

Chumor 1.0: A Truly Funny and Challenging Chinese Humor Understanding Dataset from Ruo Zhi Ba

Ruiqi He¹ Yushu He¹ Longju Bai¹ Jiarui Liu² Zhenjie Sun¹
Zenghao Tang³ He Wang² Hanchen Xia³ Naihao Deng^{1*}

¹University of Michigan ²Carnegie Mellon University ³Shanghai Jiaotong University
{ruiqih, dnaihao}@umich.edu

Abstract

Existing humor datasets and evaluations predominantly focus on English, lacking resources for culturally nuanced humor in non-English languages like Chinese. To address this gap, we construct *Chumor*, a dataset sourced from Ruo Zhi Ba (RZB, 弱智吧), a Chinese Reddit-like platform dedicated to sharing intellectually challenging and culturally specific jokes. We annotate explanations for each joke and evaluate human explanations against two state-of-the-art LLMs, GPT-4o and ERNIE Bot, through A/B testing by native Chinese speakers. Our evaluation shows that *Chumor* is challenging even for SOTA LLMs, and the human explanations for *Chumor* jokes are significantly better than explanations generated by the LLMs. We release *Chumor* at <https://github.com/dnaihao/Chumor-dataset>.

1 Introduction

Humor is an intrinsic human trait that touches the core of our social and emotional lives, making it a rich field of study across various disciplines (Lefcourt, 2001; Mihalcea and Strapparava, 2005; Gelkopf et al., 2011; Hessel et al., 2023). With the advent of Large Language Models (LLMs), researchers have evaluated LLMs’ performance on diverse tasks (Liu et al., 2023a; Deng et al., 2024; Wu et al., 2023) and observed LLMs’ extraordinary performance on many (Zhang et al., 2024b). In contrast, researchers have observed that LLMs still fail to understand humor (Ghanadian et al., 2023). However, with all these studies on humor and LLMs’ understanding of humor, most of these humor datasets and evaluations remain in English (Radev et al., 2016; Hasan et al., 2019). This presents a significant gap, particularly for non-English languages like Chinese, where culturally nuanced humor understanding is underrepresented.




Figure 1: Annotated preference for whether human explanation is better (“Human wins”) or the explanation from LLMs is better (“LLM wins”).

In this paper, we try to address this gap by constructing *Chumor*, a truly funny and challenging Chinese humor understanding dataset sourced from Ruo Zhi Ba (RZB, “弱智吧” in Chinese), a Chinese version of Reddit platform dedicated to sharing intellectually challenging and culturally specific jokes. This platform provides a set of unique Chinese jokes that incorporate the subtleties and intricacies of Chinese humor. Figure 2 provides an example of the joke from RZB. In addition, Bai et al. (2024) have observed that when tuning LLMs on data from RZB, LLMs achieve the best performance on Chinese reasoning tasks compared to tuning LLMs on data from other sources, indicating the significant value of jokes from RZB.

In *Chumor*, we manually annotate the explanations for each joke. We then prompt two state-of-the-art (SOTA) LLMs, GPT-4o from OpenAI and ERNIE Bot from Baidu to get their explanations. In the evaluation, a group of native Chinese speakers determine their preferences between the explanations from human and the LLM in an A/B testing fashion. We note that in the preference annotation process, all of our annotators report to us that the jokes are very funny and align well with the Chinese Internet trends. Our evaluation shows that *Chumor* is challenging even for the SOTA LLMs, and the human explanations for *Chumor* jokes are significantly better than explanations generated by the LLMs (Figure 1). In addition, we provide examples of our jokes on which LLMs fail to provide

*Corresponding author of this work.

笑话:看到有和尚在路上化缘,他还没开口我就知道他要的是什么了这就是要素察觉。

Joke: Seeing a monk begging on the road, even before he speaks, I know what he wants. This is what is called "elemental perception."

解释 1 (人):“要素察觉”是一种弹幕表达方式,用来表示察觉到了视频中的某些梗或因素。而这句话里却把要素察觉解释为看到和尚化缘就“察觉到他在乞要素食”,这种改变原意的双关达到了一种幽默的效果。

Explanation 1 (Human): “Elemental perception” is a type of bullet screen expression used to indicate the recognition of certain memes or elements in a video. However, in this sentence, “elemental perception” is humorously explained as seeing a monk begging and “perceiving that he is begging for vegetarian elements (food)”, creating a pun that changes the original meaning and achieves a humorous effect.



解释 2 (ChatGPT-4o):这个笑话的幽默在于它将“要素察觉”这个通常用于描述精确辨识信息或细节的术语,应用在了非常明显的情境中:和尚化缘。因为和尚化缘本来就是众所周知的行为,所以强调“要素察觉”显得过于严肃和夸张,从而产生幽默感。

Explanation 2 (ChatGPT-4o): The humor in this joke lies in applying the term "elemental perception," usually used for recognizing specific details or information, to a very obvious situation: a monk begging for alms. Since it's well-known that monks beg for alms, emphasizing "elemental perception" appears **overly serious and exaggerated**, creating a sense of humor.



Which one better explains the humor?

Human Raters: Explanation 1



ChatGPT-4o: Explanation 1

Figure 2: An Example of the Chinese joke from RZB (RZB, “弱智吧”) where the explanation differs between humans and ChatGPT-4o (as of June 5th, 2024). Interestingly, when we provide both explanations to ChatGPT-4o, it decides the human explanation better explains the humor than its own explanation. This agrees with the choice of human raters who also decide the explanation from human better explains the humor. We include a further discussion of whether LLMs can serve as the preference annotator in Appendix F.

explanations and the hypothesis of their failures.

