) proposed a benchmark (IRFL) where given an idiom, metaphor, or simile the model has to distinguish which of the four associated images implies the figurative meaning of the expression. This dataset focuses on the figurative meaning in the textual modality and does not contain textual explanations. There has also been work on understanding multimodal sarcasm with explanations (Desai et al., 2022), mostly containing noisy user-generated text and crowdworker-written explanations. Other line of work has focused on understanding humor with multimodal models. MemeCap (Hwang and Shwartz, 2023) is a dataset for understanding memes. Hessel et al. (2023) release a corpus of annotated New Yorker Caption Contest entries, where the goal is to come

| Phenomenon | Data Source | Figurative Part | Our Contribution | # instances |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------------------|
| Metaphor/Simile | HAIVMet (Chakrabarty et al., 2023) | Image | Image Selection Textual Explanations Expert Verification | 857 (450 E, 407 C) |
| | IRFL (Yosef et al., 2023) | Caption | Image Selection Textual Explanations Expert Verification | 1,149 (574 E, 575 C) |
| Idiom | IRFL (Yosef et al., 2023) | Caption | Image Selection Textual Explanations Expert Verification | 370 (186 E, 184 C) |
| Sarcasm | MuSE (Desai et al., 2022) | Caption | Claim Generation Textual Explanations Expert Verification | 1,042 (521 E, 521 C) |
| Humor | MemeCap (Hwang and Shwartz, 2023) | Image | Claim Generation Textual Explanations Expert Verification | 1,958 (979 E, 979 C) |
| | NYCartoons (Hessel et al., 2023) | Image+Caption | Taken As Is | 651 (651 E) |

Table 1: V-FLUTE dataset composition: 5 figurative phenomena, source datasets, and our contributions. E denotes number of entailment instances, C - contradiction.

up with a humorous captions for an image, with high-quality explanations for why the caption is humorous. The dataset is relatively limited in size containing only 520 unique instances in its training set. We leverage all these benchmarks to build V-FLUTE.

3 V-FLUTE Task and Dataset

Following prior work on figurative language understanding in text defined as explainable textual entailment (Chakrabarty et al., 2022), we define the *visual figurative understanding* as an *explainable visual entailment task*: given an image (premise) p and a claim (hypothesis) h , output a textual explanation \hat{e} justifying whether the premise entails or contradicts the hypothesis and assign a label $\hat{y} \in \{\text{Entailment}, \text{Contradiction}\}$. We focus on the binary classification task since, for neutral labels, the explanations would be trivial (simply describing the image).

To build V-FLUTE, we start with existing multimodal figurative datasets and use human-AI collaboration frameworks with expert annotators (Chakrabarty et al., 2022; Wiegrefe et al., 2022; Liu et al., 2022) to transform them into a high-quality, explainable visual entailment benchmark. These datasets cover particular phenomena such

as metaphors, similes, idioms, sarcasm or humor. Each instance includes an image and a caption and the figurative phenomenon can be either in the image, the caption or in both. We transform each data into a unified $\langle \text{image}, \text{claim}, \text{label}, \text{explanation} \rangle$ format for explainable visual entailment. An overview of the dataset and our contributions can be found in Table 1. See examples from each dataset in Table 2. Below, we describe the construction of V-FLUTE for each figurative language type (metaphors & similes, idioms, sarcasm and humor).

3.1 Metaphors and Similes

Metaphors and similes are powerful rhetorical devices that can be expressed either in text or visually in an image. Visual metaphors are used as persuasive devices in various fields such as advertising (Forceville, 2002; Scott, 1994). To create visual entailment instances containing metaphors and similes in V-FLUTE, we rely on two existing resources: HAIVMet (Chakrabarty et al., 2023) and IRFL (Yosef et al., 2023). Instances taken from HAIVMet contain the metaphor/simile as a part of the premise (image), while those taken from IRFL have the metaphor/simile as a part of the hypothesis (text).

| HAIVMet | IRFL | MuSE | MemeCap | NYCartoons |
|---|--|---|---|---|
|  |  |  |  |  |
| The faculty meeting was peaceful. | Their relationship is a house on fire. | Oh I just #love having to stare at this while I #work. | Even death won't exempt you from going to work. | Easy for you to say, you're cured! |
| Contradiction | Entailment | Contradiction | Entailment | Entailment |
| The image shows a faculty meeting transformed into a dramatic battlefield scene with members dressed as knights ... The visual metaphor suggests the faculty meeting was like a war, & not peaceful. | The photo suggests a conflict or an intense emotional situation ... which aligns with the symbolism of a house on fire representing a relationship filled with turmoil or heated arguments | The image shows Disneyland Resort sign, & although it's within view, the person would like to experience it in person rather than just looking at the sign during work hours. | The image shows RoboCop ... This entails the claim that even death won't exempt you from going to work because it humorously illustrates a character who has been reanimated as a cyborg to continue working despite having died. | A play on the word "cured". People seek therapy to have their mental problems remedied or cured. But "cured" can also refer to a meat prep technique; here the therapist is cured bacon, & the patient is an egg (that's not cured). The egg is saying the therapist doesn't understand his problems because he's "cured" in both senses. |

Table 2: Sample dataset instances from V-FLUTE corresponding to the source datasets displaying images (premise), claims (hypothesis), labels, and explanations [Row 1-5].




Figure 2: Creation of V-FLUTE instances for metaphors and similes from HAIVMet.

3.1.1 HAIVMet as Data Source

The HAIVMet (Chakrabarty et al., 2023) data consists of 1,193 images of visual metaphors spanning

over 958 distinct linguistic metaphors. Each image is associated with a claim that can be contradicting or entailing the image. In addition, each image is associated with a *visual elaboration* that presents a textual description of the image (See Figure 2). This visual elaboration was used in the original paper to generate the visual metaphors (images).

Generating Textual Explanations. We augment the dataset with candidate textual explanations. We prompt ChatGPT (gpt-3.5-0914) to generate an explanation for every tuple <visual elaboration, claim, label> (See Figure 2; and prompt in Appendix D.1.1).

Expert Verification. Each claim is paired with up to 5 images. However, since these images were automatically generated with DALLE-2 using the visual elaborations, not all are completely faithful. Moreover, some claims and labels were inconsistent. Finally, automatically generated LLM

candidate explanations are not always correct and require refining. To tackle these issues, we employ an *expert verification* process involving three expert annotators with significant experience in figurative language and visual metaphor understanding. Since each claim can be paired with more than one visual metaphor, we ask annotators to select the visual metaphor most faithful to the linguistic metaphor and visual elaboration (see Image Selection in Figure 2) or select none in the rare case when none of the visual metaphors are of good quality. As a part of the same annotation round, we also ask them to verify and edit the explanation if necessary to ensure correctness and high quality. Post strict quality control, we have 857 <image, claim, label, explanation> instances.

3.1.2 IRFL as Data Source




Figure 3: Creation of V-FLUTE instances for metaphors, similes, idioms from IRFL.

The IRFL dataset (Yosef et al., 2023) contains 1,440 figurative expressions, each associated with 4 distinct images. One of those images represents the figurative expression (see Figure 3), and the other 3 act as distractors.

Image Selection. We automatically select images using CLIP (Radford et al., 2021). We select one of the distractor images that have the highest CLIPScore (clip-vit-base-patch16) with the corresponding entailing image to create a challenging, contradictory instance (see where an unrelated image of a house is discarded when selecting the contradiction instance in Figure 3).

Generating Textual Explanations. We prompt GPT-4 (gpt-4-vision-preview) with the ground truth label, claim, and the image to explain the relationship between the image and the claim.

Expert Verification. We recruit the same three expert annotators from HAIVMET annotations

and ask them to verify the explanation is adequate and edit it when necessary. We also ask the annotator to discard rare noisy instances where the claim, image, and label do not fit. Post strict quality control, we are left with 1149 <image, claim, label, explanation> instances.

3.2 Idioms

The IRFL dataset contains idioms in addition to metaphors and similes. An identical procedure to the one described in Section 3.1.2 was used for generating V-FLUTE instances for idioms (370 <image, claim, label, explanation> examples).

3.3 Sarcasm

To create visual entailment instances containing sarcasm, we rely on the MuSE data (Desai et al., 2022). Similarly to IRFL, instances from MuSE data contain sarcasm in the hypothesis (text).

3.3.1 MuSE as Data Source




Figure 4: Creation of V-FLUTE instances for sarcasm from MuSE.

The MuSE dataset (Desai et al., 2022) consists of 3510 distinct images, the respective sarcastic claims that act as contradiction instances (see example in Figure 4), and crowd worker written explanations justifying the contradiction.

Generating Entailment Claims. Since the dataset only contains sarcastic instances, there are no claims with an entailment relationship. We generate the entailing claims by prompting GPT-4 to generate a non-sarcastic version of the claim while maintaining the user-generated informal style of the text (see the generated entailment claim in Figure 4).

Generating Textual Explanations. While the dataset already contains crowdworker-written explanations, upon inspection, they were often deemed poor quality, lacking enough details, and formulaic (e.g., see the crowdworker explanation in Figure 4). To improve their quality, we use the dataset’s existing crowdworker explanations and prompt GPT-4 to rewrite and generate high-quality candidate textual explanations given the claim and the label (see the re-written explanation in Figure 4). See the prompt in Appendix D.3.

