

Irony Detection, Reasoning and Understanding in Zero-shot Learning

Peiling Yi, Yuhua Xia

Abstract—Irony is a powerful figurative language (FL) on social media that can potentially mislead various NLP tasks, such as recommendation systems, misinformation checks, and sentiment analysis. Understanding the implicit meaning of this kind of subtle language is an essential step to mitigate the negative impact of irony in NLP tasks. However, building models to understand irony presents a unique set of challenges, because irony is a complex form of language that often relies on context, tone, and subtle cues to convey meaning that is opposite or different from the literal interpretation. Large language models, such as ChatGPT, are increasingly able to capture implicit and contextual information. In this study, we investigate the generalization, reasoning and understanding ability of ChatGPT on irony detection across six different genre irony detection datasets. Our findings suggest that ChatGPT appears to show an enhanced language understanding and reasoning ability. But it needs to be very careful in prompt engineering design. Thus, we propose a prompt engineering design framework IDADP to achieve higher irony detection accuracy, improved understanding of irony, and more effective explanations compared to other state-of-the-art ChatGPT zero-shot approaches. And ascertain via experiments that the practice generated under the framework is likely to be the promised solution to resolve the generalization issues of LLMs.

Impact Statement—The generalization of irony detection faces significant challenges that lead to substantial performance deviations when detection models are applied to diverse real-world scenarios. In the study, we find that domain-specific prompts, as generated from our IDADP framework for ChatGPT, can not only overcome dataset-specific limitations but also generate coherent, human-readable reasoning, transforming ironic text into its intended meaning. Based on our findings and in-depth analysis, we identify several promising directions for future research aimed at enhancing ChatGPT’s zero-shot capabilities in irony detection, reasoning, and comprehension. These include advancing contextual awareness in irony detection, exploring hybrid symbolic-neural methods, and integrating multimodal data, among others.

Index Terms—Large Language Models, Prompt engineering, Zero-shot learning.

I. INTRODUCTION

IRONY is a rhetorical device or figure of speech [1], [2], which provides a comprehensive overview of irony: the expression of one’s meaning by using language that normally signifies the opposite, typically for humorous or emphatic effect. Irony on social media often takes the form of verbal irony and situational irony. Verbal Irony occurs when someone says something but means the opposite. Situational Irony occurs when the actual outcome of a situation differs from what was expected [3]. Irony often relies on the broader context, such as Posters’ personalities, cultural references, or the situation they are commenting on. The sneaky and subtle nature of irony

poses a significant challenge for other NLP tasks, including sentiment analysis, misinformation detection, and machine translation. All these tasks need models to understand the true intent behind the text.

Irony detection involves creating algorithms to identify and interpret irony in the text by recognizing linguistic cues like word choice, sentence structure, and context [4]. Effective irony detection accurately classifies ironic statements while explaining these classifications, enhancing system transparency [5]. It should also be adaptable across platforms and content types.

Irony detection is an active domain in NLP. However, existing research has at least three limitations: **1) Generalization:** Many irony detection models are trained on relatively small or domain-specific datasets, which limits their ability to generalize across different contexts and cultures. Models may perform well on specific datasets but fail to detect irony in diverse real-world scenarios. This limitation hinders the development of models that can generalize effectively [6]. **2) Reasoning:** Detecting irony often requires common-sense reasoning and an understanding of real-world knowledge, such as knowing that certain situations are undesirable or that certain statements are typically exaggerated for effect. Current models refer to the difficulty in understanding how these models arrive at their decisions. This issue is especially pronounced in complex models such as deep neural networks and large-scale transformer-based pre-trained models [7]. **3) Understanding:** Current models primarily focus on classifying irony as binary yes or no question, but often fail to capture and generate its true semantic and affective meaning. This ability is crucial for effectively addressing other NLP tasks that rely on recognizing and interpreting irony. Ironic text understanding often relies heavily on context, including prior conversation, cultural references, and situational factors. Current models, including those based on pre-trained transformers, often struggle to incorporate the necessary context to understand irony accurately [8], [9]. These limitations hinder the model’s ability to detect various forms of irony.

This study aims to address existing limitations by utilizing ChatGPT’s zero-shot capabilities to detect irony across diverse datasets and platforms, without prior training on ironic samples, while also generating human-like reasoning. ChatGPT has demonstrated a notable advancement in its ability to understand contextual cues and detect emotional nuances [10], [11], which are critical for identifying irony. The accurate interpretation of irony often hinges on the model’s capacity to discern both the literal and implicit meanings of a statement, alongside its comprehension of the broader context, including




Fig. 1. A concrete example of the IDADP for Irony Detection, Understanding, and Reasoning.

preceding dialogue elements. Concurrently, the implementation of Chain-of-Thought (CoT) prompting [12], [13] has significantly enhanced its reasoning capabilities, leading to more logical and consistent approaches to problem-solving. Moreover, the model's sophisticated language comprehension enables it to accurately interpret complex expressions and dynamically adapt to diverse conversational styles [14], [15]. Consequently, ChatGPT's integrated focus on reasoning, contextual understanding, and conversational fluency [16] positions it as the optimal model for our study. In this context, we propose a comprehensive framework IDADP for irony detection, reasoning, and understanding by harnessing ChatGPT's zero-shot capabilities. Additionally, the framework seeks to mitigate some of ChatGPT's known shortcomings, including sensitivity to prompt engineering, inconsistent output, and the lack of domain-specific understanding [17]. A concrete example (Figure 1) is provided to illustrate our main idea. First, ChatGPT generates domain-specific knowledge by responding to carefully crafted questions. The domain knowledge, combined with various prompt engineering techniques, is used to create different prompts. These prompts, enriched with domain-specific information, guide ChatGPT to focus on specific aspects and produce varied results. The outputs are evaluated by a voting mechanism to determine whether they include irony. Simultaneously, the model provides reasoning and generates a new sentence that retains the original statement's intended meaning without irony.

This research addresses the aforementioned limitations and opens up a new direction in computational irony research. Our contributions are as follows:

- Firstly, we tackle the challenge of detecting irony across diverse social media platforms and formats without relying on pre-existing training datasets.
- Secondly, we propose the IDADP framework to enhance ChatGPT's zero-shot irony detection by combining effective prompt engineering with domain-specific irony knowledge. Tested across six datasets, this innovative framework significantly outperforms other state-of-the-

art zero-shot approaches, improving the model's ability to detect, reason about, and understand irony.

- Thirdly, we refine an evaluation framework that combines linguistic and contextual analysis to more accurately capture the nuances of irony.
- Finally, we examine the underlying processes behind model decision-making and predictions, providing insights into their reasoning and understanding. This transparency enhances the models' accountability and trustworthiness, while also serving as a valuable reference for related NLP tasks.

II. RELATED WORK

A. Irony detection

Irony detection requires sophisticated methods to handle the subtlety of figurative language, with related works falling into five categories:

1) *Rule-based:* This approach relies on predefined rules and patterns to identify ironic statements. (e.g. [18]) provide two approaches to detect irony in Twitter's text data. The first is a lexicon generation algorithm to determine the polarity sentiment, and the second detects irony based on interjection words. (e.g. [19]) detect sarcastic tweets containing positive sentiment followed by an undesirable state. While effective for certain irony types, these methods struggle with scalability and diverse text—addressing this is the focus of this study.

2) *Lexicon-based:* This method uses lexical cues and semantic patterns linked to ironic language. (e.g. [20], [21]) compare sarcastic Twitter utterances to non-sarcastic positive or negative ones. [22] explore the impact of sentiment and irony in hashtags and develop a hashtag tokeniser. A key advantage is the explainability of decisions, crucial for certain tasks. However, multiple meanings of words and scalability issues can limit this approach in large-scale applications. This study aims to maintain transparency and explainability while improving scalability.

3) *Feature-based approaches*: Machine learning models for irony detection rely on linguistic features and classifiers, with their effectiveness depending on feature selection. For instance, N-grams [23] identify recurring patterns or words indicative of irony, while part-of-speech tags [24] capture unusual sentence constructions. Sentiment analysis and semantic roles [25] help detect contradictions in meaning, and conversation history [26] offers clues based on broader interaction context. [27] integrate these features effectively, allowing traditional models to capture intricate word-context relationships. However, these models often require complex architectures and expertise in feature selection [28]. While foundational, traditional methods are now often supplemented or replaced by deep learning techniques for more automatic text representation learning.