In summary, our contributions are two folds:

1. We construct *Chumor*, a truly funny and challenging Chinese humor understanding dataset, addressing the lack of non-English humor understanding dataset.
2. We reveal that on *Chumor*, human explanations for jokes are significantly better than explanations from SOTA LLMs.

2 Dataset Construction

Data Collection. We construct *Chumor* by including RZB jokes from “Best Annual Threads” between 2018 and 2021 that have been crawled previously*, and we also collect all threads in the “Moderator’s Recommendation” section from RZB directly. Each thread in RZB consists of “标题” (the title), “一楼” (the content), and several “跟帖” (the follow-up posts). For threads from Best Annual Threads, the jokes are listed in the follow-up posts, which are selected by the forum moderator. For threads from Moderator’s Recommendation, the jokes consist of the title and the content of each thread. We remove the content if it repeats the title.

Data Cleaning. We store both the title and the content of the raw data. However, because the

posting restrictions of the platform require that the content cannot be empty, many posts contain meaningless placeholder texts such as “:”, “!”, “0”, “RT”, among others. We automatically identify and remove these patterns, and only keep the title which is the joke itself. In the meantime, due to the length limitations on the original platform, many post titles are truncated from the beginning parts of the content. We identify these instances and replace the truncated title with the complete content to get the actual joke. We also remove duplicates that appear both in the “Moderator’s Recommendation” and the “Best Annual Posts”.

Data Annotation. Since the crowd-sourcing typically cannot solicit high-quality explanations according to Hessel et al. (2023), one of the authors decides to annotate all the explanations to ensure the quality and consistency following Hessel et al. (2023). During the process, the author manually removes the threads that are not funny, threads related to forum management and rules, threads that include excessively offensive content, threads with incomplete content, and threads that focus more on philosophical insight rather than humor.

We note that this is a substantial effort, the author ended up annotating the explanations for 1,951 jokes and the resulting corpus has a mean of 78 Chinese characters of explanation per joke, and the total length, 151,730 Chinese characters, is com-

*<https://github.com/Leymore/ruozhiba>

Dataset	Source	L	# J
ExPUN (Sun et al., 2022)	SemEval Task 7	en	1,999
Joke explanation *	explainthejoke.com	en	377
NYT-Captions (Hessel et al., 2023)	New Yorker caption contest	en	651
Chumor (us)	Ruo Zhi Ba	zh	1,951

Table 1: Comparison between our collected **Chumor** dataset and other humor explanation datasets. “L” represents the language of the dataset (en: English, zh: Chinese). “# J” represents the number of manually annotated explanations in each dataset.

parable in length to a novella*. Table 1 provides a comparison between **Chumor** and the existing humor explanation datasets, and to the best of our knowledge, **Chumor** is the first Chinese humor explanation dataset. We include a more comprehensive overview of the datasets related to humor in Table 2 in Appendix B.

3 Experiments

Experiment Setup. We select two SOTA LLMs, one LLM from the company in western world, GPT-4o* from OpenAI, and the other from a Chinese Internet company, ERNIE Bot* from Baidu. To evaluate the innate Chinese humor understanding abilities of both LLMs, We prompt them in a zero-shot setting to explain the humor in two sentences as all the human explanations are in two sentences. Here is the prompt we feed to both LLMs: 请用两句话解释这个笑话的幽默之处:\n[Joke], which translates to “Please explain the joke in two sentences:\n[Joke]”.

Evaluation Setup. To fairly evaluate which explanation is better, we conduct an A/B testing by presenting the humor explanation from one LLM and from human to six college students, and ask them to annotate their preference of the explanation for each joke. These college students are native Chinese speakers who grow up in China, therefore they have a deep understanding of the cultural terms and trending terms in China. We note that the preference annotation requires a substantial effort as each annotator reads through a total length of

*The total length of our explanations surpasses the Chinese version of *The Great Gatsby* (100k Chinese characters), and is about half the length of the Chinese version of *Wuthering Heights* (325k Chinese characters).

*<https://huggingface.co/violetamaral/joke-explanation/>

*<https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>

*<http://research.baidu.com/Blog/index-view?id=174>




Figure 3: Distribution of error types for GPT-4o and ERNIE Bot. We sample 200 examples to calculate the distribution of these error types. We note that an example may correspond to multiple error types.

around 300k Chinese characters*. We end up with three preference annotations for each joke. For the preference annotations, we achieve a 61.39% agreement rate among annotators (Appendix C).

We employ the winning rate as our measure to compare LLMs’ explanation versus human explanation. We take the majority vote among all annotators for each example. In addition, if all annotators disagree, we assign an “Undecided” label. Appendix D provides the annotation instructions we present to the annotators.

Overall Results. Figure 1 reports the winning rate of explanations from human versus GPT-4o and ERNIE Bot. We can see that human explanations are significantly better than explanations from both LLMs, with human winning over 50% of the time, and LLMs win in 2-3% of cases.

4 Error Analysis

Figure 3 provides an overall distribution of error types for GPT-4o and ERNIE Bot on **Chumor** in terms of their humor explanations. GPT-4o exhibits a significantly higher error rate on jokes related to Chinese culture (29.5% compared to 10.5% for ERNIE Bot on cultural unawareness). We suspect that ERNIE Bot is more familiar with Chinese culture as it may be trained with a larger Chinese corpus than GPT-4o. GPT-4o performs better on cases that require an understanding of the context or the puns, suggesting its strong reasoning ability. We

*This is about the same length of the Chinese version of *Wuthering Heights* (325k Chinese characters).

provide three error cases for GPT-4o here and more cases for GPT-4o and ERNIE Bot in Appendix E. In the following examples, we underscore the key phrases that induce humor in green, and underscore the errors in red.