Expert Verification. Each image is now paired with a GPT-4-generated entailing claim, an original contradicting claim, and their respective labels and explanations. The same three expert annotators checked if the generated explanations are adequate (i.e., complete, correct, and concise) and if not, edit them. Experts were also instructed to discard noisy examples, e.g. when the image does not contradict the sarcastic claim. Through strict quality control, we obtain 1,042 <image, claim, label, explanation> instances.

3.4 Humor

For multimodal humor, we rely on two datasets: MemeCap (Hwang and Schwartz, 2023) and New Yorker cartoons (Hessel et al., 2023).

3.4.1 MemeCap as Data Source




Figure 5: Creation of V-FLUTE instances for humor from MemeCap.

This dataset consists of memes along with their captions that describe the meme poster’s intent (see example in Figure 5). Memes frequently contain implicit, non-literal meaning (Lestari, 2019) and rely on visual metaphors (Piata, 2016), posing a challenge to VLMs.

Claim Generation. Since meme captions are not suited for an entailment task, we perform prompt GPT-4 with the caption to generate a claim from it (see example in Figure 5). We filter

these set of samples further with GPT-4 by asking whether the image entails the claim and only selecting positive instances. In addition to generating claims that entail the meme, we generate counterclaims using GPT-4.

Generating Textual Explanations. We prompted GPT-4 with the ground truth label in the prompt to explain the relationship between the image and the claim. See prompts in Appendix D.4.

Expert Verification. We hire the same three expert annotators to ensure the correctness of the data. Each annotator is tasked with verifying that 1) the generated claim fits the image and 2) the explanation is correct and complete, and if not, make the necessary changes. We also ask to discard samples with inappropriate content. After careful quality control, we have 1958 <image, claim, label, explanation> instances.

3.4.2 NYCartoons as Data Source

The NYCartoons dataset (Hessel et al., 2023) contains 651 high-quality instances from the New Yorker Cartoon Caption Contest. Each instance consists of a humorous image paired with a caption and a natural language explanation justifying the implicit humor between the caption and the image. We simply use the existing data where the caption is treated as a claim entailing the humorous image paired with an explanation.

3.5 Dataset Statistics

We split our data into 4,578 training, 726 validation, and 723 testing instances. Detailed counts per phenomenon and dataset, as well as other statistics, are in Appendix A.

4 Experiments

We empirically study how several baseline models perform on the task of explainable visual entailment. We investigate both off-the-shelf and fine-tuned model performance.

4.1 Models

We select a variety of models for our study (see taxonomy in Appendix, Figure 10). For **off-the-shelf models**, we explore both *open* and *API-based* models. For *open* models, we select the (current) state-of-the-art LLaVA-1.6 models (Liu et al., 2024). LLaVA is one of the simplest, yet one of the most high-performing VLM architectures currently available. It utilizes a pretrained large language model (e.g., Mistral-7B (Jiang et al.,

2023)) and a vision-language cross-modal connector (e.g., an MLP layer) to align the vision encoder (e.g., CLIP (Radford et al., 2021)) outputs to the language models. We select LLaVA-1.6 models in their 7B and 34B configurations (LLaVA-v1.6-7B and LLaVA-v1.6-34B respectively) and refer to them as *LLaVA-ZS-7B* and *LLaVA-ZS-34B*. Both models have been instruction-tuned on less than 1M visual instruction tuning samples to act as general language and vision assistants. It should, however, be noted that these models do not currently support few-shot multimodal prompting.

In addition to zero-shot testing, we also test these models using *Compositional Chain-of-Thought Prompting* proposed by Mitra et al. (2023). The method first prompts the model to generate a scene graph and then utilizes that scene graph in another prompt to answer the relevant question. The method works *zero-shot* without requiring fine-tuning. We refer to these models as *LLaVA-ZS-7B-SG* and *LLaVA-ZS-34B-SG* for the 7B and 34B LLaVA configurations described above.

For *API-based* models, we select three widely available state-of-the-art VLMs: Claude-3 Opus (claude-3-opus-20240229)(Anthropic, 2024), GPT-4 (gpt-4-1106-vision-preview)(OpenAI, 2023) and GeminiPro (gemini-pro-vision)(Team et al., 2023). We refer to GPT-4 as the “teacher” model as most candidate explanations were generated with it.

For **fine-tuned** models, we focus on fine-tuning LLaVA-1.5-7B model (Liu et al., 2023a) (the fine-tuning code for 1.6 model is not available during the time the paper was written). To minimize bias for a single instruction, we fine-tune and evaluate the models on a set of 21 instruction paraphrases (see Appendix Table 8). Three model configurations are tested:

- *LLaVA-eViL* is a checkpoint of LLaVA-v1.5-7B further fine-tuned on the eViL (e-SNLIVE) dataset for explainable visual entailment (Kayser et al., 2021) converted to the instruction format. We removed neutral label instances, which resulted in 275,815 training instances and 10,897 validation instances.
- *LLaVA-VF* is the same checkpoint fine-tuned on the training set of V-FLUTE. We also fine-tune the model with a white square instead of the V-FLUTE image (denoted by $-Image$).

- *LLaVA-eViL+VF* is the same checkpoint fine-tuned on both eViL and V-FLUTE.

All hyperparameters are in Appendix C.

4.2 Automatic Metrics

Similarly to prior work (Chakrabarty et al., 2022) we utilize both classic F1 score and an adjusted score that accounts for explanation quality: $F1@ExplanationScore$. The $ExplanationScore$ computes the average between BERTScore (Zhang* et al., 2020) based on the `microsoft-deberta-xlarge-mnli` model (He et al., 2021; Williams et al., 2018) and BLEURT (Sellam et al., 2020) based on the BLEURT-20 (Pu et al., 2021). Since our goal is to ensure models provide an answer for the right reasons, ideally, we would only count predictions as correct when the explanation is also correct. Hence, we report $F1@0$ (simply F1 score), $F1@53$ (only predictions with explanation score > 53 are considered correct), and $F1@60$. Thresholds are selected based on human evaluation of explanation quality in Section 5.3.

4.3 Automatic Evaluation Results

Table 3 shows the results based on the automatic evaluation. We also include results per phenomenon in Appendix F and the drop in performance when accounting for explanations score in Figure 6. Our results inform the following insights:

Fine-tuning on V-FLUTE leads to best classification performance on average across datasets.

Our strongest fine-tuned model (LLaVA-7B-eViL+VF) outperforms the best off-the-shelf model (GPT-4-5shot) in terms of the $F1@0$ score ($p < 0.03$; all p values reported via paired bootstrap test (Koehn, 2004)), and performs competitively when incorporating the explanations quality with GPT-4 leading slightly ($F1@60$ of 49.81 vs. 48.80 for the best fine-tuned model), which is expected as GPT-4 is the teacher model with which the majority of the explanation candidates were generated. Adding the e-ViL dataset improves the performance slightly compared to only fine-tuning on V-FLUTE. Fine-tuning merely on e-ViL improves over a random baseline; however, the explanations are of poor quality.

We also utilize a hypothesis-only baseline (Poliak et al., 2018) by including a model fine-tuned on the V-FLUTE dataset, but without the relevant

| Model Name | F1@0 | F1@53 | F1@60 |
|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| <i>Random Baseline</i> | 49.82 | - | - |
| <i>Fine-tuned</i> | | | |
| LLaVA-7B | | | |
| --> VF | 72.78 | 60.66 | 47.12 |
| --> - Image | 64.77 | 53.28 | 39.37 |
| --> eViL | 54.34 | 4.11 | 0.55 |
| --> + VF | <u>74.91</u> | <u>62.34</u> | <u>48.80</u> |
| <i>Off-the-shelf</i> | | | |
| <i>Open</i> | | | |
| LLaVA-ZS | | | |
| --> 7B | 45.44 | 35.57 | 18.38 |
| --> + SG | 52.94 | 39.27 | 14.86 |
| --> 34B | 55.60 | <u>48.32</u> | <u>31.83</u> |
| --> + SG | <u>58.08</u> | 45.74 | 26.77 |
| <i>API-based</i> | | | |
| --> Gemini | 53.70 | 39.72 | 19.01 |
| --> 5-shot | 67.25 | 56.04 | 37.14 |
| --> Claude | 56.07 | 45.37 | 22.31 |
| --> 5-shot | 67.79 | 58.70 | 35.32 |
| --> GPT-4 | 64.00 | 56.22 | 38.56 |
| --> 5-shot | <u>69.36</u> | <u>61.95</u> | <u>49.81</u> |

Table 3: F1 Score results for different models across thresholds 0.0, 0.53, and 0.6 for explanation score. Best result overall is in bold, best result in each category is underlined.

image (with a white square as an input instead, denoted as -Image). Fine-tuning on the full V-FLUTE dataset shows an improvement of over 8 points in F1@0 (better with $p < 0.002$), suggesting VLMs benefit from visual information when dealing with figurative phenomena and do not just rely on the input text to make their prediction.