4) *Deep learning-based approaches*: Unlike traditional machine learning, deep learning models learn hierarchical representations from raw text, capturing complex patterns without manual feature engineering. These models use dense vector embeddings (e.g., Word2Vec, GloVe, BERT) to capture language nuances. Neural architectures like RNNs [29], CNNs [30], and Bidirectional LSTMs [27], [31] integrate these embeddings, with attention mechanisms focusing on relevant input for better irony detection in longer texts. Recent work explores transformer-based or hybrid models [5], [32]. However, complex models like transformers can be less interpretable, complicating explanations of their decision-making.

5) *Large Language Modeling approach*: Studies on using Large Language Models (LLMs) like ChatGPT for irony detection have begun to emerge, often under zero-shot or few-shot paradigms with prompt engineering, yielding mixed results. Research [33], [34] suggests that while ChatGPT shows promise in other fields, it is not yet the best tool for irony detection compared to specialized models. Notably, to the best of our knowledge, no studies have specifically focused on zero-shot irony detection, inference, and understanding.

B. Prompt engineering

Prompt engineering is the process of structuring an instruction that can be interpreted and understood by a generative AI model. The quality of the outputs generated by an LLM is directly related to the quality of the prompts [35]. The basis of prompt engineering is rooted in developing LLMs like the GPT series [36], [37], [11]. Research on the GPT series has been carried out to examine how various prompt structures affect model outputs, including the impact of length, specificity, and formatting on the quality of responses. Recent studies have focused specifically on the design optimization of prompts.

1) *Chain-of-Thought (CoT) Prompting*: CoT introduced by [13], improves reasoning by breaking tasks into intermediate steps. It can be combined with few-shot prompting for better performance on complex tasks. [38] extended this, showing that LLMs can act as zero-shot reasoners by adding "Let's think step by step" to prompts. Self-consistency [39] enhances reliability by generating multiple reasoning paths, and selecting the most consistent answer. To reduce manual effort in crafting demonstrations, [40] proposed sampling diverse

questions and generating reasoning chains. These methods inspired the design of our framework.

2) *Tree of Thoughts (ToT) Prompting*: ToT generalizes CoT prompting by encouraging the exploration of intermediate steps for problem-solving with language models. ToT requires defining the number of candidates and thoughts/steps for each task [41]. Similarly, [42] uses reinforcement learning instead of beam search for decision-making. [43] simplifies the approach by getting LLMs to evaluate intermediate thoughts in a single prompt. Though mainly used for arithmetic problems, we adopt the core idea: of promoting correct partial solutions, eliminating implausible ones using commonsense, and retaining "maybe" solutions in our framework design.

3) *Generated Knowledge Prompting*: This approach involves generating knowledge from a language model and using it as additional input when answering questions. [44] provides a representative example, consisting of two stages: first, generating question-related knowledge statements by prompting a language model, and second, integrating that knowledge to make predictions, selecting the highest-confidence response. Our framework incorporates a similar approach.

4) *Automatic prompt generation*: This approach focuses on automatically generating prompts to guide LLMs such as ChatGPT, rather than manually crafting them, which can be time-intensive. PROMpting (OPRO) [45] uses LLMs as optimizers, generating new solutions iteratively. Similarly, Promptbreeder [46] evolves task-prompts via an evolutionary algorithm, while APE [47] treats prompts as "programs" optimized by searching instruction candidates. [48] trains models to rewrite under-optimized prompts. However, our experiments show that fully automated prompts are less effective for domain-specific tasks.

C. Zero-shot learning in LLMs

LLMs can generalize knowledge across domains and handle tasks without specific training or fine-tuning, using "zero-shot" prompts without examples. While this is impressive, zero-shot performance is often less accurate or reliable than fine-tuned models trained for specific tasks, leading to less precise responses. For example, [11] have performed few-shot learning remarkably well on GPT-3. However, zero-shot performance is much worse than the few-shot performance on tasks such as reading comprehension, question answering, and natural language inference. One potential reason is that, without few-shot exemplars, it is harder for models to perform well on prompts that are not similar to the format of the pretraining data. Designing prompts that guide the model to produce better zero-shot results is a practical approach. This includes using clear and explicit instructions that reduce ambiguity. To address the issue, [38] demonstrates that LLMs are decent zero-shot reasoners by simply adding "Let's think step by step". [49] simply replace "Let's think step by step" of Zeroshot-CoT with "Let's first understand the problem and devise a plan to solve the problem. Then, let's carry out the plan and solve the problem step by step" to further improve model zero-shot learning capability. FLAN (Fine-tuned Language Net) [50] shows that instruction fine-tuning LLMs on a collection of datasets described via instructions—substantially improves

zero-shot performance on unseen tasks. [51] propose a similar approach to finetune T5-11B to respond to prompts, and they also report improved performance on zero-shot learning. However, creating a usable instruction-tuning data set is resource-intensive and is not suitable for domain-specific downstream tasks. Therefore, this study focuses on enhancing performance by optimizing prompts rather than fine-tuning using specific off-task data. In all LLMs, we selected ChatGPT, the mostly widely used LLMs so far as the example.

III. DATASETS AND CHALLENGES

A. Datasets selection

When selecting irony detection datasets, we focus on several criteria to ensure suitability for training and evaluation, helping our models generalize across various irony types and contexts. **1) Diversity of Irony Types:** Capturing multiple irony types allows models to generalize across contexts. **2) Source Diversity:** Drawing from varied sources, platforms, or domains enhances model adaptability. **3) Annotation Quality:** Since irony is context-dependent and subtle, datasets should document annotation methods to ensure labels reflect true content. **4) Public Availability and Documentation:** Publicly available, well-documented datasets ensure reproducibility and consistency in research. Based on these criteria, six irony detection corpora were selected (Table I).

TABLE I
"LENGTH" STANDS FOR THE AVERAGE TEXT LENGTH WITHIN THE DATASET, AND "RATION" INDICATES THE PROPORTION OF IRONIC INSTANCES RELATIVE TO THE TOTAL SIZE OF THE DATASET.

	iSarcasm[8]	SemEval[9]	Gen[52]	RQ[52]	HYP[52]	Reddit[53]
Size	1,600	4,792	6,520	1,702	1,164	1,949
Length	16.4	13.7	43.3	54.2	65.3	41.35
Ration	0.14	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.27
Year	2022	2018	2017	2017	2017	2014
Platforms	Twitter	Twitter	IAC 2.0	IAC 2.0	IAC 2.0	Reddit
Annotation	self-reported	Annotators	MTurk	MTurk	MTurk	Annotators

B. Datasets description

Among our selected datasets, **iSarcasm** [8] focuses on detecting intended sarcasm by minimizing labelling noise and capturing authors' true meanings, which may differ from readers' interpretations. Contributors provide links to sarcastic and non-sarcastic tweets, implicitly labelling their texts. Trained annotators then categorize each English text by irony type, ensuring labels accurately reflect authors' intentions. **SemEval-2018** [9] explores irony's effect on sentiment classification, building on challenges identified in SemEval-2014. A dataset of 3,000 tweets, gathered via irony-related hashtags, was manually labeled by linguistics students, with each tweet receiving a binary irony label and inter-annotator agreement checks to ensure consistency. **Gen & RQ & HYP** [52] stem from the same research and focus on different irony types. The "Gen" dataset captures broad sarcasm instances across contexts, "RQ" highlights rhetorical questions that convey sarcasm without expecting answers, and "HYP" focuses on exaggerated statements used ironically. Each dataset, sourced

from the Internet Argument Corpus (IAC 2.0), supports detailed irony analysis across diverse rhetorical forms. Finally, **Reddit** [53] dataset was collected from the online platform Reddit, where three undergraduates independently annotated each sentence with binary irony labels. This dataset reveals that context is essential for accurate irony assessment, as a sentence's meaning can vary between ironic and non-ironic based on contextual cues.

C. Challenges

To effectively investigate the challenges inherent in this study, it is essential to first evaluate the diversity and representativeness of our datasets. Prior research [6] underscores the importance of cross-dataset comparisons in assessing the generalizability of irony detection models that have been fine-tuned on specific datasets. These investigations have revealed that a significant number of models struggle to generalize their performance across different datasets, suggesting that no single dataset can comprehensively capture the diverse expressions of sarcasm found in varying styles, contexts, and domains. This limitation raises critical questions regarding the efficacy of sarcasm detection models trained on narrowly defined datasets. Consequently, we aim to conduct analogous preliminary experiments to further explore this issue.