Cultural Unawareness.

	(zh) 小明在正月接发竟导致舅舅复活。
Example	(en) Xiaoming <u>got hair extensions during the first lunar month</u> , which astonishingly <u>brought his uncle back to life</u> .
Correct Humor Explanation	“Getting a haircut in the first lunar month will bring death to your uncle.” is a popular superstitious saying in Chinese culture. In this joke, Xiao Ming gets hair extensions in the first month, which reverses the original logic and absurdly results in “bringing his uncle back to life.”
GPT-4o’s Answer	(zh) ...它利用了“接发”和“接发”的双关语：一方面是指理发店的接发服务，另一方面是指正月里“接福”的传统习俗。 (en) ... <u>the pun on “接发”</u> : it refers to both hair extension at a salon and the traditional practice of “receiving blessings” during the first lunar month.
Failure Reasons	Fail to grasp expressions, slang, or specific usages unique to a particular cultural context.

LLMs may fail to explain the joke because they are not aware of certain cultural knowledge. For instance, this example requires the knowledge of a superstitious belief in Chinese culture, *getting a haircut in the first lunar month brings death to your uncle*, and the explanation from GPT-4o fails to connect to this Chinese cultural belief. Though LLMs have been pre-trained on Internet-scale corpus, such culturally specific knowledge can still be very challenging for them to grasp. Moreover, even if they have acquired such cultural knowledge, they may fail to relate to them as we humans do in the reasoning process.

Homophonic Humor.

Example	(zh) 家里的猪油没了，小明只能把植物油倒快点当猪油用了。 (en) With the lard gone, Xiaoming had to pour the <u>vegetable</u> oil quickly to use it like <u>lard</u> .
Correct Humor Explanation	When pronounced quickly, “vegetable” (pronounced as <i>chih woo</i>) sounds very similar to “pig” (pronounced as <i>choo</i>) in Chinese, leading Xiaoming to comically try using vegetable oil as lard by pouring it quickly.
GPT-4o’s Answer	(zh) ...小明误解了猪油和植物油的区别，认为只要倒得快，植物油就能变成猪油。笑点在于他 <u>天真的逻辑和对常识的搞笑误解</u> 。 (en) ... Xiaoming misunderstood that if vegetable oil is poured quickly, it can turn into lard, <u>highlighting his naive logic and misinterpretation of common sense</u> .
Failure Reasons	Fail to exploit homophones or near-homophones in the jokes.

LLMs may fail to exploit homophones or near-homophones in the joke. This example requires LLMs to reason over the pronunciation as “植物” (pronounced as *chih woo*, meaning “vegetable”) sounds very similar to “猪” (pronounced as *choo*, meaning “pig”) in Chinese when we speak it fast enough, and the humor arises from the contrast between how similarly the items are pronounced and how unrelated they actually are. Such contrast may be sparse in the training corpus for LLMs, and also requires deep connections across different modalities to make LLMs understand the linkage between pronunciation and the meaning behind these terms.

Character-based Humor.

Example	(zh) 我把 <u>電車難題</u> 简化了，现在是 <u>电车难题</u> 。 (en) I simplified <u>the trolley problem (in traditional Chinese)</u> , now it's <u>the trolley problem (in simplified Chinese)</u> .
Correct Humor Explanation	The joke does not actually simplify the scenario of the trolley problem; instead, it converts the traditional Chinese characters “電車難題” into the simplified Chinese characters “电车难题”.
GPT-4o’s Answer	(zh) ...这个笑话的幽默之处在于通过 <u>将“電車難題”中的“難”字去掉，变成了“电车难题”</u> 。 (en) ... The humor of this joke lies in <u>removing the character “hard” from “the hard trolley problem”, turning it into “the trolley problem”</u> .
Failure Reasons	Fail to interpret the visual puns in the shape or form of the characters.

LLMs may fail to interpret the visual puns in the shape or form for Chinese characters. In this example, “simplify” does not mean to simplify the trolley problem, but to simplify the traditional Chinese characters to simplified Chinese characters as the traditional Chinese characters are also termed as

“complicated characters”. However, it is difficult for LLMs to reason such graphemic differences as there are no explicit connections between the textual meaning and visual representations of the glyphs.

5 Conclusion

We present *Chumor*, a Chinese humor understanding dataset that includes intellectually challenging and culturally specific humor in Chinese. We have shown that *Chumor* is challenging even for the two state-of-the-art LLMs and provided analysis of their failure cases. We hope that *Chumor* can facilitate non-English humor research and the research on enhancing LLMs’ reasoning abilities for diverse cultural backgrounds.

Limitations

Due to the time consumption and availability of native Chinese speakers, we did not include a large-scale preference annotation. We encourage future research on collecting large-scale preference data, especially for non-English languages. Moreover, humor is highly subjective, therefore a large-scale preference annotation may also benefit the models (Deng et al., 2023). However, we want to stress the high quality of our preference data annotations, as all of our annotators are native Chinese speakers and hold at least a bachelor’s degree or are involved in bachelor’s programs. We also encourage future research on comprehensive evaluation of LLMs’ humor understanding abilities, especially open-source LLMs’ humor understanding abilities. In the meantime, we want to stress that our research focuses primarily on revealing how humor understanding remains challenging even for the SOTA LLMs. Our work shows that along with many other problems (Ignat et al., 2024), humor understanding, especially non-English and culturally specific humor understanding, remains an unsolved problem in the LLM era. We hope *Chumor* can contribute to non-English humor understanding evaluations for future multi-lingual LLMs.