Open zero-shot instruction-tuned models are lagging behind API-based models, but scene graph prompting improves performance. LLaVA-7B and 34B lag behind Claude 3 and GPT-4 in zero-shot settings. However, scene graph prompting improves the zero-shot performance of the LLaVA-based models, allowing them catch up to zero-shot API model performance (Gemini and Claude 3). The explanations generated by these models tend to overly focus on the contents of the scene graph rather than the underlying figurative phenomena, possibly causing a decrease in explanation score (and consequently in F1@60). The few-shot API models outperform zero-shot API models, and are better than all configurations of open models in F1@0, 53, 60,

indicating the effectiveness of few-shot prompting (not available for LLaVA-based models as of now).

Performance for models decreases when taking into account explanation quality. We plot the relative percentage decrease between F1@0 and F1@60 for LLaVA-eViL-VF, LLaVA-34B-SG, and GPT-4-5shot in Figure 6. Higher relative drop indicates higher difficulty of generating the correct explanation. For all models, we see a substantial decrease in performance, especially on challenging phenomena such as Humor (NYCartoons). For Metaphor (IRFL), Humor (MemeCap) and Idiom (IRFL) subsets GPT-4 exhibits the lowest relative performance drop, while for Metaphor (HAIVMet), Humor (NYCartoons) and Sarcasm (MuSE) the fine-tuned model has the lowest drop.

We can see that the percentage drop is substantially higher for all models for the HAIVMet subset rather than the IRFL dataset, which contains metaphors in the image rather than in the text. *This suggests it is harder for models to generate correct explanations when the figurative meaning is contained in the image rather than in the text, indicating the need to expand current datasets to include images with figurative meaning.*




Figure 6: % Drop in F1 score for various models by source dataset between 0 to 0.6. Higher drop indicates higher proportion of wrongly generated explanations.

4.4 Human Baseline

To find out how humans perform on the task, we hire two expert annotators with formal education in linguistics. We present them with 10 example instances and then ask them to complete 99 randomly sampled test set instances. We also evaluate our best model (see Table 3) on the same set. Results are shown in Table 4. Human performance is quite strong, almost reaching 90 F1@0 score

overall. Human performance is better than our strongest fine-tuned model (LLaVA-7B-eViL+VF) performance with $p < 0.05$ for Annotator 1 and $p < 0.07$ for Annotator 2. Humans excel at interpreting memes, with both annotators reaching a 100% F1 score. Humans also perform noticeably better on the NYCartoons dataset and on the idiom subset of the task. The model has a slight edge in performance on the sarcasm and visual metaphor subsets of the task, perhaps due to difficulty of these subsets and any potential spurious correlations during fine-tuning.

| Phenomenon | Dataset | Human Avg | LLaVA-eViL+VF |
|-------------------|-------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| Metaphor /Similes | HAIVMET | 78.84 | 81.25 |
| | IRFL (metaphor /simile) | 94.36 | 77.78 |
| Idioms | IRFL (idiom) | 89.26 | 49.74 |
| Sarcasm | MuSE | 68.89 | 85.42 |
| Humor | MemeCap | 100.0 | 78.03 |
| | NYCartoons | 71.43 | 47.83 |
| Overall | | 89.09 | 77.26 |

Table 4: Human baseline results (F1@0) by phenomenon and source dataset.

5 Human Evaluation and Error Analysis

We conduct human evaluation of generated explanation to more reliably assess their quality and identify key errors in multimodal figurative language understanding. We recruit two expert annotators with background in linguistics for the task and sample 95 random instances from the test set. For each instance, we first provide the annotators with the image, claim and reference explanation and ask the annotators to choose the right label. If the annotator succeeds, they can view the rest of the task, which consists of 3 explanations from our top models by F1@0 in each category: LLaVA-eViL-VF, LLaVA-34B-SG, GPT-4-5shot. The explanations are taken for both correct and incorrect model predictions. For each explanation, we ask whether the explanation is adequate (accurate, correct, complete and concise). If not, we ask them to identify one of the three main types of errors based on the following taxonomy:

- **Hallucination:** explanation is not faithful to the image, indicating difficulties with basic visual comprehension (see prediction of a blunt tip when the pencil tip is actually sharp in row 1 of Table 5).
- **Unsound reasoning:** sentences do not adhere to natural logic or violate common sense (e.g., concluding than an upwards arrow and lots of money imply an economic crisis, see row 3).
- **Incomplete reasoning:** while overall the explanation makes sense, it does not address the key property reasons why the image entails or contradicts the claim (for example, does not address the figurative part in the image, see row 2).
- **Too Verbose:** the explanation is too verbose to the point it would interfere rather than help one decide the correct label.

5.1 How Do Models Perform According to Humans?

In Table 6, we show adequacy and preference rates for explanations from the 3 systems, where an explanation is deemed adequate if both annotators agreed it is, and inadequate if both agreed it is not. The preference percentage is also taken among instances where the annotators agreed that the model’s explanation is preferred among all the adequate explanations. The average IAA using Cohen’s κ is 0.47, indicating moderate agreement (Cohen, 1960). We observe that the teacher model is leading in terms of the adequacy of the explanations and preference rate, as expected from a larger system equipped for higher quality reasoning and generation capabilities. Yet still only half of its explanations are considered adequate. This further confirms that despite impressive performance on the F1@0 scores, the models are not yet capable of producing adequate textual explanations in many instances.

5.2 What Errors Do Models Make?

We also analyze to understand what type of errors do each model make when they are considered not adequate in the above evaluation. In Figure 7, we illustrate the normalized frequency of error types when both annotators agree that the explanation is not adequate (i.e., out of all errors for this model, what percentage is each type of error?). In general, annotators did not consider verbosity to be a

| Error Type | Image | Claim | Label and Explanation |
|---|---|--|--|
| Hallucination (describes sharp pencil as having a blunt tip) |  | The tip is as sharp as a knife. | Predicted Label: Contradiction <i>Predicted Explanation:</i> The image depicts a pencil with a blunt tip . [...] |
| Incomplete (does not address metaphorical meaning of iceberg imagery) |  | They looked at each other in an almost hostile way. | Predicted Label: Entailment <i>Predicted Explanation:</i> The image depicts two characters looking at each other with a tense and confrontational expression , which is consistent with the claim [...] |
| Unsound (concludes that large amount of money + upward trending chart implies rough waters) |  | The world recession of 2001 was one of the worst in history. | Predicted Label: Entailment <i>Predicted Explanation:</i> The image depicts a man in a boat, holding a large amount of money and a chart with an arrow pointing upwards. This suggests that the man is navigating through rough waters [...] |

Table 5: Examples of error types generated explanations.

| | LLaVA-7B eViL+VF | LLaVA-34B SG | GPT-4 (5 shot) |
|---------------------|---------------------|-----------------|-------------------|
| Adequate % | 33.78 | 29.85 | 50.67 |
| Preference % | 23.08 | 7.69 | 44.23 |

Table 6: Adequacy and Preference rates for generated explanations.




Figure 7: Normalized frequency of main error types in the explanation by model.

major issue of the systems. For GPT-4, the leading error type is hallucination, indicating the need to improve faithful image recognition even in the most advanced models. For the fine-tuned model and LLaVA-34B-SG, the main error type is unsound reasoning, indicating that it is challenging for the models to reason about multimodal figurative inputs consistently.

5.3 How Well Does the Explanation Score Predict Human Judgment on Adequacy?

We explore whether the proposed explanation score can capture human judgement of explanation adequacy. We collect all instances where both annotators agreed on the adequacy judgement for the explanation. We evaluate if the explanation score described in Section 4.2 can act as a good predictor for the human adequacy judgment. We find that the area under the Precision-Recall curve is 0.79, and the maximum F1 score is 0.77, obtainable at the explanation score threshold of 0.53. Hence, we use this threshold to report the results in Table 3. We also use the threshold of 0.6 since it maximizes F1 such that both precision and recall are above 0.75.

6 Conclusions

We introduce a high-quality dataset for understanding figurative phenomena in multimodal input, V-FLUTE, framed as an explainable visual entailment. Our dataset consists of 6,027 <image, claim, label, explanation> instances spanning a variety of figurative phenomena such as metaphor, idiom, simile, sarcasm, and humor. We use this dataset to benchmark the performance of state-of-the-art vision-language models using both automatic and human evaluation and to identify critical areas of improvement for VLMs for this task.