We set up the experiments using 80% of the data for training and 20% for testing, applying the default settings on three widely used pre-trained models for classification task and irony detection: BERT [54], RoBERTa [55], and MPNet [56]. Table II illustrates that models trained on out-of-domain datasets face significant challenges in generalizing effectively. It is important to highlight that the tests conducted on the generic sarcasm (Gen), rhetorical question (RQ) and hyperbole (HYP) datasets yielded better results. However, it is essential to acknowledge that, despite these three datasets containing different types of irony and varying logistical patterns, they were all sourced from the same platform and annotated by the same group of annotators. This observation suggests that, in addition to the inherent differences in irony types, the distinct nature of social media interactions and the varying methodologies of annotation may serve as significant barriers to model generalization.

While these models have at least been trained on the same task, our approach intends to examine their performance in a zero-shot context, where the models are not trained on any samples or tasks related to irony detection. This presents an additional layer of complexity and challenge, as we seek to understand how well these models can perform in the absence of prior exposure to irony-laden examples.

IV. METHODOLOGY

In this section, we start by defining the research problem, followed by an overview of the overall framework of our model. Next, we provide a detailed explanation of the proposed method, concluding with an outline of the application process.

Model	Cross-dataset	iSarcasm	SemEval	Gen	RQ	HYP	Reddit
BERT	iSarcasm	0.69	0.51	0.48	0.52	0.65	0.52
	SemEval	0.45	0.78	0.50	0.61	0.54	0.48
	Gen	0.30	0.39	0.80	0.78	0.64	0.53
	RQ	0.46	0.50	0.77	0.74	0.76	0.57
	HYP	0.46	0.46	0.79	0.73	0.75	0.55
	Reddit	0.54	0.50	0.57	0.59	0.58	0.60
RoBERTa	iSarcasm	0.78	0.43	0.58	0.44	0.53	0.48
	SemEval	0.55	0.71	0.57	0.59	0.56	0.55
	Gen	0.35	0.43	0.83	0.79	0.70	0.51
	RQ	0.46	0.46	0.76	0.75	0.77	0.55
	HYP	0.60	0.51	0.79	0.73	0.76	0.59
	Reddit	0.51	0.58	0.60	0.53	0.58	0.63
MPNet	iSarcasm	0.75	0.49	0.51	0.57	0.56	0.51
	SemEval	0.51	0.74	0.56	0.60	0.63	0.54
	Gen	0.34	0.36	0.80	0.67	0.76	0.53
	RQ	0.48	0.47	0.76	0.74	0.76	0.58
	HYP	0.63	0.47	0.76	0.69	0.72	0.56
	Reddit	0.50	0.53	0.55	0.53	0.41	0.65

TABLE II
PERFORMANCE OF BERT, ROBERTA, AND MPNET MODELS ON
CROSS-DATASET IRONY CLASSIFICATION.

A. Problem definition

The key notations used throughout the article, as outlined in Table III, followed by a formalization of the research problems from multiple perspectives.

TABLE III
NOTATIONS AND DESCRIPTIONS FOR IRONY DETECTION FRAMEWORK.

Notation	Description
T	Text input(written or spoken)
D	Domain-specific relevant information
P	Prompt
C	Binary Classification function
R	Description of the Reasoning Process
G	Generalization function
F	Reasoning function
U	Understanding function
D^{test}	Testing data
E	The expected value on the unseen test data.
M^i	Intended meaning.
M^l	Literal meaning.
f^θ	The trained model with parameters θ
I	Ironic
N	Non-Ironic

Irony detection: Irony detection, in computational terms, is the process of the model automatically identifying and understanding instances of irony in written or spoken language [57]. Irony detection in the study can be formulated as a classification problem:

$$C(T) \in \{I, N\}$$

The goal of the model is to accurately classify T based on its understanding of irony.

Generalization: The generalization of a model refers to its ability to perform well on new, unseen data that was not included in the training set[58]. The generalization of a model can be expressed as:

$$G(T) = D^{test}[f^\theta(T)] - E(T)$$

This study focuses on the model’s ability to handle tasks or generate responses for queries it hasn’t been explicitly trained

on. Instead of relying on specific examples for each task, the model draws on its understanding of language, context, and general knowledge to infer appropriate responses from the input.

Reasoning: Reasoning refers to the model’s ability to process information, draw inferences, and provide conclusions or answers based on the given input [59].

$$R(T) = F(P(I, T))$$

The reasoning process is successful if the model generates a logically sound conclusion and a human-readable and understanding reason.

Understanding: Understanding in irony detection refers to the model’s ability to recognize and interpret statements whose intended meaning is different or opposite from the literal meaning [60].

$$M^i \neq M^l$$

The results of this research indicate that it is possible to generate sentences that do not contain irony but retain the same intended meaning. The model’s understanding can be described as:

$$U(T) = M^i \quad \text{and} \quad U(T) \notin I^n$$

B. Theory analysis

In-Context Learning, introduced by [11], allows a language model to perform tasks by simply providing limited examples or instructions in the prompt, without updating its internal parameters. Instead of fine-tuning the model on a large dataset for a specific task, in-context learning develops a broad range of skills and pattern recognition abilities during unsupervised pre-training, enabling it to quickly adapt to or recognize the task at inference time. However, the performance of in-context learning is: **1) Highly sensitive** to the quality and format of the prompt. Even minor adjustments in wording or the order of examples can result in significant performance variations. For instance, a prompt that is structured to highlight the contrast between literal and intended meanings can enhance the model’s ability to detect irony effectively. Conversely, vague or poorly framed prompts may confuse the model, leading to misclassification. **2) Less reliable** for complex tasks such as irony detection, which require deep domain-specific knowledge. This is particularly true for understanding various forms of irony that the model may not have encountered during its pre-training phase. **3) Inherently variable** is the nature of GPT models, which involves predicting the next word based on probabilities. This randomness can result in fluctuations in the generated text, which presents additional challenges for irony detection and reasoning.

After a theoretical analysis, we show how these insights support our approach, yielding significantly improved results over state-of-the-art models and addressing issues from preliminary experiments.

1) *Attention Mechanism in Transformers (Highly sensitive)*: Transformers, the architecture behind ChatGPT, use an attention mechanism to focus on different parts of the input more effectively. Different-designed prompts activate the model’s learned patterns, guiding it toward specific types of outputs. Perhaps one of the more advanced techniques out there for prompt engineering is self-consistency [39]. Self-consistency seeks to address the limitations of the naive greedy decoding approach traditionally employed in CoT prompting. This methodology entails sampling multiple, diverse reasoning paths through few-shot CoT and leveraging these generated outputs to identify the most consistent answer. Drawing inspiration from this concept, we employ a range of prompt designs with ChatGPT to enhance the efficacy and robustness of the prompting process.

2) *Biasing the Model via Contextual Cues. (Less reliable)*: Language models rely on probabilistic methods to generate text. When given a prompt, the model calculates probabilities for possible next tokens (words or phrases). The structure and wording of a prompt heavily influence which tokens are deemed more probable, essentially “biasing” the model toward certain responses. By carefully crafting a prompt, we can bias the model toward generating responses that align with your goals. Specific keywords and instructions in-domain can increase the likelihood of generating relevant, high-quality responses. For the zero-shot setting, we can’t give the samples but we can give relevant knowledge to clear and specific prompts to guide the model to understand the task based solely on the instructions. Thus, our framework aims to generate knowledge prompts by asking ChatGPT questions related to the core domain knowledge, allowing us to extract key terms and essential instructions.

3) *Zero-shot and Contextual Framing (Inherently variable)*: Language models like GPT-3 are pre-trained on a broad corpus of data using unsupervised learning, where they learn general language patterns. Because the model has generalized language understanding, a well-engineered prompt can activate this pre-trained knowledge and transfer it to specific tasks without needing explicit task-specific training. Clear and structured prompts allow the model to apply its general knowledge in a way that’s useful for the user’s query. However, ChatGPT struggles with domain-specific knowledge in zero-shot learning tasks. Without examples or fine-tuning, it may generate incorrect or overly general responses when asked to perform specialized tasks that require expertise outside its general training data. By framing the prompt with more explicit context and instructions, we can influence the model’s “thinking” (its probabilistic output) and guide it toward a desired style or form of response.

C. Overall Framework

The overarching structure of the proposed IDADP model is depicted in Figure 2. In our framework, we use GPT to apply domain-specific knowledge. Using prompt engineering, we determine the optimal pattern and employ a voting mechanism to aggregate all results, generating the final output.

1) *Domain Knowledge Extraction*: This phase aims to design the questions to make ChatGPT-generated domain knowledge to be used as part of the prompt. These domain questions all are generated by certain patterns guided by [35]. These patterns describe effective techniques for accomplishing different interaction objectives.