Ethics Statement

We tried our best to filter out the excessively offensive content in RZB. However, due to the subjective nature of humor, some of our jokes may be considered offensive to certain people due to different standards. Therefore, we recommend researchers to use *Chumor* with cultural sensitivity

and an understanding that the jokes reflect the sociocultural context in which they were created. We encourage users of *Chumor* to maintain caution when working with the dataset, and to be mindful of the potential for offense or harm, especially when using the dataset for research or applications involving diverse audiences or sensitive domains. We provide some potential usages of *Chumor* in Appendix G. We wish to foster an ethical and responsible approach to data collection and usage, and we welcome constructive feedback from the research community and stakeholders to continually improve *Chumor* and mitigate potential harm.

6 Acknowledgement

The GPT-4o experiments are supported by the credit from OpenAI through OpenAI Researcher Access. We appreciate the review and feedback from Sheng Zhang.

References

- Yuelin Bai, Xinrun Du, Yiming Liang, Yonggang Jin, Ziqiang Liu, Junting Zhou, Tianyu Zheng, Xincheng Zhang, Nuo Ma, Zekun Wang, et al. 2024. Coigcqa: Quality is all you need for chinese instruction fine-tuning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.18058*.
- Dario Bertero and Pascale Fung. 2016. *Deep learning of audio and language features for humor prediction*. In *Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC’16)*, pages 496–501, Portorož, Slovenia. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Santiago Castro, Devamanyu Hazarika, Verónica Pérez-Rosas, Roger Zimmermann, Rada Mihalcea, and Soujanya Poria. 2019. *Towards multimodal sarcasm detection (an _Obviously_ perfect paper)*. In *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 4619–4629, Florence, Italy. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Lei Chen and Chong Min Lee. 2017. *Predicting audience’s laughter during presentations using convolutional neural network*. In *Proceedings of the 12th Workshop on Innovative Use of NLP for Building Educational Applications*, pages 86–90, Copenhagen, Denmark. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yuyan Chen, Zhixu Li, Jiaqing Liang, Yanghua Xiao, Bang Liu, and Yunwen Chen. 2023. *Can pre-trained language models understand chinese humor?* In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining, WSDM ’23*, page 465–480, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.

- Yuyan Chen, Yichen Yuan, Panjun Liu, Dayiheng Liu, Qinghao Guan, Mengfei Guo, Haiming Peng, Bang Liu, Zhixu Li, and Yanghua Xiao. 2024. [Talk funny! a large-scale humor response dataset with chain-of-humor interpretation](#). *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 38(16):17826–17834.
- Naihao Deng, Zhenjie Sun, Ruiqi He, Aman Sikka, Yulong Chen, Lin Ma, Yue Zhang, and Rada Mihalcea. 2024. [Tables as images? exploring the strengths and limitations of llms on multimodal representations of tabular data](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12424*.
- Naihao Deng, Xinliang Zhang, Siyang Liu, Winston Wu, Lu Wang, and Rada Mihalcea. 2023. [You are what you annotate: Towards better models through annotator representations](#). In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023*, pages 12475–12498, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xinrun Du, Zhouliang Yu, Songyang Gao, Ding Pan, Yuyang Cheng, Ziyang Ma, Ruibin Yuan, Xingwei Qu, Jiaheng Liu, Tianyu Zheng, et al. 2024. [Chinese tiny llm: Pretraining a chinese-centric large language model](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.04167*.
- Tomas Engelthaler and Thomas T Hills. 2018. [Humor norms for 4,997 english words](#). *Behavior research methods*, 50:1116–1124.
- Jinlan Fu, See-Kiong Ng, Zhengbao Jiang, and Pengfei Liu. 2023. [Gptscore: Evaluate as you desire](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04166*.
- Marc Gelkopf et al. 2011. [The use of humor in serious mental illness: A review](#). *Evidence-Based Complementary and Alternative Medicine*, 2011.
- Hamideh Ghanadian, Isar Nejadgholi, and Hussein Al Osman. 2023. [ChatGPT for suicide risk assessment on social media: Quantitative evaluation of model performance, potentials and limitations](#). In *Proceedings of the 13th Workshop on Computational Approaches to Subjectivity, Sentiment, & Social Media Analysis*, pages 172–183, Toronto, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Md Kamrul Hasan, Wasifur Rahman, AmirAli Bagher Zadeh, Jianyuan Zhong, Md Iftekhar Tanveer, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Mohammed (Ehsan) Hoque. 2019. [UR-FUNNY: A multimodal language dataset for understanding humor](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 2046–2056, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- 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.
- Nabil Hossain, John Krumm, and Michael Gamon. 2019. [“president vows to cut <taxes> hair”: Dataset and analysis of creative text editing for humorous headlines](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 133–142, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Oana Ignat, Zhijing Jin, Artem Abzaliev, Laura Bister, Santiago Castro, Naihao Deng, Xinyi Gao, Aylin Ece Gunal, Jacky He, Ashkan Kazemi, Muhammad Khalifa, Namho Koh, Andrew Lee, Siyang Liu, Do June Min, Shinka Mori, Joan C. Nwatu, Veronica Perez-Rosas, Siqi Shen, Zekun Wang, Winston Wu, and Rada Mihalcea. 2024. [Has it all been solved? open NLP research questions not solved by large language models](#). In *Proceedings of the 2024 Joint International Conference on Computational Linguistics, Language Resources and Evaluation (LREC-COLING 2024)*, pages 8050–8094, Torino, Italia. ELRA and ICCL.
- Herbert M Lefcourt. 2001. [Humor: The psychology of living buoyantly](#). Springer Science & Business Media.
- Zefeng Li, Hongfei Lin, Liang Yang, Bo Xu, and Shaowu Zhang. 2022. [Memeplate: A chinese multimodal dataset for humor understanding in meme templates](#). In *Natural Language Processing and Chinese Computing*, pages 527–538, Cham. Springer International Publishing.
- Hanmeng Liu, Ruoxi Ning, Zhiyang Teng, Jian Liu, Qiji Zhou, and Yue Zhang. 2023a. [Evaluating the logical reasoning ability of chatgpt and gpt-4](#). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.03439*.
- Siyang Liu, Naihao Deng, Sahand Sabour, Yilin Jia, Minlie Huang, and Rada Mihalcea. 2023b. [Task-adaptive tokenization: Enhancing long-form text generation efficacy in mental health and beyond](#). In *Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 15264–15281, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Xin Liu, Baosong Yang, Dayiheng Liu, Haibo Zhang, Weihua Luo, Min Zhang, Haiying Zhang, and Jinsong Su. 2021. [Bridging subword gaps in pretrain-finetune paradigm for natural language generation](#). 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 6001–6011, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.