References

- Shourya Aggarwal, Divyanshu Mandowara, Vishwajeet Agrawal, Dinesh Khandelwal, Parag Singla, and Dinesh Garg. 2021. [Explanations for CommonsenseQA: New Dataset and Models](#). In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 3050–3065, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Arjun R Akula, Brendan Driscoll, Pradyumna Narayana, Soravit Changpinyo, Zhiwei Jia, Suyash Damle, Garima Pruthi, Sugato Basu, Leonidas Guibas, William T Freeman, et al. 2023. [Metaclue: Towards comprehensive visual metaphors research](#). In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 23201–23211.
- Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jeff Donahue, Pauline Luc, Antoine Miech, Iain Barr, Yana Hasson, Karel Lenc, Arthur Mensch, Katherine Millican, Malcolm Reynolds, et al. 2022. [Flamingo: a visual language model for few-shot learning](#). *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:23716–23736.
- Anthropic. 2024. [The claude 3 model family: Opus, sonnet, haiku](https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-family). <https://www.anthropic.com/news/claude-3-family>.
- Samuel R. Bowman, Gabor Angeli, Christopher Potts, and Christopher D. Manning. 2015. [A large annotated corpus for learning natural language inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 632–642, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Oana-Maria Camburu, Tim Rocktäschel, Thomas Lukasiewicz, and Phil Blunsom. 2018. [e-snli: Natural language inference with natural language explanations](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 31. Curran Associates, Inc.
- Sky CH-Wang, Arkadiy Saakyan, Oliver Li, Zhou Yu, and Smaranda Muresan. 2023. [Sociocultural norm similarities and differences via situational alignment and explainable textual entailment](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 3548–3564, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tuhin Chakrabarty, Arkadiy Saakyan, Debanjan Ghosh, and Smaranda Muresan. 2022. [FLUTE: Figurative language understanding through textual explanations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 7139–7159, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Tuhin Chakrabarty, Arkadiy Saakyan, Olivia Winn, Artemis Panagopoulou, Yue Yang, Marianna Apidianaki, and Smaranda Muresan. 2023. [I spy a metaphor: Large language models and diffusion models co-create visual metaphors](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: ACL 2023*, pages 7370–7388, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jacob Cohen. 1960. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educational and psychological measurement*, 20(1):37–46.
- Poorav Desai, Tanmoy Chakraborty, and Md Shad Akhtar. 2022. [Nice perfume. how long did you marinate in it? multimodal sarcasm explanation](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 36(10):10563–10571.
- Gourab Dey, Adithya V Ganesan, Yash Kumar Lal, Manal Shah, Shreyashee Sinha, Matthew Matero, Salvatore Giorgi, Vivek Kulkarni, and H Andrew Schwartz. 2024. [Socialite-llama: An instruction-tuned model for social scientific tasks](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01980*.
- Charles Forceville. 2002. *Pictorial metaphor in advertising*. Routledge.
- Susan R Fussell and Mallie M Moss. 2014. [Figurative language in emotional communication](#). In *Social and cognitive approaches to interpersonal communication*, pages 113–141. Psychology Press.
- Matt Gardner, William Merrill, Jesse Dodge, Matthew Peters, Alexis Ross, Sameer Singh,

- and Noah A. Smith. 2021. [Competency problems: On finding and removing artifacts in language data](#). In *Proceedings of the 2021 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1801–1813, Online and Punta Cana, Dominican Republic. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Suchin Gururangan, Swabha Swayamdipta, Omer Levy, Roy Schwartz, Samuel Bowman, and Noah A. Smith. 2018. [Annotation artifacts in natural language inference data](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 2 (Short Papers)*, pages 107–112, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Pengcheng He, Xiaodong Liu, Jianfeng Gao, and Weizhu Chen. 2021. [{DEBERTA}: {DECODING}-{enhanced} {bert} {with} {disentangled} {attention}](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jack Hessel, Ana Marasovic, Jena D. Hwang, Lillian Lee, Jeff Da, Rowan Zellers, Robert Mankoff, and Yejin Choi. 2023. [Do androids laugh at electric sheep? humor “understanding” benchmarks from the new yorker caption contest](#). In *Proceedings of the 61st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 688–714, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Edward J Hu, yelong shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. [LoRA: Low-rank adaptation of large language models](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- EunJeong Hwang and Vered Shwartz. 2023. [MemeCap: A dataset for captioning and interpreting memes](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 1433–1445, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Albert Q. Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Arthur Mensch, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Florian Bressand, Gianna Lengyel, Guillaume Lample, Lucile Saulnier, L elio Renard Lavaud, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Pierre Stock, Teven Le Scao, Thibaut Lavril, Thomas Wang, Timoth ee Lacroix, and William El Sayed. 2023. [Mistral 7b](#).
- Maxime Kayser, Oana-Maria Camburu, Leonard Salewski, Cornelius Emde, Virginie Do, Zeynep Akata, and Thomas Lukasiewicz. 2021. [e-vil: A dataset and benchmark for natural language explanations in vision-language tasks](#). In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 1244–1254.
- Philipp Koehn. 2004. [Statistical significance tests for machine translation evaluation](#). In *Proceedings of the 2004 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 388–395, Barcelona, Spain. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Widia Lestari. 2019. [Irony analysis of memes on instagram social media](#). *Pioneer: Journal of Language and Literature*, 10(2):114–123.
- Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. 2022. [Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation](#). In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR.
- Alisa Liu, Swabha Swayamdipta, Noah A. Smith, and Yejin Choi. 2022. [WANLI: Worker and AI collaboration for natural language inference dataset creation](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2022*, pages 6826–6847, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, and Yong Jae Lee. 2023a. [Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning](#).
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Sheng Shen, and Yong Jae Lee. 2024. [Llava-next: Improved reasoning, ocr, and world knowledge](#).
- Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. 2023b. [Visual instruction tuning](#). In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 36, pages 34892–34916. Curran Associates, Inc.

- Pan Lu, Swaroop Mishra, Tony Xia, Liang Qiu, Kai-Wei Chang, Song-Chun Zhu, Oyvind Tafjord, Peter Clark, and Ashwin Kalyan. 2022. Learn to explain: Multimodal reasoning via thought chains for science question answering. In *The 36th Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.
- Bill MacCartney and Christopher D. Manning. 2008. [Modeling semantic containment and exclusion in natural language inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on Computational Linguistics (Coling 2008)*, pages 521–528, Manchester, UK. Coling 2008 Organizing Committee.
- Tom McCoy, Ellie Pavlick, and Tal Linzen. 2019. [Right for the wrong reasons: Diagnosing syntactic heuristics in natural language inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 3428–3448, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Chancharik Mitra, Brandon Huang, Trevor Darrell, and Roei Herzig. 2023. [Compositional chain-of-thought prompting for large multi-modal models](#).
- OpenAI. 2023. Gpt-4v(ision) system card. https://cdn.openai.com/papers/GPTV_System_Card.pdf.
- Anna Piata. 2016. [When metaphor becomes a joke: Metaphor journeys from political ads to internet memes](#). *Journal of Pragmatics*, 106:39–56.
- Adam Poliak, Jason Naradowsky, Aparajita Haldar, Rachel Rudinger, and Benjamin Van Durme. 2018. [Hypothesis only baselines in natural language inference](#). In *Proceedings of the Seventh Joint Conference on Lexical and Computational Semantics*, pages 180–191, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Amy Pu, Hyung Won Chung, Ankur P Parikh, Sebastian Gehrmann, and Thibault Sellam. 2021. Learning compact metrics for mt. In *Proceedings of EMNLP*.
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. 2021. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR.
- Nazneen Fatema Rajani, Bryan McCann, Caiming Xiong, and Richard Socher. 2019. [Explain yourself! leveraging language models for commonsense reasoning](#). In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4932–4942, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Richard M. Roberts and Roger J. Kreuz. 1994. [Why do people use figurative language?](#) *Psychological Science*, 5(3):159–163.
- Arkadiy Saakyan, Tuhin Chakrabarty, Debanjan Ghosh, and Smaranda Muresan. 2022. A report on the figlang 2022 shared task on understanding figurative language. In *Proceedings of the 3rd Workshop on Figurative Language Processing (FLP)*, pages 178–183.
- Linda M Scott. 1994. Images in advertising: The need for a theory of visual rhetoric. *Journal of consumer research*, 21(2):252–273.
- Thibault Sellam, Dipanjan Das, and Ankur Parikh. 2020. [BLEURT: Learning robust metrics for text generation](#). In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 7881–7892, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ekaterina V Shutova. 2011. Computational approaches to figurative language. Technical report, University of Cambridge, Computer Laboratory.
- Settaluri Lakshmi Sravanthi, Meet Doshi, Tankala Pavan Kalyan, Rudra Murthy, Pushpak Bhattacharyya, and Raj Dabre. 2024. Pub: A pragmatics understanding benchmark for assessing llms’ pragmatics capabilities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.07078*.
- Kevin Stowe, Prasetya Utama, and Iryna Gurevych. 2022. [IMPLI: Investigating NLI models’ performance on figurative language](#). In *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 5375–5388,