The Flipped Interaction Pattern: The pattern drives the model to start the conversation to get more accurate information from the user. For example, *I would like you to ask me questions to identify irony correctly.*

The Persona Pattern: The pattern enables the users to express what they need help with without knowing the exact details of the output they need. For example, *Act as an annotator to label irony datasets.*

The Question Refinement Pattern: If a user asks a question, they may not be an expert in the domain and might struggle to phrase it optimally or include helpful details. The model may state limitations in its answer or request additional information to provide a more accurate response. For example, *I will ask your help to identify irony in a statement. My question is "Is there irony in the statement?" suggests a better version of the question to use.*

The Recipe Pattern: The recipe pattern is that a user may not always have a well-specified description of what they would like to implement, construct, or design. For example, *Provide a complete sequence of steps to identify an irony in a statement.*

We utilized these prompt patterns to generate serial questions to acquire a collection of domain-general knowledge. This knowledge will be abstracted at the next phase as context cues to help machines do zero-shot learning.

2) *Domain Knowledge Integration*: This phase involves integrating all domain knowledge from Phase 1 into general contextual cues for the model. It is essential to be specific about the instructions and tasks we want the model to perform; the more descriptive and detailed the prompt, the better the outcomes. Furthermore, the details included should be relevant and contribute meaningfully to the task at hand. Drawing inspiration from the nuanced nature of irony and the annotation methods used for irony datasets, we need to integrate three types of knowledge.

Simple but specific definition of irony with one sentence: The first type aims to elicit quick, intuitive, or pattern-recognition-based answers from ChatGPT, focusing on straightforward and specific definitions of irony. For example, *irony expresses the opposite of its literal meaning or contrast with the context.*

Domain specificity features: The type prompt emphasizes the importance of features in the understanding of ironic statements. For example, **discrepancy**: between what is said and what is meant. and **contrast**: between expectation and reality presented in the statement. are the main features. They mentioned in past irony detection papers used as feature engineering.

The process of irony detection: This type of knowledge is specifically related to the irony detection process. For example, begin by asking ChatGPT to assess whether a statement is ironic, using a prompt such as *"Is the following statement*




Fig. 2. The Architecture of IDADP

ironic?” Next, provide the statement along with relevant context to enhance understanding. For example, “*A person says, ‘I love waiting in line for hours!’ after spending three hours at the DMV.*” Then, prompt ChatGPT to identify the literal meaning of the statement: “*What is the literal meaning?*” Following this, encourage ChatGPT to evaluate any discrepancies between the literal meaning and the situation by asking: “*Does the literal meaning match the actual situation?*” Finally, conclude by asking ChatGPT to determine whether the statement is ironic based on the previous analyses.

3) *Prompt Engineering*: This phase organizes all provided content, employing advanced prompt engineering techniques to generate varied prompts, including:

Zero-shot Prompting: These prompts directly instruct the model to perform a task without using additional examples for guidance.

Domain-Specific Chain-of-Thought (CoT): Unlike standard zero-shot CoT, which uses “step-by-step” instructions, we incorporate domain-specific guidelines to prompt the model to reason within a specific domain.

Meta Prompting: Inspired by [61] abstracts problem-solving by creating prompts that guide the model through logical steps independently of specific content examples. We emphasize the structural and syntactical aspects of tasks rather than content details, promoting a more abstract and structured interaction with LLMs that focuses on form and pattern rather than traditional content-centric methods.

Probabilistic Classification: This approach not only predicts class labels but also quantifies uncertainty, providing valuable insights for decision-making in critical applications. It is especially effective for sarcasm detection due to the subtle and nuanced nature of irony.

4) *Vote*: Voting is a rule-based classification method that determines outcomes based on results from multiple prompts, with rules varying depending on the target criteria. In our case, we apply a majority-consent rule (e.g., best-of-three) to reach a decision.

V. EXPERIMENTS

This section conducts a quantitative evaluation to assess the effectiveness of IDADP, complemented by qualitative experiments to provide a comprehensive understanding of the reasons behind IDADP’s consistent results.

A. Experiments design

To assess the reliability and consistency of ChatGPT’s understanding of irony, we will design our experiments from

four key perspectives:

1) *Generalization*: We conducted experiments using six different irony detection test datasets in a zero-shot learning setting to determine if irony is present in each statement. This will evaluate the model’s ability to generalize its understanding of irony across diverse datasets without prior exposure to any specific training data.

2) *Reasoning*: In this task, the reasoning process is deemed successful if the model generates a logically sound conclusion along with a human-readable and understandable explanation. For a response to be considered adequate, it must demonstrate coherence, accurately follow from the premises, and align with established logical principles. Additionally, the explanation should not only justify the conclusion but also be clear and concise, allowing users to easily follow the thought process behind the model’s reasoning. We evaluate the clarity and accessibility of the explanations by using the Flesch-Kincaid readability tests, which measure how easily a human can comprehend the text. This ensures that the explanations are not overly complex or difficult to interpret, making them suitable for a broad audience. The results are further analyzed manually to assess whether there is a balance between logical accuracy and ease of comprehension, ensuring that the reasoning process remains both robust and user-friendly.

3) *Understanding*: iSarcasmEval is the first shared dataset that includes pairs of sarcastic texts and their non-sarcastic rephrasings—two texts conveying the same meaning but with one using sarcasm and the other expressing the message directly. This unique structure allows for a more nuanced evaluation of sarcasm detection and understanding. Unlike the original pairwise detection task, where the goal is to classify sarcasm, we designed a more complex generation test to evaluate ChatGPT’s comprehension ability. Specifically, we tasked ChatGPT with reversing 200 ironic or sarcastic texts into their non-ironic counterparts, requiring the model to not only recognize the sarcastic intent but also accurately rephrase it into a neutral, direct form that retains the core meaning. To assess the model’s performance, we compared the generated non-ironic texts with those provided by the original authors, focusing on semantic equivalence and how well the sarcastic undertones were removed without altering the meaning

B. Settings

In this study, we employed the GPT-3.5-turbo model, a variant within the GPT-3.5 family, chosen for its decent performance in generating high-quality text and its large user base.

Additionally, GPT-3.5 is more accessible and cost-effective compared to GPT-4, making it a practical choice for large-scale experiments and reproducibility. To minimize variability, we adhered to the default parameter settings from OpenAI’s API. only set `output_max_tokens: 100`, `temperature: 0.3`.

C. Baseline

1) *Zero-shot CoT* [38]: Zero-shot CoT Prompting enables complex reasoning capabilities through intermediate reasoning steps by adding “Let’s think step by step” to the original prompt.

2) *Auto-CoT* [40]: Consists of two stages: (1) question clustering, which groups dataset questions by similarity to streamline varied question types, and (2) demonstration sampling, where a representative question from each cluster is selected, with its reasoning chain generated using Zero-Shot CoT. Simple heuristics ensure coherence in the reasoning chain. Unlike traditional clustering, we select samples directly from each dataset, enhancing flexibility and better reflecting dataset diversity and complexity.

3) *APE* [47]: Automatic prompt engineer (APE) is a framework for automatic instruction generation and selection. they discover a general prompt “Let’s work this out in a step-by-step way to be sure we have the right answer.” can improve performance on different datasets and tasks.

4) *PS* [62]: Plan-and-Solve (PS) Prompting expand In Zero-shot CoT includes the instructions “Let’s first understand the problem and devise a plan to solve the problem. Then, let’s carry out the plan and solve the problem step by step”.

5) *PS+* [62]: PS+ is to reduce errors resulting from missing necessary reasoning steps, which include “extract relevant variables and their corresponding numerals” to explicitly instruct the LLMs not to ignore relevant information in the input problem statement.

D. Prompts in IDADP

In the section, we will give three prompt samples generated from IDADP framework and used in our experiments.

E. Evaluation

In this section, we introduce several evaluation metrics and strategies to assess ChatGPT’s performance in irony detection, reasoning and understanding. These metrics were carefully selected because each offers a unique perspective on the model’s effectiveness, contributing to a well-rounded assessment of its ability to accurately identify irony across diverse contexts. By using a combination of these metrics, we ensure a comprehensive evaluation of the model’s strengths and weaknesses, allowing for a more thorough understanding of its performance.

1) *Detection and Generalization*: We evaluated ChatGPT’s performance in irony detection using three metrics across six datasets: precision, recall, and micro-average F1-score. Precision measures the model’s accuracy in correctly identifying ironic statements without misclassifying non-ironic ones, though it doesn’t capture missed ironic cases (false negatives).