- Yang Liu, Dan Iter, Yichong Xu, Shuohang Wang, Ruochen Xu, and Chenguang Zhu. 2023c. [G-eval: NLG evaluation using gpt-4 with better human alignment](#). In [Proceedings of the 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing](#), pages 2511–2522, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rada Mihalcea and Carlo Strapparava. 2005. [Making computers laugh: Investigations in automatic humor recognition](#). In [Proceedings of Human Language Technology Conference and Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing](#), pages 531–538, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Arjun Panickssery, Samuel R Bowman, and Shi Feng. 2024. [Llm evaluators recognize and favor their own generations](#). [arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.13076](#).
- Peter Potash, Alexey Romanov, and Anna Rumshisky. 2017. [SemEval-2017 task 6: #HashtagWars: Learning a sense of humor](#). In [Proceedings of the 11th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation \(SemEval-2017\)](#), pages 49–57, Vancouver, Canada. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dragomir Radev, Amanda Stent, Joel Tetreault, Aasish Pappu, Aikaterini Iliakopoulou, Agustin Chanfreau, Paloma de Juan, Jordi Vallmitjana, Alejandro Jaimes, Rahul Jha, and Robert Mankoff. 2016. [Humor in collective discourse: Unsupervised funniness detection in the new yorker cartoon caption contest](#). In [Proceedings of the Tenth International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation \(LREC'16\)](#), pages 475–479, Portorož, Slovenia. European Language Resources Association (ELRA).
- Chhavi Sharma, Deepesh Bhageria, William Scott, Srinivas PYKL, Amitava Das, Tanmoy Chakraborty, Viswanath Pulabaigari, and Björn Gambäck. 2020. [SemEval-2020 task 8: Memotion analysis- the visuo-lingual metaphor!](#) In [Proceedings of the Fourteenth Workshop on Semantic Evaluation](#), pages 759–773, Barcelona (online). International Committee for Computational Linguistics.
- Honglin Sun and Daniel Jurafsky. 2004. [Shallow semantic parsing of Chinese](#). In [Proceedings of the Human Language Technology Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: HLT-NAACL 2004](#), pages 249–256, Boston, Massachusetts, USA. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Jiao Sun, Anjali Narayan-Chen, Shereen Oraby, Alessandra Cervone, Tagyoung Chung, Jing Huang, Yang Liu, and Nanyun Peng. 2022. [ExpUNations: Augmenting puns with keywords and explanations](#). In [Proceedings of the 2022 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing](#), pages 4590–4605, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Weiwei Sun, Zhifang Sui, Meng Wang, and Xin Wang. 2009. [Chinese semantic role labeling with shallow parsing](#). In [Proceedings of the 2009 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing](#), pages 1475–1483, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Yuen-Hsien Tseng, Wun-Syuan Wu, Chia-Yueh Chang, Hsueh-Chih Chen, and Wei-Lun Hsu. 2020. [Development and validation of a corpus for machine humor comprehension](#). In [Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference](#), pages 1346–1352, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Benyou Wang, Xiang Wu, Xiaokang Liu, Jianquan Li, Prayag Tiwari, and Qianqian Xie. 2022. [Can language models make fun? a case study in chinese comical crosstalk](#). In [Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics](#).
- Orion Weller and Kevin Seppi. 2020. [The rJokes dataset: a large scale humor collection](#). In [Proceedings of the Twelfth Language Resources and Evaluation Conference](#), pages 6136–6141, Marseille, France. European Language Resources Association.
- Jiaming Wu, Hongfei Lin, Liang Yang, and Bo Xu. 2021. [Mumor: A multimodal dataset for humor detection in conversations](#). In [Natural Language Processing and Chinese Computing: 10th CCF International Conference, NLPCC 2021, Qingdao, China, October 13–17, 2021, Proceedings, Part I](#), page 619–627, Berlin, Heidelberg. Springer-Verlag.
- Yufan Wu, Yinghui He, Yilin Jia, Rada Mihalcea, Yulong Chen, and Naihao Deng. 2023. [Hi-ToM: A benchmark for evaluating higher-order theory of mind reasoning in large language models](#). In [Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2023](#), pages 10691–10706, Singapore. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Diyi Yang, Alon Lavie, Chris Dyer, and Eduard Hovy. 2015. [Humor recognition and humor anchor extraction](#). In [Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing](#), pages 2367–2376, Lisbon, Portugal. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Dongyu Zhang, Heting Zhang, Xikai Liu, Hongfei Lin, and Feng Xia. 2019. [Telling the whole story: A manually annotated chinese dataset for the analysis of humor in jokes](#). In [Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing](#).
- Min Zhang, Jianfeng He, Taoran Ji, and Chang-Tien Lu. 2024a. [Don't go to extremes: Revealing the excessive sensitivity and calibration limitations of llms in implicit hate speech detection](#).
- Tianyi Zhang, Faisal Ladhak, Esin Durmus, Percy Liang, Kathleen McKeown, and Tatsunori B. Hashimoto. 2024b. [Benchmarking Large Language Models for News Summarization](#). [Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics](#), 12:39–57.