Dublin, Ireland. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Yonghui Wu, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M. Dai, Anja Hauth, Katie Millican, David Silver, Slav Petrov, Melvin Johnson, Ioannis Antonoglou, Julian Schrittwieser, Amelia Glaese, Jilin Chen, Emily Pitler, Timothy Lillicrap, Angeliki Lazaridou, Orhan Firat, James Molloy, Michael Isard, Paul R. Barham, Tom Hennigan, Benjamin Lee, Fabio Viola, Malcolm Reynolds, Yuanzhong Xu, Ryan Doherty, Eli Collins, Clemens Meyer, Eliza Rutherford, Erica Moreira, Kareem Ayoub, Megha Goel, George Tucker, Enrique Piqueras, Maxim Krikun, Iain Barr, Nikolay Savinov, Ivo Danihelka, Becca Roelofs, Anaïs White, Anders Andreassen, Tamara von Glehn, Lakshman Yagati, Mehran Kazemi, Lucas Gonzalez, Misha Khalman, Jakub Sygnowski, Alexandre Frechette, Charlotte Smith, Laura Culp, Lev Proleev, Yi Luan, Xi Chen, James Lottes, Nathan Schucher, Federico Lebron, Alban Rustemi, Natalie Clay, Phil Crone, Tomas Kocisky, Jeffrey Zhao, Bartek Perz, Dian Yu, Heidi Howard, Adam Bloniarz, Jack W. Rae, Han Lu, Laurent Sifre, Marcello Maggioni, Fred Alcober, Dan Garrette, Megan Barnes, Shantanu Thakoor, Jacob Austin, Gabriel Barth-Maron, William Wong, Rishabh Joshi, Rahma Chaabouni, Deeni Fatiha, Arun Ahuja, Ruibo Liu, Yunxuan Li, Sarah Cogan, Jeremy Chen, Chao Jia, Chenjie Gu, Qiao Zhang, Jordan Grimstad, Ale Jakse Hartman, Martin Chadwick, Gaurav Singh Tomar, Xavier Garcia, Evan Senter, Emanuel Taropa, Thanumalayan Sankaranarayanan Pillai, Jacob Devlin, Michael Laskin, Diego de Las Casas, Dasha Valter, Connie Tao, Lorenzo Blanco, Adrià Puigdomènech Badia, David Reitter, Mianna Chen, Jenny Brennan, Clara Rivera, Sergey Brin, Shariq Iqbal, Gabriela Surita, Jane Labanowski, Abhi Rao, Stephanie Winkler, Emilio Parisotto, Yiming Gu, Kate Olszewska, Yujing Zhang, Ravi Ad-danki, Antoine Miech, Annie Louis, Laurent El Shafey, Denis Teplyashin, Geoff Brown, Elliot Catt, Nithya Attaluri, Jan Balaguer, Jackie Xiang, Pidong Wang, Zoe Ashwood, Anton Briukhov, Albert Webson, Sanjay Ganapathy, Smit Sanghavi, Ajay Kannan, Ming-

Wei Chang, Axel Stjerngren, Josip Djolonga, Yuting Sun, Ankur Bapna, Matthew Aitchison, Pedram Pejman, Henryk Michalewski, Tianhe Yu, Cindy Wang, Juliette Love, Junwhan Ahn, Dawn Bloxwich, Kehang Han, Peter Humphreys, Thibault Sellam, James Bradbury, Varun Godbole, Sina Samangooei, Bogdan Damoc, Alex Kaskasoli, Sébastien M. R. Arnold, Vijay Vasudevan, Shubham Agrawal, Jason Riesa, Dmitry Lepikhin, Richard Tanburn, Srivatsan Srinivasan, Hyeontaek Lim, Sarah Hodgkinson, Pranav Shyam, Johan Ferret, Steven Hand, Ankush Garg, Tom Le Paine, Jian Li, Yujia Li, Minh Giang, Alexander Neitz, Zaheer Abbas, Sarah York, Machel Reid, Elizabeth Cole, Aakanksha Chowdhery, Dipanjan Das, Dominika Rogozińska, Vitaly Nikolaev, Pablo Sprechmann, Zachary Nado, Lukas Zilka, Flavien Prost, Luheng He, Marianne Monteiro, Gaurav Mishra, Chris Welty, Josh Newlan, Dawei Jia, Miltiadis Allamanis, Clara Huiyi Hu, Raoul de Liedekerke, Justin Gilmer, Carl Saroufim, Shruti Rijhwani, Shaobo Hou, Disha Shrivastava, Anirudh Baddepudi, Alex Goldin, Adnan Ozturel, Albin Cassirer, Yunhan Xu, Daniel Sohn, Devendra Sachan, Reinald Kim Amplayo, Craig Swanson, Dessie Petrova, Shashi Narayan, Arthur Guez, Siddhartha Brahma, Jessica Landon, Miteyan Patel, Ruizhe Zhao, Kevin Vilella, Luyu Wang, Wenhao Jia, Matthew Rahtz, Mai Giménez, Legg Yeung, Hanzhao Lin, James Keeling, Petko Georgiev, Diana Mincu, Boxi Wu, Salem Haykal, Rachel Saputro, Kiran Vodrahalli, James Qin, Zeynep Cankara, Abhan-shu Sharma, Nick Fernando, Will Hawkins, Behnam Neyshabur, Solomon Kim, Adrian Hutter, Priyanka Agrawal, Alex Castro-Ros, George van den Driessche, Tao Wang, Fan Yang, Shuo yiin Chang, Paul Komarek, Ross McIlroy, Mario Lučić, Guodong Zhang, Wael Farhan, Michael Sharman, Paul Natsev, Paul Michel, Yong Cheng, Yamini Bansal, Siyuan Qiao, Kris Cao, Siamak Shakeri, Christina Butterfield, Justin Chung, Paul Kishan Rubenstein, Shivani Agrawal, Arthur Mensch, Kedar Soparkar, Karel Lenc, Timothy Chung, Aedan Pope, Loren Maggiore, Jackie Kay, Priya Jhakra, Shibo Wang, Joshua Maynez, Mary Phuong, Taylor Tobin, Andrea Tacchetti, Maja Trebacz, Kevin Robinson, Yash Katariya, Se-

bastian Riedel, Paige Bailey, Kefan Xiao, Nimesh Ghelani, Lora Aroyo, Ambrose Slone, Neil Houlsby, Xuehan Xiong, Zhen Yang, Elena Gribovskaya, Jonas Adler, Mateo Wirth, Lisa Lee, Music Li, Thais Kagohara, Jay Pava-gadhi, Sophie Bridgers, Anna Bortsova, San-jay Ghemawat, Zafarali Ahmed, Tianqi Liu, Richard Powell, Vijay Bolina, Mariko Inuma, Polina Zablotskaia, James Besley, Da-Woon Chung, Timothy Dozat, Ramona Comanescu, Xiance Si, Jeremy Greer, Guolong Su, Mar-tin Polacek, Raphaël Lopez Kaufman, Simon Tokumine, Hexiang Hu, Elena Buchatskaya, Yingjie Miao, Mohamed Elhawaty, Aditya Sid-dhant, Nenad Tomasev, Jinwei Xing, Christina Greer, Helen Miller, Shereen Ashraf, Aurko Roy, Zizhao Zhang, Ada Ma, Angelos Fi-los, Milos Besta, Rory Blevins, Ted Klimenko, Chih-Kuan Yeh, Soravit Changpinyo, Jiaqi Mu, Oscar Chang, Mantas Pajarskas, Carrie Muir, Vered Cohen, Charline Le Lan, Krishna Hari-dasan, Amit Marathe, Steven Hansen, Sholto Douglas, Rajkumar Samuel, Mingqiu Wang, Sophia Austin, Chang Lan, Jiepu Jiang, Justin Chiu, Jaime Alonso Lorenzo, Lars Lowe Sjö-sund, Sébastien Cevey, Zach Gleicher, Thi Avrahami, Anudhyan Boral, Hansa Srinivasan, Vittorio Selo, Rhys May, Konstantinos Aisopos, Léonard Hussenot, Livio Baldini Soares, Kate Baumli, Michael B. Chang, Adrià Recasens, Ben Caine, Alexander Pritzel, Filip Pavetic, Fabio Pardo, Anita Gergely, Justin Frye, Vinay Ramasesh, Dan Horgan, Kartikeya Badola, Nora Kassner, Subhrajit Roy, Ethan Dyer, Víctor Campos, Alex Tomala, Yunhao Tang, Dalia El Badawy, Elspeth White, Basil Mustafa, Oran Lang, Abhishek Jindal, Sharad Vikram, Zhitao Gong, Sergi Caelles, Ross Hemsley, Gregory Thornton, Fangxiaoyu Feng, Wojciech Stokowiec, Ce Zheng, Phoebe Thacker, Çağlar Ünlü, Zhishuai Zhang, Mohammad Saleh, James Svensson, Max Bileschi, Piyush Patil, Ankesh Anand, Roman Ring, Katerina Tsih-las, Arpi Vezer, Marco Selvi, Toby Shevlane, Mikel Rodriguez, Tom Kwiatkowski, Samira Daruki, Keran Rong, Allan Dafoe, Nicholas FitzGerald, Keren Gu-Lemberg, Mina Khan, Lisa Anne Hendricks, Marie Pellat, Vladimir Feinberg, James Cobon-Kerr, Tara Sainath, Maribeth Rauh, Sayed Hadi Hashemi, Richard Ives, Yana Hasson, YaGuang Li, Eric Noland,