Determine whether `[input_comment]` include irony.
Let’s think step by step

Sample 1: Steps to follow:

1. Identify the irony: Determine which part of the sentence conveys the opposite of what is meant.
 2. Clarify the intent: Express the actual meaning directly
 3. Please write the reason why you think this statement has irony.
 4. Please rephrase this statement without the irony with a new line.
 5. the result in only a JSON format where the key is "irony" and the value is 1 for irony, 0 for No-irony.
-

Sample 2: Steps to follow:

1. The text is not ironic if the statement does not contain a discrepancy between what is said and what is meant.
 2. The text is not ironic if There is no unexpected outcome or contrast between expectation and reality presented in the statement.
 3. Please write the reason why you think this statement has irony.
 4. Please rephrase this statement without the irony with a new line.
 5. the result in only a JSON format where the key is "irony" and the value is 1 for irony, 0 for No-irony.
-

Sample 3: Steps to follow:

1. Please provide a probabilistic score ranging from 0 to 1, representing the likelihood that the text is ironic.
 2. The threshold for irony detection is set to 0.7.
 3. Please write the reason why you think this statement is the likelihood.
 4. Please rephrase this statement without the irony with a new line.
 5. the result in only a JSON format where the key is "irony" and the value is 1 for irony, 0 for No-irony.
-

TABLE IV
THREE PROMPT SAMPLES OF IDADP

Recall assesses the model’s ability to identify all ironic instances, with high recall indicating strong identification but potentially more false positives. The micro-average F1-score provides equal weight to all classes, making it suitable for imbalanced datasets like iSarcasm and Reddit, as it prevents dominant classes from overshadowing minority class performance, offering a balanced view of overall effectiveness.

2) *Reasoning*: We evaluated the model’s reasoning using three metrics: logical soundness, coherence of the explanation, and readability. Human evaluators assessed whether the model’s responses were logically sound, well-structured, and easy to understand, with readability measured by the Flesch Reading Ease Score [63], where higher scores indicate easier readability, while lower scores mark more difficult passages. In addition, we perform human evaluation where human evaluators criteria are given to the annotator as follows: **1) Contextual Accuracy (1 point)**: Does the response refer to the correct context? **2) Internal Consistency (1 point)**: Is the reasoning in the response free of contradictions? **3) Clarity of Structure (1 point)**: Is it structured in a way that the main point is introduced, elaborated, and concluded logically?

3) *Understanding*: Evaluating irony understanding in language models like ChatGPT is challenging, as it requires understanding context, intention, and the contrast between literal meaning and actual intent. In this study, we use Irony Rephrasing as the evaluation task, where the model rephrases ironic sentences non-ironically while preserving the intended meaning. Cosine Similarity with BERT Sentence Embeddings: calculates the cosine similarity between the sentence embeddings obtained from a pre-trained BERT model. It outputs a similarity score between 0 and 1, where 1 indicates perfect similarity.

Original statement:	"What a beautiful day for a walk," said as it rains heavily.
Model response_1:	"The speaker is using irony because the weather is clearly bad, making the compliment about the day's beauty an obvious contradiction."
Annotation:	3 points
Remarks:	The response correctly explains the contradiction between the literal and intended meaning.
Model response_2:	"Basically, the thing is that irony happens when you say something but don't really mean it, which is kind of what's going on here. Like, they said something good about the weather but it's raining, so it's ironic."
Annotation:	2 points
Remarks:	Somewhat clear, but could be better organized or more concise.
Model response_3:	"The statement seems ironic, but in reality, it may not be because the weather could actually be pleasant depending on someone's preferences, even if it's raining"
Annotation:	1 points
Remarks:	The structure is not bad, but the reasoning is flawed, as it fails to properly identify irony.

TABLE V
EXAMPLES OF HUMAN ANNOTATION

4) *Consistence*: We use Standard Deviation (STD) to measure the consistency of the model's performance. A low standard deviation shows stable, reliable results, while a high one indicates varying, less dependable performance.

F. Results

This section presents the experiments' results to address the research questions driving our study.

1) *Detection and Generalization*: The results presented in Table VI indicate the performance of the proposed model (IDADP) alongside five baseline models across six datasets for irony detection. Comparing IDADP to the baseline models, it consistently outperformed the baseline models in terms of precision, recall, and F1 score. Certain baseline models (e.g., Auto-CoT) struggled, particularly on datasets like SemEval and Reddit, where F1 scores were significantly lower (0.35 and 0.28, respectively). This suggests that these models might face difficulties in handling more complex irony structures or varied linguistic styles present in those datasets. Notably, the results indicate that while some models had higher precision (like PS+ at 0.63 on iSarcasm), they lagged in recall or F1 score, suggesting that these models may struggle to capture all relevant instances of irony. In contrast, IDADP not only exhibited higher precision but also maintained a balanced recall, making it a robust choice for irony detection.

To gain further insight into this phenomenon, a comprehensive analysis comparing the performance of different models for detecting non-ironic and ironic (Figure 3) sentences based on the precision and recall metrics. The x-axis represents precision, while the y-axis denotes recall. Each coloured point signifies a different model, with black representing the IDADP model. IDADP generally exhibits a good balance between precision and recall across all datasets, indicating robust performance in irony detection tasks. Comparing IDADP,

base models show some variability, Some models show high precision but lower recall, while others exhibit the opposite trend, indicating potential areas where they may struggle to generalize. There is a clear distinction in the performance of the models on no-ironic and ironic detection. In ironic detection, the models tend to favour lower precision, whereas in no-irony detection, the models generally yield high precision, indicating the inherent challenges in irony detection.

In Figure 3, the IDADP model (black point) outperforms all models on precision, except in HYP. However, its recall is somewhat inconsistent, indicating that while it may accurately identify a number of ironic instances, it could also be missing several others. IDADP (black point) model maintains a balanced performance, however, it needs to non-ironic statements while minimizing false positives sample.

The performance of the models varies across datasets, suggesting that certain datasets may pose unique challenges on different class detection tasks, for example, all models have a better performance on HYP datasets but very struggled with Semeval, implying that the task may be particularly challenging in certain contexts.

Table VII lists various posts along with their predicted labels and human evaluations. The errors can be categorized as false positives (predicted ironic when not) and false negatives (predicted non-ironic when it is). We can generally classify the three reasons the model makes wrong predictions. 1) **Contextual and Linguistic Complexity**: The model struggles with contextual nuances and the implications of certain phrases like humans. 2) **Model Calibration**: Many simple questions or comments often fail to be recognized by the model when expressed sarcastically, revealing underlying gaps in subtle language processing capabilities. 3) **Need for Enhanced Training**: Improving model performance may necessitate exposure to more diverse linguistic structures, focusing specifically on irony, sarcasm, and social commentary.

2) *Reasoning*: Table VIII compares the Flesch Reading Ease (F), Standard Deviation (S) of F, and Human Evaluation Scores (H) for different ChatGPT prompts across several datasets. In general, IDADP demonstrates strong balance between readability and human evaluation scores across all datasets, making it a solid all-round performer. Especially, IDADP performs well in Human Evaluations (H), showing consistent improvement in human preference compared to other models. IDADP scores average 2.5, suggesting that its outputs are well-received by humans across these datasets. Moreover, IDADP shows relatively lower standard deviations across datasets. High standard deviation (S) generally indicates that a model may produce responses that vary greatly in terms of readability, with some responses being very readable and others much less so. Low standard deviation suggests more consistency in readability, which is a positive sign for predictability and stability in response quality. It is notable, for Flesch Reading Ease (F) Scores, IDADP shows achieving moderately high Flesch Reading Ease scores but not the highest. Meanwhile, we notice some models achieve the highest Flesch Reading Ease scores, but with very lower human annotator value. For example, PS achieves a particularly high value of 50.9, but with the lowest human annotator score of

	iSarcasm			SemEval			Gen			RQ			HYP			Reddit		
Detection	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1	P	R	F1
Zero-CoT	0.60	0.71	0.58	0.47	0.47	0.47	0.61	0.61	0.61	0.64	0.63	0.63	0.67	0.66	0.64	0.58	0.59	0.57
Auto-CoT	0.57	0.54	0.20	0.49	0.50	0.35	0.58	0.51	0.36	0.77	0.51	0.31	0.74	0.52	0.36	0.59	0.52	0.28
APE	0.60	0.69	0.58	0.62	0.60	0.59	0.65	0.64	0.64	0.69	0.70	0.69	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.59	0.60	0.58
PS	0.62	0.59	0.60	0.54	0.51	0.40	0.62	0.53	0.42	0.62	0.62	0.55	0.47	0.56	0.52	0.57	0.53	0.52
PS+	0.63	0.56	0.57	0.49	0.50	0.35	0.58	0.51	0.36	0.77	0.51	0.31	0.74	0.52	0.36	0.59	0.52	0.28
IDADP	0.65	0.72	0.67	0.65	0.65	0.65	0.74	0.74	0.74	0.80	0.73	0.82	0.81	0.78	0.76	0.63	0.64	0.64

TABLE VI
RESULTS OF THE IDADP IN COMPARISON TO THE BASELINES ACROSS SIX DATASETS. P: PRECISION; R: RECALL; F1: MICRO F1; THE BEST PERFORMANCES ARE HIGHLIGHTED IN BOLD.