Jun Zhao, Zhihao Zhang, Qi Zhang, Tao Gui, and Xuanjing Huang. 2024. Llama beyond english: An empirical study on language capability transfer. [arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01055](https://arxiv.org/abs/2401.01055).

A Contributions

Idea Proposal. Naihao Deng proposed the high-level idea of constructing a humor understanding benchmark sourced from RZB data.

Background Survey. Ruiqi He surveyed the humor-related tasks.

Data Processing. Ruiqi He crawled and processed the jokes from RZB.

Annotation. Ruiqi He annotated the explanations for the RZB jokes. Yushu He, Longju Bai, Jiarui Liu, Zhenjie Sun, Zhenghao Tang, He Wang, Naihao Deng conducted the preference annotations.

Experiments. Hanchen Xia conducted experiments to prompt ERNIE-Bot, Naihao Deng conducted experiments to prompt GPT-4o.

Result Aggregation. Ruiqi He, Naihao Deng, Yushu He aggregated the results.

Paper Writing. Ruiqi He and Naihao Deng drafted the paper. Other authors provided revisions and feedback on the paper. Naihao Deng organized the research.

B Dataset Comparison

Table 2 provides a comprehensive overview of the existing datasets related to humor. We note that *Chumor* is the first humor explanation dataset in Chinese.

C Agreement Rate Calculation

We calculate the percentage agreement rate among annotators who annotate their preferences between explanations from LLMs and humans. The results showed an average inter-annotator agreement of 61.92% for GPT-4o and 60.86% for ERNIE Bot. Considering the inherent subjectivity of humor interpretation tasks (Deng et al., 2023), we consider that the combined average agreement percentage of 61.38% is decent.

D Annotation Instructions for Preference Annotation

We include the following instructions for the preference annotations of the joke explanations: “在这个标注中，你会看到一个笑话和对这个笑话的幽默之处的两个解释，请你比较哪个

解释更好的解释了这个笑话的幽默之处，并从以下三个标签中选择：

1. 解释1
2. 解释2
3. 一样好”

which translates to,

“In this annotation task, you will see a joke along with two explanations of its humor. Please compare which explanation better explains the reason why this joke is funny and choose from the following three labels:

1. Explanation 1
2. Explanation 2
3. Both are equally good.”

For each example, we randomly assign the explanations from the LLM and the human as Explanation 1 and Explanation 2 to ensure a fair comparison.

E More Error Cases

We note that many examples here encompass multiple error types, which demonstrates *Chumor*’s complexity.

Insufficient Contextual Understanding.

Example	(zh) 真可怕，犯罪嫌疑人就在 <u>我们之中</u> ，被告席上一名法警对另一名法警说。 (en) “Terrifying, the criminal suspect is <u>right between the two of us</u> ,” said one bailiff to another in the defendant’s dock.
Correct Humor Explanation	“between us” can refer to “either one of us” or literally means the actual physical position.
GPT-4o’s Answer	(zh) ...暗示他们自己可能是犯罪嫌疑人... (en) ...it suggests the bailiffs themselves might be criminal suspects...
Failure Reasons	Fail to address the literal meaning.

LLMs may fail to ground their responses to the context when they explain the joke. For instance, in this example, “between us” typically means “either you or me”, but it also has the literal meaning to indicate the person standing “between us”, which is the right interpretation given that the two bailiffs are talking about the criminal. However, GPT-4o only reasons that “the criminal is either you or me” but fails to capture the literal meaning from the context. We hypothesize that in the pre-training corpus, “between us” most likely acquires the meaning of “either you or me” rather than the literal meaning in a scenario like this, which biases the LLM to not

Dataset	Sources	Language	Tasks
One Liners (Mihalcea and Strapparava, 2005)	Websites	en	Humor detection
Pun of the Day (Yang et al., 2015)	Websites	en	Humor recognition, humor anchor extraction
Big Bang Theory (Bertero and Fung, 2016)	TV sitcom	en	Punchline detection
Ted Laughter (Chen and Lee, 2017)	TED talks	en	Humor recognition, punchline detection
#HashtagWars (Potash et al., 2017)	TV show	en	Humor comparison and ranking
HumorNorm (Engelthaler and Hills, 2018)	Online crowd-sourcing platform	en	Humor level rating
MUStARD (Castro et al., 2019)	Sitcoms	en	Sarcasm detection
UR-FUNNY (Hasan et al., 2019)	TED talks	en	Punchline detection
Humicroedit (Hossain et al., 2019)	Reddit	en	Humor level rating and generation
rJokes (Weller and Seppi, 2020)	Reddit	en	Sentiment analysis, humor level rating
Memotion (Sharma et al., 2020)	Internet memes	en	Humor classification and level rating
MUMOR (Wu et al., 2021)	TV-sitcoms	en, zh	Humor detection
NYT-Captions (Hessel et al., 2023)	New Yorker caption contest	en	Humor explanation
Short Jokes Dataset*	Websites	en	-
C^3 (Wang et al., 2022)	Xiangsheng (Chinese crosstalk)	zh	Crosstalk generation
TalkFunny (Chen et al., 2024)	RED, Zhihu, etc	zh	Joke generation
TCHD (Chen et al., 2023)	-	zh	Humor detection, level rating, classification, and punchline detection
TTWS (Zhang et al., 2019)	Books, literary journals, etc	zh	Humorous word identification
CHM (Tseng et al., 2020)	Websites, books, Apps	zh	Humor level rating and classification
Memeplate (Li et al., 2022)	Social media, image recognition website	zh	Humor level rating
<i>Chumor</i> (us)	Ruo Zhi Ba	zh	Humor explanation