Yuan Cao, Nathan Byrd, Le Hou, Qingze Wang, Thibault Sottiaux, Michela Paganini, Jean-Baptiste Lespiau, Alexandre Moufarek, Samer Hassan, Kaushik Shivakumar, Joost van Amers-foort, Amol Mandhane, Pratik Joshi, Anirudh Goyal, Matthew Tung, Andrew Brock, Han-nah Sheahan, Vedant Misra, Cheng Li, Nemanja Rakićević, Mostafa Dehghani, Fangyu Liu, Sid Mittal, Junhyuk Oh, Seb Noury, Eren Sezener, Fantine Huot, Matthew Lamm, Nicola De Cao, Charlie Chen, Gamaleldin Elsayed, Ed Chi, Mahdis Mahdieh, Ian Tenney, Nan Hua, Ivan Petrychenko, Patrick Kane, Dylan Scandinaro, Rishub Jain, Jonathan Uesato, Romina Datta, Adam Sadovsky, Oskar Bunyan, Dominik Ra-biej, Shimu Wu, John Zhang, Gautam Vasude-van, Edouard Leurent, Mahmoud Alnahlawi, Ionut Georgescu, Nan Wei, Ivy Zheng, Betty Chan, Pam G Rabinovitch, Piotr Stanczyk, Ye Zhang, David Steiner, Subhajit Naskar, Michael Azzam, Matthew Johnson, Adam Paszke, Chung-Cheng Chiu, Jaume Sanchez Elias, Afroz Mohiuddin, Faizan Muhammad, Jin Miao, Andrew Lee, Nino Vieillard, Sahitya Potluri, Jane Park, Elnaz Davoodi, Jiageng Zhang, Jeff Stanway, Drew Garmon, Abhijit Karmarkar, Zhe Dong, Jong Lee, Aviral Ku-mar, Luowei Zhou, Jonathan Evens, William Isaac, Zhe Chen, Johnson Jia, Anselm Lev-skaya, Zhenkai Zhu, Chris Gorgolewski, Peter Grabowski, Yu Mao, Alberto Magni, Kaisheng Yao, Javier Snaider, Norman Casagrande, Paul Suganthan, Evan Palmer, Geoffrey Irving, Ed-ward Loper, Manaal Faruqui, Isha Arkatkar, Nanxin Chen, Izhak Shafran, Michael Fink, Alfonso Castaño, Irene Giannoumis, Wooyeol Kim, Mikołaj Rybiński, Ashwin Sreevatsa, Jen-nifer Prendki, David Soergel, Adrian Goedeck-emeyer, Willi Gierke, Mohsen Jafari, Meenu Gaba, Jeremy Wiesner, Diana Gage Wright, Yawen Wei, Harsha Vashisht, Yana Kulizh-skaya, Jay Hoover, Maigo Le, Lu Li, Chimezie Iwuanyanwu, Lu Liu, Kevin Ramirez, Andrey Khorlin, Albert Cui, Tian LIN, Marin Georgiev, Marcus Wu, Ricardo Aguilar, Keith Pallo, Ab-hishek Chakladar, Alena Repina, Xihui Wu, Tom van der Weide, Priya Ponnappalli, Caro-line Kaplan, Jiri Simsa, Shuangfeng Li, Olivier Dousse, Fan Yang, Jeff Piper, Nathan Ie, Minnie Lui, Rama Pasumarthi, Nathan Lintz, Anitha Vijayakumar, Lam Nguyen Thiet, Daniel An-

dor, Pedro Valenzuela, Cosmin Paduraru, Daiyi Peng, Katherine Lee, Shuyuan Zhang, Somer Greene, Duc Dung Nguyen, Paula Kurylowicz, Sarmishta Velury, Sebastian Krause, Cassidy Hardin, Lucas Dixon, Lili Janzer, Kiam Choo, Ziqiang Feng, Biao Zhang, Achintya Singhal, Tejasi Latkar, Mingyang Zhang, Quoc Le, Elena Allica Abellan, Dayou Du, Dan McKinnon, Natasha Antropova, Tolga Bolukbasi, Orgad Keller, David Reid, Daniel Finchelstein, Maria Abi Raad, Remi Crocker, Peter Hawkins, Robert Dadashi, Colin Gaffney, Sid Lall, Ken Franko, Egor Filonov, Anna Bulanova, Rémi Leblond, Vikas Yadav, Shirley Chung, Harry Askham, Luis C. Cobo, Kelvin Xu, Felix Fischer, Jun Xu, Christina Sorokin, Chris Alberti, Chu-Cheng Lin, Colin Evans, Hao Zhou, Alek Dimitriev, Hannah Forbes, Dylan Banarse, Zora Tung, Jeremiah Liu, Mark Omernick, Colton Bishop, Chintu Kumar, Rachel Sterneck, Ryan Foley, Rohan Jain, Swaroop Mishra, Jiawei Xia, Taylor Bos, Geoffrey Cideron, Ehsan Amid, Francesco Piccinno, Xingyu Wang, Praseem Banzal, Petru Gurita, Hila Noga, Premal Shah, Daniel J. Mankowitz, Alex Polozov, Nate Kushman, Victoria Krakovna, Sasha Brown, MohammadHossein Bateni, Dennis Duan, Vlad Firoiu, Meghana Thotakuri, Tom Natan, Anhad Mohananey, Matthieu Geist, Sidharth Mudgal, Sertan Girgin, Hui Li, Jiayu Ye, Ofir Roval, Reiko Tojo, Michael Kwong, James Lee-Thorp, Christopher Yew, Quan Yuan, Sumit Bagri, Danila Sinopalnikov, Sabela Ramos, John Mellor, Abhishek Sharma, Aliaksei Severyn, Jonathan Lai, Kathy Wu, Heng-Tze Cheng, David Miller, Nicolas Sonnerat, Denis Vnukov, Rory Greig, Jennifer Beattie, Emily Caveness, Libin Bai, Julian Eisenschlos, Alex Korchemniy, Tomy Tsai, Mimi Jasarevic, Weize Kong, Phuong Dao, Zeyu Zheng, Frederick Liu, Fan Yang, Rui Zhu, Mark Geller, Tian Huey Teh, Jason Sanmiya, Evgeny Gladchenko, Nejc Trdin, Andrei Sozanschi, Daniel Toyama, Evan Rosen, Sasan Tavakkol, Linting Xue, Chen Elkind, Oliver Woodman, John Carpenter, George Papamakarios, Rupert Kemp, Sushant Kafle, Tanya Grunina, Rishika Sinha, Alice Talbert, Abhimanyu Goyal, Diane Wu, Denese Owusu-Afriyie, Cosmo Du, Chloe Thornton, Jordi Pont-Tuset, Pradyumna Narayana, Jing Li, Sabaer Fatehi, John Wieting, Omar

Ajmeri, Benigno Uria, Tao Zhu, Yeongil Ko, Laura Knight, Amélie Héliou, Ning Niu, Shane Gu, Chenxi Pang, Dustin Tran, Yeqing Li, Nir Levine, Ariel Stolovich, Norbert Kalb, Rebeca Santamaria-Fernandez, Sonam Goenka, Wenny Yustalim, Robin Strudel, Ali Elqursh, Balaji Lakshminarayanan, Charlie Deck, Shyam Upadhyay, Hyo Lee, Mike Dusenberry, Zonglin Li, Xuezhi Wang, Kyle Levin, Raphael Hoffmann, Dan Holtmann-Rice, Olivier Bachem, Summer Yue, Sho Arora, Eric Malmi, Daniil Mirylenka, Qijun Tan, Christy Koh, Soheil Hassas Yeganeh, Siim Pöder, Steven Zheng, Francesco Pongetti, Mukarram Tariq, Yanhua Sun, Lucian Ionita, Mojtaba Seyedhosseini, Pouya Tafti, Ragha Kotikalapudi, Zhiyu Liu, Anmol Gulati, Jasmine Liu, Xinyu Ye, Bart Chrzaszcz, Lily Wang, Nikhil Sethi, Tianrun Li, Ben Brown, Shreya Singh, Wei Fan, Aaron Parisi, Joe Stanton, Chenkai Kuang, Vinod Koverkathu, Christopher A. Choquette-Choo, Yunjie Li, TJ Lu, Abe Ittycheriah, Prakash Shroff, Pei Sun, Mani Varadarajan, Sanaz Bahargam, Rob Willoughby, David Gaddy, Ishita Dasgupta, Guillaume Desjardins, Marco Cornero, Brona Robenek, Bhavishya Mittal, Ben Albrecht, Ashish Shenoy, Fedor Moiseev, Henrik Jacobsson, Alireza Ghaffarkhah, Morgane Rivièrè, Alanna Walton, Clément Crepy, Alicia Parrish, Yuan Liu, Zongwei Zhou, Clement Farabet, Carey Radebaugh, Praveen Srinivasan, Claudia van der Salm, Andreas Fildjeland, Salvatore Scellato, Eri Latorre-Chimoto, Hanna Klimczak-Plucińska, David Bridson, Dario de Cesare, Tom Hudson, Piermaria Mendolichio, Lexi Walker, Alex Morris, Ivo Penchev, Matthew Mauer, Alexey Guseynov, Alison Reid, Seth Odoom, Lucia Loher, Victor Cotruta, Madhavi Yenugula, Dominik Grewe, Anastasia Petrushkina, Tom Duerig, Antonio Sanchez, Steve Yadlowsky, Amy Shen, Amir Globerson, Adam Kurzrok, Lynette Webb, Sahil Dua, Dong Li, Preethi Lahoti, Surya Bhupatiraju, Dan Hurt, Haroon Qureshi, Ananth Agarwal, Tomer Shani, Matan Eyal, Anuj Khare, Shreyas Rammohan Belle, Lei Wang, Chetan Tekur, Mihir Sanjay Kale, Jinliang Wei, Ruoxin Sang, Brennan Saeta, Tyler Liechty, Yi Sun, Yao Zhao, Stephan Lee, Pandu Nayak, Doug Fritz, Manish Reddy Vuyyuru, John Aslanides, Nidhi Vyas, Martin Wicke, Xiao Ma, Tay-