Index	Posts	Ironic	Prediction	Human Evaluate
1	"villainous pro tip: change the device name on her Bluetooth devices so she doesn't forget u"	No	Yes	Yes
<i>Human Reason:</i>	<i>the advice is villainous, implying bad or unethical behaviour rather than something genuinely helpful.</i>			
2	"Where did they get 1.22xg from without the pen?!"	No	Yes	No
<i>Human Reason:</i>	<i>It appears to be a straightforward question or expression of confusion about the expected goals (xG) statistic in sports</i>			
3	"Sort of a 'Read my lips, no new taxes.' GHW Bush moment for Obama."	No	Yes	Not Sure
<i>Human Reason:</i>	<i>the reference to Bush's famous failed pledge adds an ironic twist to Obama's situation</i>			
4	"So much for the Hippocratic oath"	Yes	No	Yes
<i>Human Reason:</i>	<i>it typically implies that a doctor or medical professional has acted in a way that contradicts the principles of the Oath</i>			
5	"Would they take it back?"	Yes	No	Not Sure
<i>Human Reason:</i>	<i>Without context, it may just be a straightforward question.</i>			
6	"No, their primary motivation is to get money from the wealthy then do what the wealthy want"	Yes	No	No
<i>Human Reason:</i>	<i>It appears to be a direct, critical commentary on the motivations of a group or organization</i>			

TABLE VII
MISCLASSIFICATION SAMPLES ALONG WITH THEIR PREDICTED LABELS, HUMAN EVALUATIONS AND HUMAN REASON

1.5 on SemEval dataset.

Table IX illustrates the phenomena. While a high Flesch Reading Ease score makes a text more accessible and easier to read, but it can't reflect if the sentence expresses the intended meaning. For example, PS generated the highest score but with a wrong answer. To achieve a higher Flesch score, sentences are shortened and complex words are replaced with simpler ones. While this improves readability, it can lead to oversimplification, stripping away important nuance, detail, or sophistication from the text. For irony detection, reasoning requires complexity to convey precise or meaningful information. Simplifying too much may result in a loss of important context, accuracy, or depth. Just like the initial experiment design, there needs a trade-off between high Flesch scores and human evaluation quality; overly simplistic models may fail to provide nuanced or useful insights, as shown by the low human scores in models like Zero-CoT.

Irony reasoning refers to the cognitive process used to detect, understand, or interpret ironic statements. It involves recognizing the discrepancy between the literal meaning of words and the actual intended meaning in a given context. ChatGPT seems have a notable ability to perceive and com-

prehend this difference. The main advantages ChatGPT shows are **1) Context Awareness:** Understanding the surrounding situation or background is crucial. For example, the statement "What a beautiful day! alone" ChatGPT will give a reason: might be ironic if said during a storm. **2) Contradiction Detection:** Recognizing when the literal meaning contradicts the speaker's actual intention is key. For example, if someone says, 'Oh great, another meeting,' with a sigh, the positive words directly contrast with the negative tone, indicating dissatisfaction." **3) Prior Knowledge:** Irony frequently depends on shared knowledge or contextual assumptions. For instance, the statement, 'Max Verstappen is such a clean driver,' may seem positive if interpreted literally. However, recognizing the irony requires prior knowledge of "Verstappen's reputation as an aggressive driver", which allows for the intended contrast between the literal meaning and the implied message.

From the results showing in reasoning generated. ChatGPT demonstrates significant potential to achieve better performance in irony detection and reasoning by leveraging its advanced natural language processing capabilities. It can analyze subtle cues in context, tone, and word choice, allowing it to recognize discrepancies between what is said and what is




Fig. 3. Performance comparison of IDADP and baseline models on ironic and non-ironic sentence detection across six datasets.

	iSarcasm			SemEval			Gen			RQ			HYP			Reddit			
	Readable	F \uparrow	S \downarrow	H \uparrow	F \uparrow	S \downarrow	H \uparrow	F \uparrow	S \downarrow	H \uparrow	F \uparrow	S \downarrow	H \uparrow	F \uparrow	S \downarrow	H \uparrow	F \uparrow	S \downarrow	H \uparrow
Zero-CoT		71.3	29.1	1.6	46.9	11.0	1.8	44.6	9.5	1.7	47.2	24.1	1.8	37.3	13.0	2	46.4	9.9	1.8
Auto-CoT		48.2	9.9	1.4	48.3	4.5	1.6	46.4	9.4	1.5	42.4	7.6	1.7	45.7	8.8	1.7	45.4	8.9	2.1
APE		13.7	11.1	1.5	47.2	13.4	1.6	36.4	15.3	1.4	45.0	7.6	1.7	40.1	14.1	1.6	39.3	13.9	1.6
PS		45.9	16.2	1.2	50.9	8.0	1.5	40.3	11.8	1.5	45.3	7.6	1.9	39.3	15.2	1.7	41.2	13.7	1.8
PS+		48.6	19.3	2.1	49.6	8.8	2.2	46.1	9.4	2.2	45.5	8.1	2.1	40.3	13.2	1.7	47.2	11.9	1.9
IDADP		49.3	8.0	2.6	47.9	9.4	2.5	43.7	8.5	2.2	46.9	7.2	2.6	46.1	9.2	2.6	46.5	9.0	2.5

TABLE VIII

RESULTS OF THE IDADP IN COMPARISON TO THE BASELINES ACROSS SIX DATASETS FOR REASONING. F: FLESCH READING EASE SCORE; S: STANDARD DEVIATION; H: HUMAN ANNOTATION SCORE; THE BEST PERFORMANCES ARE HIGHLIGHTED IN BOLD.

meant. Additionally, ChatGPT’s ability to understand sarcasm, situational contrasts, and unexpected outcomes enhances its effectiveness in identifying both verbal and situational irony. With continuous improvements in context understanding and reasoning, ChatGPT can refine its ability to pick up on the nuanced layers of irony, making it more adept at distinguishing between literal statements and ironic intent.

3) *Understanding*: Figure 4 shows how well each method aligns the generated meaning of a statement with its intended ironic meaning. A higher cosine similarity score indicates closer alignment with the actual intended irony, while a lower score suggests misalignment. The IDADP method demonstrates scores concentrated between 0.7 and 0.9, reflecting its effectiveness in capturing intended irony consistently. In contrast, APE displays a broader range of scores from 0.4 to 0.9, peaking around 0.7, indicating significant inconsistency in irony reasoning. APE struggles with subtle contextual nuances. While PS and PS+ perform moderately well, they lack the consistency of IDADP. Auto-CoT and CoT show tight

distributions between 0.7 and 0.9 but still fall short of IDADP, as noted in Figure 5.

The radar charts in Figure 6 provided a visualisation of the relationship between the literal meanings, intended meanings, and generated meanings of ChatGPT through cosine similarity scores. Orange Line (Literal – Understanding) reflects the cosine similarity between the literal meaning of the statement and the understanding generated by ChatGPT, which consistently maintains higher scores than the other two lines indicating that ChatGPT understanding still needs based on literal meaning. Red Line (Literal – Intended): Indicates the cosine similarity between the literal meaning of the statement and the intended ironic meaning provided by the author, which exhibits fluctuations same with Blue Line (Intended – Understanding) indicating ChatGPT still hard to understand the irony with Lack of explicit markers and context. Some samples are illustrated in table X.

Approach	Reasoning	FRE
Sample:	<i>Max Verstappen is such a clean driver, he never makes dirty moves when racing.</i>	Ironic
CoT	<i>Max Verstappen is actually known for making aggressive and sometimes reckless moves when racing, so describing him as a "clean driver" who "never makes dirty moves" is ironic.</i>	33.7
Auto-CoT	<i>It is ironic because it sarcastically praises Max Verstappen as a clean driver who never makes dirty moves when racing, when in reality, Verstappen has been involved in several controversial incidents on the track.</i>	27.5
APE	<i>Max Verstappen is known for his aggressive driving style and has been involved in several controversial incidents on the track, so the statement that he is a clean driver who never makes dirty moves is ironic.</i>	43.6
PS	<i>It is a straightforward statement praising Max mVerstappen for his clean driving.</i>	57.1
PS+	<i>The use of the word "clean" to describe a driver in a racing context is ironic because it typically refers to a driver who avoids making aggressive or risky moves on the track. However, the statement goes on to mention that the driver "never makes dirty moves when racing," which implies that the driver is actually not clean in their racing tactics. Therefore, the statement is ironic.</i>	47.7
IDADP	<i>Yes, the statement "Max Verstappen is such a clean driver; he never makes dirty moves when racing." is likely ironic. The irony arises from the contrast between the literal praise of being a "clean driver" and the implied sarcasm, suggesting that Verstappen is actually known for making aggressive or controversial moves in races. The tone implies the opposite of what the words directly state, which is a hallmark of irony.</i>	47.6

TABLE IX
FLESCH READING EASE SCORE (FRE) FOR REASONING EXAMPLES
ACROSS SIX MODELS.