Table 2: Existing datasets related to humor. We note that *Chumor* is the first Chinese humor explanation dataset.

reason the literal meaning needed for the explanation.

Hallucinations.

Example	(zh) 五步蛇的危险性是李白的两倍。 (en) The danger of a five-step snake is twice that of Li Bai .
Correct Humor Explanation	<i>Kill one in ten steps</i> is a line from a poem by the ancient Chinese poet Li Bai, suggesting that while it takes Li Bai ten steps to kill, a person can die within five steps of being bitten by the “Five-Step Snake” hence it is twice as dangerous as Li Bai.
GPT-4o’s Answer	(zh) ... 李白的名字听起来像“二步”，所以“五步蛇”的危险性被戏称为是“二步”的两倍。 (en) ... Li Bai’s (pronounced as lee bye) name sounds similar to “two steps” (pronounced as r boo) in Chinese , so the danger of “Five-Step Snake” is humorously claimed to be twice that of “two steps”
Failure Reasons	Fabricate ungrounded details or facts.

LLMs may fabricate ungrounded details or facts in the joke explanation. For instance, in this explanation, GPT-4o provides the reason that “Li Bai’s name sounds similar to two steps”, while “Li Bai” (pronounced as *lee bye*) does not sound like “two steps” (pronounced as *r boo*).

On the other hand, the correct explanation requires an understanding of a Chinese poem from Li Bai, “十步杀一人” (The warrior kills a person for every ten steps). This sentence is intended to praise the courage of the soldiers, but the joke deliberately portrays this as a characteristic of Li Bai. Therefore, compared to Li Bai who can kill a person in ten steps, a five-step snake, which can kill a person in five steps, is twice as dangerous as Li Bai. Such explanation requires LLMs to have a deep understanding of Chinese culture and reason over these cultural terms, which poses a great challenge to the current LLMs. Though recent works have made progress towards building LLMs beyond English (Du et al., 2024; Zhao et al., 2024), building an LLM that can understand such nuanced Chinese cultural terms can be extremely hard.

Pun-based Humor.

Example	(zh) 你可以在 steam 上找到 GTA , 所以水是 DNA。 (en) You can find GTA on Steam , so water is DNA.
Correct Humor Explanation	Normally, “Steam” refers to a gaming platform and “GTA” refers to the “Grand Theft Auto” game series. The joke uses a pun, where “steam” literally means the gaseous form of water, and “G”, “T”, and “A” represent Guanine, Thymine, and Adenine, respectively—three of the four nucleotides (AGTC) that make up DNA.
GPT-4o’s Answer	(zh) ...这种 明显错误的类比 制造了荒诞的效果, 引人发笑。 (en) ... This clearly wrong analogy creates an absurd effect.
Failure Reasons	Fail to discover multiple meanings of a word in the jokes

LLMs may fail to discover multiple meanings of the same word in the joke, leading to its failure on pun-based jokes where the humor lies in inverting the conventional usage of words. In this example, GPT-4o fails to understand the switch from the video game “Steam”, “GTA” to the scientific terminologies “G”, “T”, “A” that make up DNA. Typically, “steam” refers to a game platform, and “GTA” refers to the game series “Grand Theft Auto”. The joke uses a pun on words as “steam” in its literal sense means water vapor, and “GTA” can represent not only the video game, but guanine, thymine, and adenine, which are nucleotides involved in the structure of DNA. These kinds of jokes require LLMs to identify puns, and reason on the association of the multiple meanings. In addition, such a process requires LLMs to bridge the logic gap between these terms, such as “steam” and “GTA”, and an unusual context, like “water is DNA”. The overall process is particularly challenging, involving scientific knowledge and creative thinking which LLMs still struggle with.

Parsing Error.

Example	(zh) 小王 订了张飞去北京的机票 , 给 张飞 省了一大笔钱。 (en) Xiaowang booked an airline ticket to Beijing, saving Zhang Fei a lot of money.
Correct Humor Explanation	There are two ways to parse the first half of the sentence: (1) 小王/订了/ 张/飞 /去/北京的/机票 XiaoWang/ booked/ a / ticket to fly to Beijing. (2) 小王/订了/ 张飞 /去北京的/机票 XiaoWang / booked/ Zhangfei / a ticket/ to Beijing. Typically, people would interpret in the first way as Zhangfei is a fictional figure and do not appear in the daily conversation. However, the second half of the sentence confirms that the second way of parsing turns out to be correct. Such contrast is hilarious.
GPT-4o’s Answer	(zh) ... 由于历史人物张飞已经不在世 , 所以给他省了一大笔钱。 (en) ... since the historical figure Zhang Fei is dead and cannot take a flight , the joke humorously suggests that he saved a lot of money.
Failure Reasons	Fail to parse textual elements in a sentence dynamically.