- Ian Bilal, Evgenii Eltyshev, Daniel Balle, Nina Martin, Hardie Cate, James Manyika, Keyvan Amiri, Yelin Kim, Xi Xiong, Kai Kang, Florian Luisier, Nilesh Tripuraneni, David Madras, Mandy Guo, Austin Waters, Oliver Wang, Joshua Ainslie, Jason Baldridge, Han Zhang, Garima Pruthi, Jakob Bauer, Feng Yang, Riham Mansour, Jason Gelman, Yang Xu, George Polovets, Ji Liu, Honglong Cai, Warren Chen, XiangHai Sheng, Emily Xue, Sherjil Ozair, Adams Yu, Christof Angermueller, Xiaowei Li, Weiren Wang, Julia Wiesinger, Emmanouil Koukoumidis, Yuan Tian, Anand Iyer, Madhu Gurumurthy, Mark Goldenson, Parashar Shah, MK Blake, Hongkun Yu, Anthony Urbanowicz, Jennimaria Palomaki, Chrisantha Fernando, Kevin Brooks, Ken Durden, Harsh Mehta, Nikola Momchev, Elahe Rahimtoroghi, Maria Georgaki, Amit Raul, Sebastian Ruder, Morgan Redshaw, Jinhyuk Lee, Komal Jalan, Dinghua Li, Ginger Perng, Blake Hechtman, Parker Schuh, Milad Nasr, Mia Chen, Kieran Milan, Vladimir Mikulik, Trevor Strohman, Juliana Franco, Tim Green, Demis Hassabis, Koray Kavukcuoglu, Jeffrey Dean, and Oriol Vinyals. 2023. [Gemini: A family of highly capable multimodal models](#).
- Tony Veale, Ekaterina Shutova, and Beata Beigman Klebanov. 2016. *Metaphor: A computational perspective*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers.
- Sarah Wiegrefe, Jack Hessel, Swabha Swayamdipta, Mark Riedl, and Yejin Choi. 2022. [Reframing human-AI collaboration for generating free-text explanations](#). In *Proceedings of the 2022 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pages 632–658, Seattle, United States. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Sarah Wiegrefe and Ana Marasovic. 2021. [Teach me to explain: A review of datasets for explainable natural language processing](#). In *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks*, volume 1. Curran.
- Adina Williams, Nikita Nangia, and Samuel Bowman. 2018. [A broad-coverage challenge corpus for sentence understanding through inference](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 1112–1122, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Ning Xie, Farley Lai, Derek Doran, and Asim Kadav. 2019. [Visual entailment: A novel task for fine-grained image understanding](#). *ArXiv*, abs/1901.06706.
- Ron Yosef, Yonatan Bitton, and Dafna Shahaf. 2023. [IRFL: Image recognition of figurative language](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 1044–1058, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xiang Yue, Yuansheng Ni, Kai Zhang, Tianyu Zheng, Ruoqi Liu, Ge Zhang, Samuel Stevens, Dongfu Jiang, Weiming Ren, Yuxuan Sun, Cong Wei, Botao Yu, Ruibin Yuan, Renliang Sun, Ming Yin, Boyuan Zheng, Zhenzhu Yang, Yibo Liu, Wenhao Huang, Huan Sun, Yu Su, and Wenhua Chen. 2024. [Mmmu: A massive multi-discipline multimodal understanding and reasoning benchmark for expert agi](#). In *Proceedings of CVPR*.
- Tianyi Zhang*, Varsha Kishore*, Felix Wu*, Kilian Q. Weinberger, and Yoav Artzi. 2020. [Bertscore: Evaluating text generation with bert](#). In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Jianing Zhou, Hongyu Gong, and Suma Bhat. 2021. [PIE: A parallel idiomatic expression corpus for idiomatic sentence generation and paraphrasing](#). In *Proceedings of the 17th Workshop on Multiword Expressions (MWE 2021)*, pages 33–48, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Caleb Ziems, William Held, Omar Shaikh, Jiao Chen, Zhehao Zhang, and Diyi Yang. 2024. [Can large language models transform computational social science?](#) *Computational Linguistics*, pages 1–55.

A Dataset Statistics

Table 7 shows the number of samples from each source dataset that are included in the randomly selected training, validation, and held-out test splits.

| Type | Dataset | Train | Valid | Test |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|-------|-------|------|
| Metaphor /Similes | HAIVMET | 649 | 107 | 101 |
| | IRFL (metaphor /simile) | 912 | 117 | 120 |
| Idioms | IRFL (idiom) | 170 | 100 | 100 |
| Sarcasm | MuSE | 830 | 106 | 106 |
| Humor | MemeCap | 1566 | 196 | 196 |
| | NYCartoons | 451 | 100 | 100 |
| Total | | 4,578 | 726 | 723 |

Table 7: Data counts per phenomenon and dataset.

Length distribution Average length of a claim in V-FLUTE is ≈ 61 characters. Average length of an explanation is ≈ 367 characters. Figure 8 shows the distribution of claim lengths, and Figure 9 shows the distribution of explanation lengths by source dataset. We manually verified that the outlier instances are correct.




Figure 8: Distribution of lengths of claims by source dataset.

B API models Hyperparameters

B.1 Claude

- Model `claude-3-opus-20240229` Name:
- Max Tokens: 256




Figure 9: Distribution of lengths of explanations by source dataset.

- Images greater than 5MB were resized maintaining aspect ratio

B.2 GPT-4

- Model `gpt-4-1106-vision-preview` Name:
- Max Tokens: 256
- Seed: 42
- Image URL detail: 'high'

B.3 Gemini

- Model Name: `gemini-pro-vision`
- Max Tokens: 256
- Safety Settings: 'BLOCK NONE'
- Images greater than 5MB were resized maintaining aspect ratio

C Fine-tuning Hyperparameters

We utilize LoRA (Hu et al., 2022) to fine-tune the models. We utilize the same hyperparameters for all fine-tunes outlined in Appendix C and use early stopping based on a V-FLUTE validation set to prevent overfitting. Due to size of the data, we only train for 3 epochs in both eViL and eViL+VFLUTE variations, but we saved intermediate steps and chose the checkpoint where the validation loss is lowest.

Fine-tuning

- Seed: 42
- Vision Tower: `openai-clip-vit-large-patch14-336`
- Number of Training Epochs: 3

- Train Batch Size (per device): 16
- Eval Batch Size (per device): 4
- Learning Rate: 2e-5
- Weight Decay: 0
- Warmup Ratio: 0.03
- Scheduler Type: cosine
- Number of epochs: 4 for eViL and eViL + vFLUTE, 10 for VFLUTE
- mm-projector-type: mlp2x gelu
- mm-vision-select-layer: -2
- mm-use-im-start-end: False
- mm-use-im-patch-token: False
- image-aspect-ratio: pad
- group-by-modality-length: False

LoRA

- lora r: 128
- lora alpha: 256
- mm-projector-lr: 2e-5

Deepspeed Configuration

- FP16 enabled: auto
- BF16 enabled: auto
- Micro Batch Size Per GPU: auto
- Train Batch Size: auto
- Gradient Accumulation Steps: auto
- Zero Optimization Stage: 3

Training and Inference Instructions

All models are evaluated using beam search with $n = 3$, temperature 0, max length 256. In the case of generating scene graphs for the compositional chain-of-thought method, we set the max length to 256 for the graph generation step as recommended by [Mitra et al. \(2023\)](#). API models are evaluated with default hyperparameters. We format all fine-tuning data in the instruction format following LLaVA ([Liu et al., 2023a](#)). To avoid overfitting on a particular instruction for this task,

we generate 20 similar instructions using an LLM (ChatGPT-4) and randomly assign one of them to every instance in the training, validation, and testing set. Same instructions were sampled for the e-ViL dataset. Table 8 shows the 20 instructions used.

D Prompts for LLMs

D.1 HAIVMET

D.1.1 One-shot Prompt for generating explanations

We describe our one-shot prompts given to an LLM (`gpt-3.5-turbo-instruct-0914`) for generating explanations of entailment-contradiction relationship. Refer to Table 9 for the detailed prompt.

D.2 IRFL

D.2.1 Zero-shot Prompt for generating explanations

We provide our zero-shot prompt given to an LLM (`gpt-4-vision-preview`) for generating the entailment explanations given the claim and the image. Refer Table 10 for the detailed prompt.

D.3 MuSE

D.3.1 Few-shot Prompt for generating opposite claims

We provide our few-shot prompt given to an LLM (`gpt-4-0613`) for generating the opposite claims. Refer Table 11 for the detailed prompt.