Posts	Intended	Understanding
I see that your team played well today!	I'm sorry that your team didn't win yesterday.	I see that your team played poorly today.
I think my husband has lost the ability to find the kitchen.	I know you're busy but can I have a cuppa please?	My husband seems to have trouble locating the kitchen.
Dry your eyes mate, they're only trousers.	The way people wear their trousers does not matter to most people so perhaps it would be a better use of your time to focus on yourself.	Dry your eyes mate, they're only trousers.

TABLE X
THREE SAMPLES OF MISUNDERSTANDING INTENT.

VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Irony detection is a complex linguistic task that involves recognizing when the intended meaning of a statement differs from its literal interpretation, especially in zero-shot learning scenarios where models lack pre-training on ironic examples. Our research leverages ChatGPT's zero-shot capabilities to detect irony across various social media platforms without rely-




Fig. 4. Frequency distribution of cosine similarity scores for irony understanding across six models.




Fig. 5. Frequency distribution of cosine similarity scores across three ranges for irony understanding.

ing on existing datasets. We introduce the IDADP framework, enhancing interactions through effective prompt engineering, improved context awareness, and features that address irony contradictions. Our refined evaluation framework incorporates linguistic and contextual analysis, boosting the model's accuracy. We also explore ChatGPT's decision-making process, increasing transparency and trust in its outputs. We will discuss key observations, how our findings address identified




Fig. 6. Radar charts display cosine similarities of literal, intended, and understanding meanings, where vertices represent similarity values with higher scores closer to the chart's outer edge.

limitations, and the ongoing challenges ChatGPT faces in generalization, reasoning, and understanding irony detection.

Generalization: To address generalization challenges, we leveraged ChatGPT’s zero-shot learning and prompt engineering to enhance adaptability to new data, reducing overfitting. Domain-specific prompts improved handling of linguistic complexities, though misclassification persists due to three main issues: First, the model struggles with nuanced meanings due to contextual and linguistic complexity. Second, model calibration remains a limitation, particularly in recognizing subtle cues like irony. Lastly, the model’s accuracy could benefit from exposure to a broader range of linguistic patterns, especially those involving irony, sarcasm, and social commentary.

Reasoning: In our experiments, we found that integrating prompt engineering with multi-step reasoning processes and domain-specific knowledge significantly enhanced ChatGPT’s ability to generate coherent, human-readable reasoning. However, there was a significant difference in performance when the model encountered unfamiliar contexts, highlighting the importance of providing rich contextual information to enhance the model’s focus.

Understanding: We analysed ChatGPT’s capability to convert 200 ironic texts into their non-ironic equivalents, and we found that the model demonstrated a notable proficiency in recognizing irony. It was able to retain the intended message by relying on literal interpretations. However, this approach is limited in scenarios where explicit markers or contextual clues are absent. While the task underscored ChatGPT’s ability to disentangle complex linguistic features, it simultaneously revealed its limitations in comprehensively grasping irony without clear indicators.

Future directions: Enhancing ChatGPT’s zero-shot capabilities for irony detection, reasoning, and comprehension offers promising research paths. Key areas include improving contextual awareness for irony detection, as it relies on subtle, conversation-embedded cues; context-aware attention mechanisms or expanded context windows could help capture these nuances. Hybrid symbolic-neural methods may support complex reasoning by combining logical structuring with neural flexibility. Addressing implicit knowledge gaps is also crucial, as irony often requires shared cultural understanding; multi-task transfer learning across satire, hypothetical reasoning, and idiom-related tasks could strengthen this. Finally, integrating multi-modal data may enhance irony detection by incorporating tone and body language, paving the way for a more contextually nuanced ChatGPT.

REFERENCES

- [1] W. C. Booth, *A rhetoric of irony*. University of Chicago Press, 1974.
- [2] J. Lear, *A case for irony*. Harvard University Press, 2011.
- [3] J. Lucariello, “Situational irony: A concept of events gone awry.” *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, vol. 123, no. 2, p. 129, 1994.
- [4] A. Reyes, P. Rosso, and D. Buscaldi, “From humor recognition to irony detection: The figurative language of social media,” *Data & Knowledge Engineering*, vol. 74, pp. 1–12, 2012.
- [5] R. A. Potamias, G. Siolas, and A.-G. Stafylopatis, “A transformer-based approach to irony and sarcasm detection,” *Neural Computing and Applications*, vol. 32, no. 23, pp. 17 309–17 320, 2020.
- [6] H. Jang and D. Frassinelli, “Generalizable sarcasm detection is just around the corner, of course!” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.06357*, 2024.
- [7] C. Van Hee, E. Lefever, and V. Hoste, “We usually don’t like going to the dentist: Using common sense to detect irony on twitter,” *Computational Linguistics*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 793–832, 2018.
- [8] I. A. Farha, S. Oprea, S. Wilson, and W. Magdy, “Semeval-2022 task 6: isarcasmeval, intended sarcasm detection in english and arabic,” in *The 16th International Workshop on Semantic Evaluation 2022*. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2022, pp. 802–814.
- [9] C. Van Hee, E. Lefever, and V. Hoste, “Semeval-2018 task 3: Irony detection in english tweets,” in *Proceedings of the 12th international workshop on semantic evaluation*, 2018, pp. 39–50.
- [10] J. Yang, H. Jin, R. Tang, X. Han, Q. Feng, H. Jiang, S. Zhong, B. Yin, and X. Hu, “Harnessing the power of llms in practice: A survey on chatgpt and beyond,” *ACM Transactions on Knowledge Discovery from Data*, vol. 18, no. 6, pp. 1–32, 2024.
- [11] T. B. Brown, “Language models are few-shot learners,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165*, 2020.
- [12] X. Cheng, J. Li, W. X. Zhao, and J.-R. Wen, “Chainlm: Empowering large language models with improved chain-of-thought prompting,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.14312*, 2024.
- [13] J. Wei, X. Wang, D. Schuurmans, M. Bosma, F. Xia, E. Chi, Q. V. Le, D. Zhou *et al.*, “Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 35, pp. 24 824–24 837, 2022.
- [14] W. Hariri, “Unlocking the potential of chatgpt: A comprehensive exploration of its applications, advantages, limitations, and future directions in natural language processing,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02017*, 2023.
- [15] L. Ouyang, J. Wu, X. Jiang, D. Almeida, C. Wainwright, P. Mishkin, C. Zhang, S. Agarwal, K. Slama, A. Ray *et al.*, “Training language models to follow instructions with human feedback,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 35, pp. 27 730–27 744, 2022.
- [16] P. P. Ray, “Chatgpt: A comprehensive review on background, applications, key challenges, bias, ethics, limitations and future scope,” *Internet of Things and Cyber-Physical Systems*, vol. 3, pp. 121–154, 2023.
- [17] A. Azaria, R. Azoulay, and S. Reches, “Chatgpt is a remarkable tool—for experts,” *Data Intelligence*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 240–296, 2024.
- [18] S. K. Bharti, K. S. Babu, and S. K. Jena, “Parsing-based sarcasm sentiment recognition in twitter data,” in *Proceedings of the 2015 IEEE/ACM International Conference on Advances in Social Networks Analysis and Mining 2015*, 2015, pp. 1373–1380.
- [19] E. Riloff, A. Qadir, P. Surve, L. De Silva, N. Gilbert, and R. Huang, “Sarcasm as contrast between a positive sentiment and negative situation,” in *Proceedings of the 2013 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, 2013, pp. 704–714.
- [20] M. Mladenović, C. Krstev, J. Mitrović, and R. Stanković, “Using lexical resources for irony and sarcasm classification,” in *Proceedings of the 8th Balkan Conference in Informatics*, 2017, pp. 1–8.
- [21] R. González-Ibáñez, S. Muresan, and N. Wacholder, “Identifying sarcasm in twitter: a closer look,” in *Proceedings of the 49th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies*, 2011, pp. 581–586.
- [22] D. G. Maynard and M. A. Greenwood, “Who cares about sarcastic tweets? investigating the impact of sarcasm on sentiment analysis,” in *Lrec 2014 proceedings*. ELRA, 2014.
- [23] J. Dimovska, M. Angelovska, D. Gjorgjevikj, and G. Madjarov, “Sarcasm and irony detection in english tweets,” in *ICT Innovations 2018. Engineering and Life Sciences: 10th International Conference, ICT Innovations 2018, Ohrid, Macedonia, September 17–19, 2018, Proceedings 10*. Springer, 2018, pp. 120–131.
- [24] E. Fersini, F. A. Pozzi, and E. Messina, “Detecting irony and sarcasm in microblogs: The role of expressive signals and ensemble classifiers,” in *2015 IEEE international conference on data science and advanced analytics (DSAA)*. IEEE, 2015, pp. 1–8.
- [25] I. Hernández-Farías, J.-M. Benedí, and P. Rosso, “Applying basic features from sentiment analysis for automatic irony detection,” in *Pattern Recognition and Image Analysis: 7th Iberian Conference, IbPRIA 2015, Santiago de Compostela, Spain, June 17-19, 2015, Proceedings 7*. Springer, 2015, pp. 337–344.
- [26] J. Karoui, F. Benamara, V. Moriceau, N. Aussenac-Gilles, and L. H. Belguith, “Towards a contextual pragmatic model to detect irony in tweets,” in *53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL 2015)*, vol. 2. ACL: Association for Computational Linguistics, 2015, pp. 644–650.
- [27] A. Kumar and G. Garg, “Empirical study of shallow and deep learning models for sarcasm detection using context in benchmark datasets,” *Journal of ambient intelligence and humanized computing*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 5327–5342, 2023.