LLMs cannot parse certain elements in the sentence in more than one way at a time, therefore failing to explain jokes that require different parsing for the same sentence. In this example, the humor hinges on the ambiguity of the phrase “张飞”, which can be interpreted either as part of the verb phrase implying “a ticket flying to Beijing” or as a proper noun, referring to the historical figure Zhang Fei. There is great flexibility in how Chinese characters form a word, as each Chinese character can serve independently as a word, and combinations of these characters can also forge new words or phrases. There are decades of research studying the problem of parsing Chinese (Sun and Jurafsky, 2004; Sun et al., 2009). Recently, researchers have proposed task-specific tokenization approaches that adapt the parsing process to better align with downstream tasks (Liu et al., 2021, 2023b). However, how to incorporate different ways of parsing at one time still remains challenging.

Cross-lingual Humor.

Example	(zh) 曹操于城楼上问夏侯惇：“你瞧到了什么。” 夏侯惇说：“ <u>瞧到马岱</u> 。” (en) Cao Cao, from atop the city tower, asked Xia Houdun, “What did you see?” Xia Houdun replied, “ <u>I saw Ma Dai</u> .”
Correct Humor Explanation	Cao Cao, Xiahou Dun, and Ma Dai were historical figures from the Three Kingdoms period in ancient China. The phrase “saw Ma Dai” (pronounced as <i>chuh dow ma die</i>) not only literally refers to spotting Ma Dai but also play on similar pronunciation with the Japanese phrase “ちよつと待つて” (<i>chotto matte</i>), which means to “wait a moment.”
GPT-4o’s Answer	(zh) ... <u>这个笑话的幽默之处在于利用了“马岱”这个名字的谐音梗，听起来像“妈的”，让人误以为夏侯惇在骂人。</u> (en) ... <u>a pun involving the name "Ma Dai," which sounds like "damn" in Chinese.</u> It sounds like Xiahou Dun is swearing at Cao Cao.
Failure Reasons	Fail to recognize information/elements across different languages.

LLMs may fail to recognize elements or information across different languages. In its explanation, GPT-4o tries to link the pronunciation of “Ma Dai” to other Chinese terms but fails to reason on the similar pronunciations across the Chinese term “瞧到马岱” (pronounced as *chuh dow ma die*, meaning “saw Ma Dai”) and the Japanese term “ちよつと待つて” (*chotto matte*, meaning “wait a moment”). Such examples require LLMs to connect pronunciations across languages, which may be rare in the LLMs’ pre-training corpus and poses significant challenges to current LLMs.

Excessive Sensitivity. For ERNIE Bot, apart from making mistakes in all the aforementioned categories, it also shows excessive sensitivity to certain examples. Specifically, for content that contains languages related to hate speech but used in non-harmful contexts, ERNIE Bot refuses to answer. During our evaluation, we observe excessive sensitivity in the ERNIE Bot’s responses to humor related to medical ethics, and political discussions. This suggests that how to correctly understand the context and the language toxicity remains an open challenge (Zhang et al., 2024a). Such a problem is especially important for humor explanation, as misclassifying non-toxic context can lead to responses that deviate from the intended humor.

F Can LLMs Serve as Preference Annotator?

Figure 4 presents the results of GPT-4o preference study. We prompt the GPT-4o by:



Figure 4: Preference annotation from GPT-4o. We prompt GPT-4o to choose a better explanation between its own explanation and the explanation written by human. We note that the GPT-4o’s preference is significantly different from the human preference in Figure 1.

“对于笑话“[Joke]”

以下两个解释

解释1: [Explanation 1]

解释2: [Explanation 2]

哪个解释更好的解释了这个笑话的幽默之处？”，

which translates to,

“For the joke“[Joke]”

The following two explanations

Explanation 1: [Explanation 1]

Explanation 2: [Explanation 2]

Which one better explains the reason for why this joke is funny?”

Though prior works have shown the promise of employing LLMs as evaluators (Fu et al., 2023; Liu et al., 2023c). We note that as the evaluator for humor explanation, GPT-4o’s preference significantly differs from the human preference compared to Figure 1. Our results show that GPT-4o significantly favors its own explanation than explanation from human, which aligns with the finding in previous study that LLM evaluators prefer their own answer (Panickssery et al., 2024). But for a small proportion of the dataset, GPT-4o prefers explanation from human than the explanation from itself, and Figure 2 demonstrates one such example, which shows the potential of leveraging LLMs in automatic humor evaluation.

G Potential Application

First, we expect researchers to use *Chumor* to comprehensively evaluate the humor understanding abilities of LLMs. We want to stress that this may not be an effort limited to the NLP community, but researchers from psychology, cognitive science and beyond can also use *Chumor* to study how human perceives humor differently than LLMs. Such insights can in turn guide the algorithm innovation in the NLP community on humor understanding.

In addition, *Chumor* contains comprehensive linguistic and cultural components. We expect researchers to use *Chumor* to evaluate the culture-

understanding abilities of current LLMs, and develop LLMs that can deeply understand the nuances of diverse cultural backgrounds.

We also consider *Chumor* to be especially valuable to enhance the logic reasoning abilities of LLMs. As revealed by Bai et al. (2024), RZB data is effective in improving LLMs' ability on Chinese reasoning that is not limited to humor understanding, but can be generalized to many other tasks.

Last but not least, we hope that *Chumor* facilitates humor evaluation, especially humor evaluation in non-English languages like Chinese. As discussed in Appendix F, our evaluation reveals a significant gap between LLMs' preference versus human preference, we expect researchers to come up with new algorithms to better evaluate humor reasoning automatically.