D.3.2 Zero-shot Prompt for Rephrasing

We provide our zero-shot prompt given to an LLM (`gpt-4-vision-preview`) for rephrasing the explanations given the claim and the crowd worker explanation. Refer Table 12 for the detailed prompt.

D.4 MemeCap

D.4.1 Few-shot Prompt for generating entailing claims

We describe our few-shot prompts given to an LLM (`gpt-4-0613`) for generating entailing claims as part of the pipeline. Refer to Table 13 for the detailed prompt.

D.4.2 Zero-shot Prompt for validating the entailing claims

We describe our zero-shot prompt given to an LLM (`gpt-4-vision-preview`) for validating

| No. | Instruction |
|-----|--|
| 1 | Does the image's narrative confirm or disprove the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Discuss your reasoning and identify it as either entailment or contradiction. |
| 2 | Does this image confirm or deny the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Discuss your reasoning and determine a label: entailment or contradiction. |
| 3 | Is the image's message supporting or opposing the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Discuss your rationale and determine the appropriate label: entailment or contradiction. |
| 4 | Is there agreement or disagreement between the image and the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Provide your analysis and choose between entailment or contradiction. |
| 5 | Does the visual evidence support or counter the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Provide your explanation and assign it a label of entailment or contradiction. |
| 6 | Does the image agree with or dispute the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Explain your analysis and mark it as entailment or contradiction. |
| 7 | Does the illustration affirm or contest the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Provide your argument and choose a label: entailment or contradiction. |
| 8 | Is the visual content in agreement or disagreement with the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Offer your explanation and categorize it under entailment or contradiction. |
| 9 | Is the image in harmony with or in conflict with the statement REPLACE_CLAIM? Explain your justification and label it as entailment or contradiction. |
| 10 | Is the portrayal in the image consistent with or contradictory to the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Offer your insights and select between entailment or contradiction. |
| 11 | Does the image's depiction validate or refute the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Explain your point of view and select a label: entailment or contradiction. |
| 12 | Is the content of the image endorsing or challenging the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Justify your position and label it as entailment or contradiction. |
| 13 | Is the image consistent with the statement REPLACE_CLAIM? Justify your answer and classify it as either entailment or contradiction. |
| 14 | Does the illustration affirm or negate the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Articulate your reasoning and apply a label: entailment or contradiction. |
| 15 | Does the picture support or refute the assertion REPLACE_CLAIM? Offer your rationale and select a label: entailment or contradiction. |
| 16 | Is the visual portrayal compatible with or adverse to the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Justify your viewpoint and label it as entailment or contradiction. |
| 17 | Does the image corroborate or dispute the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Outline your reasoning and categorize it under entailment or contradiction. |
| 18 | Is the depiction aligned with or against the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Share your evaluation and identify it as either entailment or contradiction. |
| 19 | Does the image entail or contradict the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Explain your reasoning and provide a label between entailment or contradiction. |
| 20 | Can the image be seen as validating or opposing the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Explain your thought process and assign a label of entailment or contradiction. |
| 21 | Is the image's representation supportive of or contradictory to the claim REPLACE_CLAIM? Articulate your analysis and assign the label: entailment or contradiction. |

Table 8: Instruction variations for the figurative visual entailment task.

| |
|--|
| <p>You will be provided a Caption describing what is in the image in detail. You will also be provided with a Claim that contradicts or is entailed by the image (as indicated by the Label). Your task is to explain why the claim contradicts or is entailed by the image. Be very brief in your explanation. Start your explanation by describing what the image depicts, displays or shows.</p> |
| <p>Caption: An illustration of a group of soldiers with red skin, horns, and pitchforks in hand with a fierce expression on their faces. Claim: The soldiers were angels. Label: Contradiction Explanation: The image depicts soldiers with red skin, horns, and pitchforks, which are traditional characteristics associated with demons, not angels. Therefore, the claim that the soldiers were angels contradicts the image.</p> |
| <p>Caption:.....</p> |

Table 9: One shot prompt given to an LLM (gpt-3.5-turbo-instruct-0914) for generating explanations of entailment-contradiction relationship of the HAIVMET dataset.

| |
|---|
| <p>You will be provided an image. You will also be provided with a simile that contradicts or is entailed by the image (as indicated by the Label). Your task is to explain why the simile contradicts or is entailed by the image. Be very brief in your explanation and remain consistent to the Label in your explanation. Start your explanation by describing what the image depicts, displays or shows. Simile: Label: Explanation:</p> |
|---|

Table 10: Zero shot prompt given to an LLM (gpt-4-vision-preview) for generating explanations of entailment-contradiction relationship of the IRFL Dataset. The dataset contains similes, metaphors and idioms. For metaphors and idioms, the word simile in the prompt is replaced with the corresponding type.

| |
|--|
| <p>u are an online redditor or flickr user and u always type in informal style. Convert the following sarcastic claim into a non-sarcastic claim. Preserve the informal style, including capitalization. Be super laid back and informal!!!</p> |
| <p>1. Sarcastic claim: stairs vs . escalator in airport . i wonder why we have an # obesity problem ? # publichealth # ncads # globalhealth # isometimesdothisoo Explanation: no wonder we have an obesity problem since everyones using escalator instead of stairs in airport. Non-sarcastic claim: it s clear why we have an # obesity problem look at stairs vs. escalator in airport</p> |
| <p>Claim:.....</p> |
| <p>Explanation:.....</p> |

Table 11: Few shot prompt given to an LLM (gpt-4-0613) for generating opposite claims utilizing the sarcastic claim and crowd worker explanation.

| |
|---|
| <p>Paraphrase the draft explanation of why the image contradicts the literal interpretation of the claim. Be sure to first describe the image in one sentence. Keep your answer short. Do not refer to the claim or the draft explanation in your paraphrase. Stay close to the draft explanation. Claim: Draft Explanation:</p> |
|---|

Table 12: Zero shot prompt given to an LLM (gpt-4-vision-preview) for rephrasing the explanations given the claim and the.

| |
|---|
| You will be provided with a meme caption. Your task is to write the meme caption as a claim such that the meme poster is not mentioned in the claim. |
| Caption: Meme poster is saying that searching Google plus the term you want to search on reddit is better than searching reddit itself. Claim: Searching on Google with the term you want to search plus 'reddit' is more effective than searching directly on Reddit. |
| Caption: The person who wrote the post is saying people on Instagram are soft and reddit are funny. Claim: People on Instagram are soft, whereas those on Reddit are funny. |
| Caption:..... |

Table 13: Two shot prompt given to an LLM (gpt-4-0613) for generating entailing claims utilizing the meme captions part of the MemeCap dataset.

ing the claims generated in the previous step. Refer Table 14 for the detailed prompt.

| |
|--|
| You will be provided a meme image and a claim. Your task is to check whether the claim entails the image. Answer with a Yes or No. Claim: |
|--|

Table 14: Zero shot prompt given to an LLM (gpt-4-vision-preview) for validating the claims generated in D.4.1. The corresponding meme image is also attached with the prompt.

D.4.3 Few-shot Prompt for generating opposite claims

We provide our few-shot prompt given to an LLM ((gpt-4-0613)) for generating the opposite claims. Refer Table 15 for the detailed prompt.

D.4.4 Zero-shot Prompt for generating explanations

We provide our zero-shot prompt given to an LLM (gpt-4-vision-preview) for generating the entailment explanations given the claim and the image. Refer Table 16 for the detailed prompt.

E Model Taxonomy

The taxonomy of all models used for automatic evaluation is shown in Figure 10.

| |
|---|
| Claim: A useful feature has been removed on YouTube, causing disappointment. Explanation: The image shows a painting of a character with a distraught face and a speech bubble that reads "y tho," placed over text saying "When YouTube removed sort by oldest option." This implies that the removal of the sort by oldest option is a decision that users are questioning, hence indicating disappointment over the loss of a useful feature. Opposite claim: An unhelpful feature has been removed on YouTube, causing happiness. |
| Claim:..... Explanation:..... |

Table 15: Few shot prompt given to an LLM (gpt-4-0613) for generating opposite claims utilizing the generated claim and explanation.

| |
|--|
| You will be provided a meme. You will also be provided with a claim that entails the image. Your task is to explain why the claim is entailed by the image. Be very brief in your explanation and start your explanation by describing what the image depicts, displays or shows. Claim: Explanation: |
|--|

Table 16: Zero shot prompt given to an LLM (gpt-4-vision-preview) for generating the entailment explanations. The corresponding meme image is also attached with the prompt.





Figure 10: Taxonomy of models used for the study.

F By-Phenomenon Performance


In Figure 11, we show the performance of the models by phenomenon and dataset across various thresholds.

G Annotator Recruitment and Compensation


All recruited annotators have significant background in figurative language understanding (having formal educational background in linguistics or literature). Annotators were recruited through Upwork platform. All are on fluent or native/bilingual level in English. All are fairly compensated with USD \$20 to \$25 per hour with self-reported time needed to complete the tasks.



(a) Metaphors and Similes



(b) Humor



(c) Sarcasm and Idioms

Figure 11: Performance of the models by phenomenon.