- [28] A. Joshi, P. Bhattacharyya, and M. J. Carman, "Automatic sarcasm detection: A survey," *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, vol. 50, no. 5, pp. 1–22, 2017.
- [29] Y.-H. Huang, H.-H. Huang, and H.-H. Chen, "Irony detection with attentive recurrent neural networks," in *Advances in Information Retrieval: 39th European Conference on IR Research, ECIR 2017, Aberdeen, UK, April 8-13, 2017, Proceedings 39*. Springer, 2017, pp. 534–540.
- [30] R. Ahuja and S. C. Sharma, "Transformer-based word embedding with cnn model to detect sarcasm and irony," *Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering*, vol. 47, no. 8, pp. 9379–9392, 2022.
- [31] D. Olaniyan, R. O. Ogundokun, O. P. Bernard, J. Olaniyan, R. Maskeliūnas, and H. B. Akande, "Utilizing an attention-based lstm model for detecting sarcasm and irony in social media," *Computers*, vol. 12, no. 11, p. 231, 2023.
- [32] M. Belal, J. She, and S. Wong, "Leveraging chatgpt as text annotation tool for sentiment analysis," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.17177*, 2023.
- [33] M. Gole, W.-P. Nwadiugwu, and A. Miranskyy, "On sarcasm detection with openai gpt-based models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.04642*, 2023.
- [34] M. U. Aytikin and O. A. Erdem, "Generative pre-trained transformer (gpt) models for irony detection and classification," in *2023 4th International Informatics and Software Engineering Conference (IISEC)*. IEEE, 2023, pp. 1–8.
- [35] J. White, Q. Fu, S. Hays, M. Sandborn, C. Olea, H. Gilbert, A. El-nashar, J. Spencer-Smith, and D. C. Schmidt, "A prompt pattern catalog to enhance prompt engineering with chatgpt," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.11382*, 2023.
- [36] A. Radford, "Improving language understanding by generative pre-training," 2018.
- [37] A. Radford, J. Wu, R. Child, D. Luan, D. Amodei, I. Sutskever *et al.*, "Language models are unsupervised multitask learners," *OpenAI blog*, vol. 1, no. 8, p. 9, 2019.
- [38] T. Kojima, S. S. Gu, M. Reid, Y. Matsuo, and Y. Iwasawa, "Large language models are zero-shot reasoners," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 35, pp. 22 199–22 213, 2022.
- [39] X. Wang, J. Wei, D. Schuurmans, Q. Le, E. Chi, S. Narang, A. Chowdhery, and D. Zhou, "Self-consistency improves chain of thought reasoning in language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11171*, 2022.
- [40] Z. Zhang, A. Zhang, M. Li, and A. Smola, "Automatic chain of thought prompting in large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03493*, 2022.
- [41] S. Yao, D. Yu, J. Zhao, I. Shafran, T. Griffiths, Y. Cao, and K. Narasimhan, "Tree of thoughts: Deliberate problem solving with large language models," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 36, 2024.
- [42] J. Long, "Large language model guided tree-of-thought," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.08291*, 2023.
- [43] D. Hulbert, "Using tree-of-thought prompting to boost chatgpt's reasoning," 2023.
- [44] J. Liu, A. Liu, X. Lu, S. Welleck, P. West, R. L. Bras, Y. Choi, and H. Hajishirzi, "Generated knowledge prompting for commonsense reasoning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08387*, 2021.
- [45] C. Yang, X. Wang, Y. Lu, H. Liu, Q. V. Le, D. Zhou, and X. Chen, "Large language models as optimizers," 2023.
- [46] C. Fernando, D. Banarse, H. Michalewski, S. Osindero, and T. Rocktäschel, "Promptbreeder: Self-referential self-improvement via prompt evolution," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16797*, 2023.
- [47] Y. Zhou, A. I. Muresanu, Z. Han, K. Paster, S. Pitis, H. Chan, and J. Ba, "Large language models are human-level prompt engineers," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.01910*, 2022.
- [48] W. Kong, S. A. Hombaiah, M. Zhang, Q. Mei, and M. Bendersky, "Prewrite: Prompt rewriting with reinforcement learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08189*, 2024.
- [49] L. Wang, W. Xu, Y. Lan, Z. Hu, Y. Lan, R. K.-W. Lee, and E.-P. Lim, "Plan-and-solve prompting: Improving zero-shot chain-of-thought reasoning by large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04091*, 2023.
- [50] J. Wei, M. Bosma, V. Y. Zhao, K. Guu, A. W. Yu, B. Lester, N. Du, A. M. Dai, and Q. V. Le, "Finetuned language models are zero-shot learners," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01652*, 2021.
- [51] V. Sanh, A. Webson, C. Raffel, S. H. Bach, L. Sutawika, Z. Alyafeai, A. Chaffin, A. Stiegler, T. L. Scao, A. Raja *et al.*, "Multitask prompted training enables zero-shot task generalization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.08207*, 2021.
- [52] S. Oraby, V. Harrison, L. Reed, E. Hernandez, E. Riloff, and M. Walker, "Creating and characterizing a diverse corpus of sarcasm in dialogue," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1709.05404*, 2017.
- [53] B. C. Wallace, L. Kertz, E. Charniak *et al.*, "Humans require context to infer ironic intent (so computers probably do, too)," in *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, 2014, pp. 512–516.
- [54] J. Devlin, "Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*, 2018.
- [55] Y. Liu, "Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.11692*, 2019.
- [56] K. Song, X. Tan, T. Qin, J. Lu, and T.-Y. Liu, "Mpnet: Masked and permuted pre-training for language understanding," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 33, pp. 16 857–16 867, 2020.
- [57] Q. Zeng and A.-R. Li, "A survey in automatic irony processing: Linguistic, cognitive, and multi-x perspectives," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.04712*, 2022.
- [58] S. Shalev-Shwartz and S. Ben-David, *Understanding machine learning: From theory to algorithms*. Cambridge university press, 2014.
- [59] N. Duan, D. Tang, and M. Zhou, "Machine reasoning: Technology, dilemma and future," in *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing: Tutorial Abstracts*, 2020, pp. 1–6.
- [60] R. Brunsch and W. Ruch, "Studying irony detection beyond ironic criticism: Let's include ironic praise," *Frontiers in Psychology*, vol. 8, p. 606, 2017.
- [61] Y. Zhang, "Meta prompting for agi systems," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.11482*, 2023.
- [62] L. Wang, W. Xu, Y. Lan, Z. Hu, Y. Lan, R. Lee, and E. Lim, "Plan-and-solve prompting: improving zero-shot chain-of-thought reasoning by large language models (2023)," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.04091*, 2024.
- [63] J. N. Farr, J. J. Jenkins, and D. G. Paterson, "Simplification of flesch reading ease formula." *Journal of applied psychology*, vol. 35, no. 5, p. 333, 1951.